

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th September, 1981.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry); His Honour C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A. (Econ.); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Education); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Health); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.); Hon. L. R. TULL, Q. C., M.A., (Attorney General, and Minister of Foreign Affairs); Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Minister of Housing and Lands); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.); Mr. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Transport and Works); Mr. L. A. WEEKES; Mr. M. A. KING; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.A.S., J.P.; Mr. N. K. SIMMONS; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were led by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the Minutes of the Meeting of the 21st July, 1981 are not yet ready.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received copies of Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1981 as prepared by the Accountant General.

Also, copies of Accounts and Statements for the month of April, 1981 as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS

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

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1981;

The Income Tax (Tax Credit) Regulations, 1981;

The Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations, 1981;

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the month of April, 1981;

The Accountant General's Report for the Financial Year 1980-81.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the following:

Report on the Registration Office and the Supreme Court Registry for the year 1979.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay on behalf of the Minister of Labour and Social Security the following:

Reports of the Registration of Trade Unions for 1979-80.

Instruments adopted at the 66th Session of the International Labour Conference held in June 1980.

Dr. the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

The National Assistance (Amendment) Regulations, 1981.

Statements of Accounts of the Child Care Board for the years 1978-79 and 1979-80 and the Auditor General's Report thereon.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have the honour to lay the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer on allegations that irregularities occurred in the conduct of the recent General Elections.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in briefly summarising the Report I would say only this. The Chief Electoral Officer effectively gives the lie to the wild, and as is now shown, unsubstantiated, allegations that there were widespread irregularities at the General Election held on June 18, 1981.

The Chief Electoral Officer makes it clear that two years went into the preparation of the Electoral List and that the number of persons participating in the election was far, far greater than any that have ever voted at an election before in Barbados.

Although the population has increased by only a small amount since 1976, there were 20,000 more voters at the General Election of 1981 than at that of 1976, the greatest increase in numbers ever known between elections. By comparison, only 5000 persons more voted in 1976 than in 1971. This clearly shows that the exercise designed to ensure that all qualified voters were on the Electoral Register was successful, and utterly contradicts suggestions that there was any large number of persons deprived of the vote. Instead, it would seem that this may have been true of earlier elections, rather than the Election of 1981.

The Chief Electoral Officer received only 11 complaints from members of the public who felt aggrieved about their experiences in voting or attempting to vote.

An extensive computer exercise, and careful investigations, by officials in all the 27 constituencies revealed that there were four persons whose names were on the preliminary Voters List but were subsequently omitted from the final Electoral List, 4 Mr. Speaker, out of 167,000.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Chief Electoral Officer, all Returning Officers, and Election Officials

for their devoted and impartial service during the recent General Election. Those who have attacked the conduct of the Election and by inference the impartiality of Mr. Dennis Smith, the Chief Electoral Officer, and his officials have done Barbados a great and vicious disservice.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay, Sir:

The Annual Reports of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the years 1975, 1976 and 1977.

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

The Hotel Aids (Coconut Creek Hotel) (Extension) Notice, 1981; and

The Hotels Aids (Extension of Coconut Court Hotel) Notice, 1981.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay:

The Financial (Drug Service) (Amendment) Rules, 1981.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Community College for the year 1979-80.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the:

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Caves Authority for the year 1979-80.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1981.

Resolution to regrade the post of Executive Personal Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Applegrove, Christ Church.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at White Park Road, St. Michael.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at My Lord's Hill, St. Michael.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Dash Valley, St. Michael.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Oistin, Christ Church.

Sir, I am also commanded to give notice of:

A Bill to amend the Legal Profession Act, 1972.

A Bill to amend the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, 1980.

A Bill to make provision for the preservation of trees; and

A Bill to provide for the exemption from payment of taxes and duties and other moneys by certain persons, businesses or undertakings.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to amend the Legal Profession Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE a Bill to amend the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to make provisions for the preservation of trees was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to provide for the exemption from payment of taxes and duties and other moneys by certain persons, businesses or undertakings was read a first time.

12.35 p.m.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir,

After four years of rapid expansion, the Barbados economy has experienced strong recessionary pressures in the first half of this year. This state of affairs is expected to continue for the rest of the year, and can persist through to the middle of 1982.

There has been a fall in the rate of growth of output, accompanied by some deterioration both in the country's balance of payments position, and the condition of public finances. I shall later deal with these economic trends in greater detail.

The difficulties now being experienced have resulted in part from the worsening of international market conditions, brought on in part by recession in the major world economies, and also by a domestic factor wholly beyond the Government's control, namely the extraordinarily wet weather of the past six months. The Government is satisfied that our Island's current problems are not the results of any basic flaws in the development strategy to which we are committed and it is therefore not Government's intention to depart from the economic path which the country has followed, with great advantage, for the past five years.

The prevailing economic difficulties however necessitate a recourse to certain corrective measures, designed to halt any further deterioration in the balance of payments or of public finances, and to create the conditions for renewed economic buoyancy at the earliest opportunity.

The proposals which I will shortly announce are based on the conviction that the highest measure of economic management is always to

be found in the steps taken to avert an economic crisis, rather than steps taken to try to manage after the crisis has fully developed to an acute stage.

My proposals, Mr. Speaker, are intended to deal with an economic situation where the most recent estimates are that, on present trends, there could be a 1% decline in Gross Domestic Product in 1981, since all the Island's major economic sectors, with the exception of construction, have been badly affected by the unfortunate conditions.

Sugar

I turn, first, Mr. Speaker, to sugar. This year's sugar production, which was adversely affected not only by the weather but by a late start to the reaping of the crop, is approximately 25% less than the 135,000 tons produced in 1980. This, coupled with a drop in sugar prices, will cause receipts from the industry to amount to only an estimated \$78 million, or a fall of \$43 million from earnings in 1980. Moreover, the slow progress with the sugar harvest and the heavy rains have delayed the planting of other crops, resulting in the current shortage of vegetables. Overall therefore, not only have the incomes of those who work in the industry been affected, but the country itself is short of \$43 million in foreign exchange.

Manufacturing

The performance of the manufacturing sector has been mixed. Total output and exports for the first half of 1981 have been 5% less than for the equivalent period in 1980, largely in response to the prevailing recession in the markets of Barbados' major trading partners, and especially those in Caricom.

Fortunately, the output of clothing and electronic equipment has been on the increase, and there are signs of a second half upswing in manufactured exports as a whole. It is therefore projected that the performance of the sector for the entire year (1981) will match that of 1980.

Tourism

The performance of the tourist industry has provided the greatest cause for concern. Tourist arrivals during January to July have been 5% less than arrivals during the same period in 1980, and tourist spending has risen only in nominal terms. It is not likely that this trend will be significantly reversed before the 1982/83 winter season.

Energy

In the energy sector, the production of crude oil and natural gas has declined, as there has been a shift from the previous programme of drilling shallow wells to produce relatively small quantities of oil. Emphasis has instead been placed on a deep drilling programme from which it is hoped that greater quantities of oil will be discovered. This

decline in domestic oil production comes at a time when the Island had to absorb the greatest of the increases in the cost of petroleum, those of 1979/80. It is not generally known that, according to the UN Statistical Handbook, as recently as 1978 the average price of Venezuelan oil was US\$13.99 per barrel. In 1979 this went to US\$19.30 and in June last year to US\$34.25, where it has remained. This increase was very much more than those of 1973/1975 and the resulting pressures on Venezuela's customers shattered many of their economies. The international recession which is now coming home to Barbados is caused by that increase, as is the double digit inflation being experienced by the developed countries, where it was formerly largely confined to mismanaged Third World economies. We are fortunate in Barbados that we have continued to enjoy economic growth and that inflation in our Island is running at less than half the rate of 1974-75.

Construction

Construction has been the only productive sector to remain buoyant during the first half of the year. It is however clear that the economy cannot accommodate any substantial increase in construction activity, as such would only serve to aggravate the skills-shortage and cost overrun problems which have started to become a feature of the industry. The Government therefore will not commit itself to an economic recovery programme based on capital injections into the construction sector. On the contrary, a decision has been made already to reschedule construction of some planned projects.

The Balance of Payments

Because of the difficulties experienced by the major export sectors, the country's balance of payments position has deteriorated during the first half of 1981.

Domestic exports to the end of April have been only 6.1% higher than a year ago, and exports for 1981 as a whole are expected to rise only to \$377 million, 11.8% greater than the amount (\$337m) realised in 1980.

Imports have been growing faster than exports, so much so that the country's external reserves fell by \$15.3 million between December 1980 and June 1981.

On the basis of these trends, it is projected that the overseas current account payments balance for 1981 will be minus \$173 million as compared to minus \$55 million in 1980. Net capital inflows have been projected at \$145 million, leaving a balance of \$28 million to be met by official financing. In addition, the Central Bank is due to repay \$12 million of earlier foreign loans, which, together with the official financing gap of \$28 million, will give rise to an overall balance of payments deficit of \$40 million.

It is worthy of note that this deficit is almost equivalent to the difference of \$43 million between earnings by the sugar industry in 1980 and earnings in 1981.

If uncorrected, these balance of payments trends will lead either to a substantial reduction in our foreign exchange reserves (which at the end of 1980 represented the equivalent of 2.2 months of imports) or will necessitate substantial foreign borrowing. In any case the current deficit will have to be paid for out of the reserves which may then have to be restored by a modest foreign loan.

Inflation

It is pleasant in the midst of this catalogue, Mr. Speaker, to report that, contrary to constantly repeated assertions otherwise, we have *not* had any repetition of the runaway inflation experienced under the regime of 7 years ago. Figures to the end of July, 1981 show an annualised figure of 11% for the year and all agencies and sources agree that wages are still rising considerably faster than prices.

Financial Review

A review of the Central Government's revenue and expenditure patterns for April-July 1981, and projections for the rest of the financial year 1981-1982 indicate that a deficit in the order of \$187 million will be incurred if current trends are allowed to continue.

The situation is that some \$177 million in revenue was raised during the April-August period of 1981, as compared to \$175.9 million for the same period 1980-1981. However, current expenditure amounted to \$186.3 million, as against \$148.2 million in the same period of 1980. Whereas a current account surplus of \$27.7 million was realised by the end of August 1980, there is a deficit of \$9.2 million on current account for the period ending August 1981.

To compound the problem, capital expenditure for the first four months of fiscal year 1981/82 stood at \$62.97 million, as compared to \$29.6 million in 1981.

A deficit of \$187 million will clearly be intolerable and would have to be met by financial expedients which would only serve to undermine the long-term resilience of the economy. Government therefore intends to exercise the strictest financial discipline for the rest of the year. Already, certain administrative measures have been instituted to restrain expenditure and to improve the collection of revenue.

Policy Measures

But this, Mr. Speaker, will not be enough. If present trends are allowed to continue, the country's balance of payments will come under severe pressure by the middle of next year. I therefore propose to prevent this by instituting measures to restrain imports now that export earnings have started to level off.

To this end:

- (i) the import quota on motor vehicles for 1982 will be reduced from the 1981 quota of \$25 million to \$15 million;
- (ii) Central Bank restrictions on consumer and commercial credit will be strengthened, with immediate effect. Specifically, the minimum percentage payment and the maximum period of payment under the Hire Purchase and Credit Sales Agreements of the Central Bank in respect of motor cars, motor cycles, stereo equipment, cameras and jewellery, including watches, will be revised as follows:

(a) *Motor Cars*

At present, for cars valued up to and including \$20,000, a minimum percentage down payment of 33 1/3% is required, and the maximum period of payment is 24 months. These rates will now apply to all motor vehicles (two tonnes and under) valued up to and including \$13,500. The rates (50% down payment and 18 months maximum payment period) formerly applicable to cars valued between \$20,000 and \$30,000 will now apply to all motor vehicles valued between \$13,501 to \$20,000. The rates (50% down payment and 12 months repayment period) formerly applicable to vehicles valued \$30,000 and over, will now apply to vehicles valued at between \$20,001 and \$30,000. All cars valued at over \$30,000 will have to be paid for in cash.

(b) *Motor Cycles*

For motor cycles valued up to and including \$3,000 the minimum percentage payment will be increased from 25% to 33 1/3%. There will be no change in the payment period. The minimum percentage on motor cycles valued at \$3,001 and over is to be increased from 40% to 50%. There will be no change in the payment period.

(c) *Stereo Equipment*

At present there are no credit regulations governing the sale of stereo equipment and accessories. The minimum percentage payment on such items will now be 50% and the maximum period for the payment of the balance will be 6 months. Video cassette recorders will be included under this head for the first time.

(d) *Cameras, Jewellery etc.*

The minimum percentage payment for the purchase of jewellery, cameras and watches will remain at 50% but the maximum period for the payment of the balance will be reduced from 12 to 9 months.

I would point out that with the spectacular appreciation of the US dollar (to which our dollar is tied) against most other currencies there should be a substantial fall in the price of most of the foregoing items, particularly motor cars, and the new Regulations have been designed to take account of this.

Exports

I turn now from imports to exports, Mr. Speaker. During the last session of Parliament the Government set up an Export Promotion Corporation. Initially funded by grants from the EEC, the Corporation has worked very successfully in expanding Barbados' trade, notably within Caricom. One of its functions is the certifying of locally manufactured products to enable them, where they meet the rules, to enter other Caricom countries duty free. Until now, this service has been rendered free of cost to the manufacturer. The Government considers that the work of the Corporation is so important to domestic economic activity and to our balance of payments that more funds should be made available for export promotion operations. It is therefore proposed that a charge of \$5 be imposed on applications for certification and \$5 for the certification itself, payable to the Corporation. The necessary steps under the Export Promotion Act will shortly be taken and the date from which the charge will take effect be announced. Charges for export certifications for destinations other than Caricom will be announced at the same time.

Fiscal Policy and Revenue Proposals

I turn, Mr. Speaker, to fiscal policy generally and specifically to revenue proposals.

The Government has no intentions of incurring a deficit of \$187 million for fiscal year 1981/82 and I make no apologies for repeating this statement. Such a deficit would have to be met by a combination of the following; all of which are unpalatable:

- Either (i) the printing of high-powered money, which would lead to an increase in the rate of inflation;
- (ii) increased borrowing from the domestic banking system, which would trigger a competition for scarce credit within the domestic economy and slow down the growth of the private productive sectors, or
- (iii) a really substantial increase in external borrowing, which, at the prevailing high rates of interest, would be a most costly expedient.

Ways therefore have to be found not only to restrain expenditure, particularly on capital projects, but to raise revenues.

I therefore, propose the following measures for the purpose of raising revenue to meet public expenditure. The proposals will take effect under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act.

Transport and Highways

The financial situation in relation to public transport in Barbados has now become untenable. The subsidy given the Transport Board to maintain cheap bus-fares has risen out of all proportion and, in the absence of corrective action, will this year reach \$17m. This is more than is voted for road maintenance, drainage, bus stands, car parks and other works. It is more than the Government can afford to spend on housing. The increase of the subsidy to pay this year's wage increases necessarily means that even less money will be available to the Ministry of Transport and Works to repair and maintain our roads. The whole expenditure of the Transport Board for this financial year excluding the purchase of buses is estimated at over \$32m. and collections from bus-fares at present levels will total less than \$15m.

Add to this the fierce competition for the best routes from mini-buses and maxi-taxis and it is clear that the taxpayers can no longer be called on to bear so enormous a burden of subsidy and the consequent fall in the standards of other services which the Ministry of Transport and Works is expected to provide with limited funds.

An economic bus-fare to cover current expenses would be in the region of one dollar per journey. To replace the buses as they become too old and decrepit would call for a bus-fare of at least \$1.20 per journey. But although a study carried out by the Barbados Statistical Service shows that the population spends less than 1% of its income on bus-fares the Government is well aware that many wage earners are simply not geared to pay \$10 per week to get to work or more if two buses are needed. In developed countries this would indeed be a trivial amount and even the proportion of income which it represents in Barbados is not particularly great, but it is a burden which I have no intention of placing suddenly on a population that has been made accustomed to very cheap transport. Accordingly, as from tomorrow, September 9 the bus-fares for adult passengers will be raised only to 60 cents per journey. The Transport Board has calculated that the subsidy in the case of school children is exceptionally generous since three school children occupy as much space in a bus as two adults but school fares are one third the amount of adult fares. Beginning next week Monday, 14th September the school fare will be raised to two thirds of that of the adult fare and school tickets will therefore cost \$4 per week. The individual fare will be 40 cents. School transfer tickets will cost \$2 per week.

The increased bus-fares will of course bring large increases in the revenues of mini-bus operators. The registration and renewal permit fees payable in respect of taxis, mini-buses and tour coaches will therefore be increased as of Monday 21st September as follows:—

- (i) *Owner operated Mini-buses* will now be charged an initial permit fee of \$5000 and a renewal fee of \$1500 annually.
- (ii) *Mini-buses other than owner operated* will attract an initial permit fee of \$7500 and a renewal fee of \$2,500 annually. The same rates will apply to

Tour Coaches;

- (iii) Churches registered as charities which operate mini-buses or coaches for their charitable purposes will be granted exemption from the increased fees;
- (iv) *Owner operated taxis* licensed to carry up to five passengers will now pay an initial permit fee of \$500 and a renewal fee of \$100. The only change here is the \$50 increase in the renewal fee;
- (v) *Owner-operated taxis for more than five persons* will attract an initial permit fee of \$2,500 and a renewal fee of \$750. This proposal is designed to deal with the fact that, following liberalization of the law relating to what vehicles could register as taxis, it has been observed that a number of persons have registered vans which carry up to ten passengers as taxis and then put them into service as mini-buses. If persons wish to do this they must pay for the privilege, as they are in effect competing at much lower rates against registered mini-buses and against the Transport Board.
- (vi) In addition to the foregoing all transfers of taxi and mini-bus licences will henceforth be paid for at half the rate of an initial registration, that is, where a person sells the right to run a mini-bus to another person who then seeks to register it.

I have given almost two weeks before the new rates come into force. The reason for this is there are still a number of unlicensed mini-buses on the highways carrying passengers although the new "B" numbers have not been issued to them. In an effort to accommodate those mini-bus and taxi operators who have not yet been able to licence their vehicles a grace period has been given before the new rates are effective. They will, however, note that if they do not licence their vehicles before September 21st they will be liable to pay \$5,000 at least for first registration for a mini-bus, and they should be advised that the Royal Barbados Police Force, for whose recent efforts to deal with the traffic situation we should all be grateful, will rigidly enforce the law against all offenders.

The foregoing proposals will reduce the deficit for the Transport Board and will therefore reduce the size of the subsidy, but they will do very little for the weak underlying position of both public transport and of the highways. I have been much impressed by the vehemence with which the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union has called on the Government to undertake massive programme of highway repair and reconstruction. I have therefore decided to set up a Board on which, among other organisations, the Barbados Workers' Union will be represented, and place it in funds for the purpose both of improving public transport and the condition of the highways. The Board will be funded by a Transport Levy, which I now propose, and this levy will be used for the purpose of buying buses for the Transport Board and for special programs of highway repair. The levy will be in the form of a charge on all employed persons in the amount of 1% of their earnings insurable for National Insurance purposes. I also propose a levy of .25% of the insurable wage bill on employers. Employers get the benefit of Barbados' road system and of a cheap bus system and are therefore able to site factories and other businesses all over the country on the basis of convenient Government transportation. The Government therefore considers that they should also carry a part of a burden of maintaining these systems. The Transport Levy will be collected in the same way as National Insurance contributions, and will come into effect on Monday October 5, 1981.

Social Security

I turn next to certain aspects of the Government's social security schemes which are related to the National Insurance Scheme. In its manifesto for the General Election of 1976 the Government pledged the introduction of a National Health Service to be financed through the National Insurance Scheme. The first part of this service is now in place, namely the National Drug Plan. This was initially financed by a capital grant of \$8m from the Consolidated Fund and in this initial stage no provisions were therefore made for the levying of a Health Service charge. The Drug Plan is now in operation, as is the model Polyclinic which is bringing primary care benefit to particular vulnerable classes. Other Polyclinics have been built and others are now coming into service. I therefore consider it appropriate that the first of the National Health Service charges should be imposed at this time and I accordingly propose a 1% *Health Service Levy* starting on Monday, October 5 to be shared equally between employees and employers at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}\%$ of 1% each.

Other developments in Social Security were envisaged in the Throne Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General at the opening of this session of Parliament. On that occasion it was indicated that announcements will be made in due course about improved pensions and changes in the pension schemes. The Government has decided that these changes will be made commencing with the new financial year and that they will be introduced in steps. Beginning with the first Monday in January next year, that is January 4, all old age pensions whether contributory or non-contributory will be paid through the National Insurance

Scheme. The Means Test will also be abolished from that date. (*Applause*) Arrangements are being made for all payments to be sent out by cheque.

An announcement will soon be made of a substantial increase in National Insurance coverage and, at a later stage, of substantial increases also of all old age pensions whether contributory or non-contributory.

Other Adjustment Policies

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I come to a matter unrelated to previous subjects. The Government has taken note that it has become very difficult in recent months to obtain funds for housing mortgages. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that the ceiling on mortgage interest rates was 10% effective January 1st, 1981 but that it is impossible for Trust Companies and indeed even the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation to attract sufficient funds to enable them to lend out monies at so low an interest rate in today's world. An interest rate of 10% is way below the 16% or more interest rate that prevails in the money market of Britain and the United States and funds are no longer available at low deposit rates within Barbados. With effect therefore from 1st October, 1981 I propose that the ceiling on mortgage interest rates be increased to 12% to place mortgage companies in a more advantageous position for obtaining and on lending funds to prospective home owners. To soften the impact on home owners who have to pay the increased rates I also propose that as from the new income tax year, which commences in January 1982, the amount of exemption of mortgage interest payments from income tax will be increased by the same percentage as the mortgage interest rates have now been increased, namely 20%. Mortgage interest allowance claimable will therefore increase from \$6000 annually to \$7200 annually.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that concludes my short Economic review and the Government's modest financial proposals for dealing with the exceptionally unfavourable economic conditions that have descended on Barbados. That these conditions have not done more damage to our economy can be attributed to the resilience built into that economy during the last five years. It is also a tribute to the hard work of Barbadians and to their readiness to accept the methods of modern economic management which have been the envy of the Caribbean and of the wider world. The Government has taken Barbados up many rungs of the economic ladder but we could not have got there without the support of the public. I have no doubt that this support will continue to be forthcoming, and that Barbados will overcome these temporary difficulties as triumphantly as we overcame in the years following 1976. We will continue to make Barbados better. (*Applause.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1981

Order Number One was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1981.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the National Union of Public Workers submitted its pay claims for the 1980 salaries increases, it also submitted proposals for regrading a number of posts in the Public Service. It was, however agreed that the regrading exercise would be undertaken after a settlement was reached on the levels of increases. Accordingly, the salaries revision was completed late in 1980 and increases were paid retroactively from the 1st April, 1980.

Discussion took place between the Union and the Establishments Division on the Union's proposals for regrading and at the Union's request the regrading for Air Traffic Control staff was given priority treatment. Honourable Members will recall that this regrading was effective by Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1981 which made regradings for Air Traffic Controllers and other Civil Aviation staff with retroactive effect to the 1st April, 1981.

The Order which is before the Honourable House today which is the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order 1981 in the main seeks to upgrade a large number of posts with effect from the same date, 1st April, 1981 as set out in the Addendum to the resolution. It also redesignates a number of posts, it establishes a number of temporary posts and creates a number of additional posts among which are 87 posts for the Royal Barbados Police Force, 6 posts for the new rank of Deputy Permanent Secretary and a post of Deputy Chief Establishments Officer.

At the time the Order was made, Mr. Speaker, it was considered that after five years' service Permanent Secretaries who held the posts at salary level B, the Chief Personnel Officer and the Chief Establishments Officer should advance from salary level B to salary level A. This is in accordance with changes in the conditions of service of a number of officers principally in the legal services. The period of five years, Mr. Speaker, which is mentioned in the Addendum to the resolution is now under reconsideration since it is felt that it may be somewhat too short for the particular advance that is proposed. In accordance with paragraph 2.2 of the Civil Establishment (General) Order, the Governor-General will in due course

be advised of any new period which these officers should be required to serve before being advanced to salary level A, so that although the Addendum refers to this that is not in fact a final decision and is subject to further consideration which will be notified in due course.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we know that regradings even more than salary increases create anomalies which are resented. In many cases, they create anomalies which are the results merely of oversight. This is well understood and at a meeting which I held last week with a delegation from the National Union of Public Workers, I invited the Union to submit a list of such anomalies which they are able to foresee and this list will be given the very fullest consideration. The presently upgraded posts, Mr. Speaker, Sir, span the greater part of the Public Service and include positions in the Nursing Service, the senior echelons of the Administrative Service, Senior Technical Officers, the Schools Meals Service as well as cooks and maids in Government Service. There will be further regradings, for example, in the welfare cadre of the Civil Service, but these will be dealt with separately.

Inadvertently, Mr. Speaker, the regrading of the post of Matron at the Prison and the Third Class Prison Officer have been omitted from the bottom of one of the scale. I mention this so as to assure the officers concerned that they have not been forgotten. The omission will be rectified in another Order which will very shortly be sent down to Parliament.

1.15 p.m.

In addition to the Order, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to anticipate very slightly on this matter, there is a companion document before the House which will shortly come up, which is a resolution seeking to classify the unestablished and casual positions in the Government Service in addition to upgrading a number of posts with effect from 1st April 1981. Indeed, Sir, the reclassification exercise has been most extensive and it is the first such exercise, I understand, since Barbados has become independent. It really affects all the casual workers of Government. Artisans have been given improved positions, heavy equipment operators have been given a few more dollars a week, and so on. It is a very major exercise.

We have also taken the opportunity of reversing the order of categories. Previously Category I used to be the lowest paid workers. That has been abolished altogether, Sir. They have been put into Category II, and Category I we are now making the highest grade down to Category X which is the lowest grade, so we have reorganised the entire key scale.

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that we discovered buried in the key scale, and unnoticed by workers' organisations, what was virtually the last element of sex discrimination in the salary scales of the Government of Bar-

bados. Category I previously contained a category of labourers, and these labourers were less well paid than labourers in Category II. Upon investigation it was discovered that all the labourers in Category I were women, so that the Government was in fact paying women less than men were receiving for doing the same work. This point has been overlooked indeed by successive Governments, Mr. Speaker, and I am very glad to be able to rectify it so that all women labourers employed by Government will now be upgraded and receive the same wages as male labourers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make another speech on the subsequent resolution and that is why I have dealt with it for a few moments on this one. Of course, I will do my best to answer any questions which hon. members might have.

The Civil Establishment Order, Sir, has been laid for some time and hon. members should be thoroughly familiar with it. I therefore beg to move that the resolution approving that Order do now pass.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Finance just before he sat down. It is true that he purported to attribute blame equally to successive Governments when he spoke about Category I. I should like to assure members of the House that from a very long time ago there has been no discrimination against persons on the basis of sex in the Government Service. What the hon. member omitted to say was that the recruiting officers tended to reserve this particular occupation in Category I for women, but there is no restriction on men being recruited into that particular grade, so he is not really removing any discrimination. It is merely that in this particular kind of work (which I believe used to be described by the Barbados Workers' Union as cantoneers) I believe people of that grade were women, but more people were doing that work, whereas before men used to do that type of work. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You mean mason tenders.) Mason tenders. Anybody can be a mason tender, so if the people in the Ministry of Communications and Works decided that they would reserve it for women you cannot accuse this Government or the Government over which I had the honour to preside of discriminating against women; so in this attempt, I should say, to get praise for abolishing discrimination, the only way he could abolish that discrimination is to abolish the recruitment of people altogether to that post, because men do not want to do the job. There is no discrimination, discrimination is when you are paying female teachers less than you are paying male teachers for doing the same work.

I wish to come to something which is far more serious. The Hon. Minister of Finance said that all regrad-

ings create anomalies. Before he went on to state that he inferentially must take credit for removing the last element of sex discrimination in the Government Service, which we know to be a myth. There was no sex discrimination when he took office. If it has arisen it has arisen during his tenure.

It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, that when the officers in the Legal Department wrote letters to the Chief Establishments Officer complaining about the anomalies which were created when the magistrates, about seven of them, were put in a special category in the Government Service, and the post of Chief Magistrate was created whereby certain persons — I am not dealing with personalities — who were occupying posts in the magistracy with limited experience found themselves catapulted over some of the 27 legal officers in the Attorney General's Office, Parliamentary Counsel, Crown Counsel, Senior Crown Counsel, Senior Parliamentary Counsel, that the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Minister of Finance, did not recognise that from time immemorial it has been almost impossible to carry out a regrading in the Public Service of Barbados unless you create anomalies. When I was Minister in charge of Establishments the way that we used to deal with anomalies was to appoint an Anomalies Committee represented usually by senior Government officers and persons who were affected by the anomalies which may have been created at the time. From the time of a gentleman called Mr. Jarvis who had been brought down here from England — you would remember, Sir, I believe there were two Jarvises, but they have all gone out of fashion, I believe there was a Jarvis succeeded by another Jarvis, but we decided that those anomalies could be dealt with within the confines of our own shores by our own people — we set up an Anomalies Committee invariably so that in the process of time after careful study the anomalies could be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, what do we find now? There are approximately, as I mentioned before, about 27 legally qualified people in the Legal Department in Barbados, outside of magistrates and judges, approximately 27 — maybe 25, I cannot remember, there are between 25 and 27 — but there are seven magistrates and one chief magistrate. The legal officers are persons who have been taken from the magisterial bench and put in the Legal Department to help prepare legislation for us, for you and me, Sir, to draft legislation, to do cases, important cases, in the courts, in the Supreme Court and in the Magistrates' Courts in this island, but chiefly in the Supreme Court. 125 p.m.

People who have moved from the magistracy into the Legal Department on promotion find themselves in the position where a person would be only just called to the Bar, find that he cannot make it in private practice, applies for a post as a magistrate and is pitch-forked over the people who have gone into the legal department on

promotion. Now I am going to cut a long story short. When they complained about this — I do not want to read all the correspondence — what is the reaction? The reaction is nothing short of scandalous, and I have in my hand here a document from the Chief Establishments Officer written to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Attorney General and circulated to all the legal officers; so it is a matter of public and general knowledge. You have probably heard about it yourself, but I am bringing it officially to your attention, and this is how the document reads:

“From: Chief Establishments Officer
To: Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of the Attorney General
Date: 1981-07-27”

Now this is in reply to correspondence which the Chief Establishments Officer received in May, but you must remember, Sir, that you could not write a letter like this in May or June in reply to the representations being made to the Chief Establishments Officer over these anomalies. You had to hold it back like the increase in gasoline until after the 18th June, 1981, and this is how the letter reads:

*“Matters affecting the grading and conditions of
Service of Legal Officers*

I refer to correspondence resting with a letter dated 1981-06-23 from Miss Kay Goodridge *et al* addressed to me and copied to you and a letter (copy attached) dated 81-05-22 addressed to me from Mr. Carlisle Payne *et al* in connection with the above-mentioned subject.

2. The Prime Minister has directed me to make known his views on the abovementioned subject to you as well as the officers concerned as follows:—”

I wonder if the hon. member for St. Joseph knows about this letter. (*Asides*). I am addressing the Chair. The Chair is not listening so I have to mark time a little bit.

“(i) Throughout the submissions of the Crown Counsel and Parliamentary Counsel there seems to run a theme that salaries and other emoluments of the legal service ought to be governed by the number of years called to the bar.”

The members of the Legal Profession will note that the Chief Establishments Officer must not be annoyed because he said “the number of years called to the Bar”, not “call”, although he does quote the Hon. Minister correctly later on.

“Taken to its illogical conclusion this would require that those responsible for appointing — and even more to promoting — persons to posts in the different branches of the legal service would not be allowed to look at ability and suitability but would have to regard only to seniority in terms of call. It may very well be that a mature person with only five years call but perhaps with 20 or 30 years service in other employment would be more suitable for appointment to the post of magistrate than a person aged 28 years with 5½ years call. A little reflection on the part of the officers concerned will make them realise that not even seniority in the public service, far less seniority in call to the bar can be the only determinant for appointment.”

Paragraph (ii), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know you will make the whole document a document of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Completely. You cannot miss any of this.

“(ii) I find it distasteful that the lawyers are behaving with respect, like the traditional” — I hope the members of the legal profession are listening to me carefully — “crabs in a barrel. As soon as one crab crawls a little higher up the side of the barrel the others try to pull him or her back down.”

(A VOICE: Who is saying that?) The Prime Minister.

“It really appals me to read of what I can only construe as jealousy of the necessary regradings of the magistracy and the creation of the post of Chief Magistrate. I have not the slightest sympathy with the argument that the Chief Magistrate’s Office, was previously on the same level of other officers and therefore when he goes up the other officers must go up also. I equally have little regard for arguments relating to qualifications for the post of Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel and the number of years which it will take to qualify for an upgrading. I am well aware that all persons wish to earn more money and that there is a major belief that there are enormous earnings to be made in the private law practice in Barbados. You are probably also aware of my views that rather than have a grumbling and dissatisfied legal service that we should give serious consideration to the recruitment of mature and senior persons from the legal services of other islands/territories where emoluments do not approach those of Barbados. In the end we will do better with an immigrant with 15 or 20 years experience who is glad to be in Barbados at a

higher rate of pay than he could have earned in his home territory, than with disgruntled members of the bar more concerned to pull down others who have gone ahead of them than to lift up the legal service and the whole framework of public administration in our island."

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You brought Perry here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not me, the Chief Justice; and he did a good job too; but I did not bring him here as scab labour, and I did not threaten any legal officers that I would bring in Magistrate Perry to take their jobs away from them. Chief Justice Stoby brought him in as he brought in Mr. Tulloch, his godson. Let me continue. Do not interfere with me.

"3. The Prime Minister has further directed me to inform you that he cannot accede to any of the requests made by the legal officers in their petitions.

4. I shall be grateful if you will ensure that the Prime Minister's views are drawn to the attention of the officers concerned.

F. A. PARRIS
Chief Establishments Officer."

Now I am saying that this letter is inconsistent with the statement made by the Prime Minister before he sat down that there are anomalies with every regrading and they are prepared to look into anomalies, and he has even had meetings with the NUPW and that the NUPW is going to submit a list of those anomalies which will be given due consideration because in this communication delivered to the Permanent Secretary in the Attorney General's Office, the Chief Establishments Officer clearly said you are wasting your time, you are behaving like crabs in a barrel and I will bring in people from outside, as what we in the Trade Union Movement call scab labour to take over your jobs if you keep too much noise. Do not let us butter it up with anything. That is what it amounts to. You are dealing with members of your own profession in that way.
1.35 p.m.

If you deal with members of your own profession or of our profession in that way, how does the mason or carpenter in Public Works expect you to deal with them? If that is how you deal with the legal profession and tell them that you are going to bring people who are equipped to take their jobs from them when you have thousands of Vincentians and St. Lucians and so, taking away jobs from Barbadian working-class people, 14,800 of them from the enumeration which you carried out here during the past two years and said it was not for electoral

purposes. You have brought them in already. I think it is disgraceful. (ASIDES).

You had better keep out of this because I heard you talk of one \$900,000 payment for compulsory acquisition and you may have been right. I was willing to support you. I am making a serious point. I am making a very, very serious point.

The Prime Minister said he had a meeting with the NUPW and he assured them that if they submit a list of the anomalies that he would have — the precise words which he used, Mr. Speaker were — he will have the fullest possible consideration. I left out a line because he was talking too fast, but — the fullest possible consideration. But long before the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning, met with the NUPW, he had told the members of the legal profession working for Government, to use the words of the hon. member for St. James North, "No dice". I do not even know what the expression means, Sir.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I only lived next door when they were playing. I never used to play.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the place for poking fun.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member, Sir, told the legal profession, do not even worry to discuss the matter so how are you going to give the fullest consideration to these anomalies when you have people leaving the Magistracy because they felt they were doing something good by helping the Government out to go into the Legal Department to do drafting and other work of that nature and when they point out that by putting the magistrate in this — I cannot remember the Grade, Sir, it was either "C" or "F" or something like that. It really does not matter. It is somewhere here on the file the Grade that they were put into, and you tell them do not even worry to talk, you are behaving like crabs in a barrel? Sir, it is a right legal argument.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Right Hon. Prime Minister rise?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, Sir, and the hon. member has given way. Very briefly, really obviously I stand by whatever the hon. member has read out in the letter purloined through the

disloyalty of some lawyers in the Government Service and contrary to the Official Secrets Act.

We are accustomed to that from the acolytes in the Democratic Labour Party in the Magistracy and other parts of the Government but, that apart, the hon. member probably has not been told that a personal allowance is paid to all persons who left the Magistracy and who have therefore left behind a post that has been upgraded behind them. He has not been told that.

He has only seen the letter of disgruntlement. He has not seen all of the increases that every single legal officer, whether in the Magistracy or otherwise has received. He is only repeating, unfortunately, special pleading that not only he does not understand but even his informant, well known, perhaps, for being the most ignorant among the officers at Marine House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would know what is an infringement of the Official Secrets Act from what is not. That is one thing that I know and I was Minister in charge of Establishments for 15 years so I think that I would understand Establishments matters and I am telling the hon. member that any communication from a Permanent Secretary to another Permanent Secretary to be brought to the 27 persons who are represented by a Trade Union could never even be privileged far less coming under the Official Secrets Act. This is a question of negotiation and I am going to come to that now too.

This is a letter, now, from the several officers. I do not want to call their names, 12 officers, copied to the National Union of Public Workers complaining that they have been waiting over 9 months. They had submitted memoranda on the anomalies and had not even been treated with the courtesy of a reply.

Furthermore, there was only one meeting, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief between the Minister in charge of Establishments and the NUPW; probably the meetings to which he referred.

Furthermore, as far as the Air Traffic Control Officers are concerned, the Air Traffic Control Officers in Barbados were ready to go on strike long before the Air Traffic Control Officers in New York went out on strike, long, long before, and it was only the Senior officials in the NUPW who restrained them from going out on strike because the reclassification was imposed without proper negotiation or consultation with the Air Traffic Control Officers and still they are not satisfied.

Now I should know something about air traffic. I know something about the grading of air traffic con-

trollers and I know that they are not satisfied. They do not have to come to me to make any complaint because I know and if you tell me as a representative of Parliament that when people write on trade union matters you cannot come in here and represent the true statement of affairs of the general public — I am not speaking about you, Sir — it is when any other member makes a suggestion like that that is monstrously inept and misleading that you cannot intimidate me because you cannot bring in anybody from outside, from Guyana or from anywhere else to take my job as Leader of the Opposition. You have to be elected for that.

He once threatened to bring a man called Haynes to put me out of St. John. I asked him if it was the man who beat him in his office. He said it was the man who made him beat him in his office but that is the nearest that he got to threatening me politically, that he was going to bring Slims Haynes to take my seat in St. John.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He will not be in St. James North either. (ASIDES) Empty vessels traditionally have always kept the loudest reverberations. You see the hon. member has not said anything?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to sum up the whole situation. We accept that anomalies can be expected. We are not against the magistrates being upgraded. We are not against reclassification of the people who were sometimes called unestablished staff, non-established staff, or casual workers. All of that nonsense, I feel, since we have a National Insurance Act now has got to go. Although I was in Establishments, I could never understand why they had this situation of non-established, un-established and casual workers as three separate and distinct categories in the Government Service. All of that will have to go in the process of time.
1.45 p.m.

There is one other thing that I am a bit uneasy about, not directly arising but indirectly arising, because when these established people come to retirement age, I hope I was not hearing when it was stated that the National Insurance will have to take care of all old age pensions, contributory and non-contributory because there is only one old age pension, that is the non-contributory old age pension. The National Insurance Board now takes care of retirement benefits. The Government pays non-contributory pensions to X Government workers who have retired and if in order to cover a deficit in your Budget you are going to tell me that the National Insurance Board has got to pay all pensions for people who have reached the age of sixty or sixty-five, I think we have to make our position clear and the general public should be told that the gap is going to be closed

by shifting the burden on to the National Insurance Board. But, this is only parenthetical because we are not ready for that yet and you have been very indulgent in this particular respect but, you and I Sir, have to be very concerned whether there will be any pensions left when the time comes for us to draw. Now, it looks as if they are removing the funds from which we will be able to draw pensions, so we all have to be concerned. "Ask not for whom the bell tolls". It tolls for all of us. But, Sir, those are the points which I really want to make and I do not want really to draw out the discussion any longer because somebody else will have an important contribution to make.

I am very pleased to make, pleased but hurt, to make this communication a document of the Honourable House.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that the Rt. Hon. Member has given the Honourable House the benefit of his experience of the difficulties which arise on the occasion of a regrading in the Public Service in Barbados. I believe that these difficulties pre-date not only this Administration and the Rt. Hon. member's Administration. I distinctly remember in the 1950's when the pattern then was to bring in a so-called expert from abroad to make recommendations with respect to salary increases that, as soon as the salary increases were reported in a report, literally hell used to break out in Barbados because the Barbadians used to look at what they would draw and it did not matter what they would draw, but what mattered to them was that the people who previously drew the same as they were getting more. So that, an Anomalies Committee was the inevitable result which followed a salaries revision and regrading exercise.

Now, the Government has said that arising out of the exercise which has been done, and I think this should be known, further and in addition to the salary increases which were granted by this Honourable House, this regrading exercise results in an additional amount of money to be looked for by the taxpayers in Barbados to pay those officers who have been regraded. So that, we have a long tradition in this country of dissatisfaction resulting from a regrading exercise.

Now, the Rt. Hon. Member has in particular picked out the problem of the lawyers. I have my own views in this respect. One of the greatest injustices that has been done to Barbados was done during the regime of the Rt. Hon. Member's administration when they accepted the proposals that were put forward by a small group of people to create an elitist profession in the legal profession and change the basis of qualification whereby it has become so expensive now to qualify as a lawyer that unless you come from people who are able to afford it, you cannot afford to qualify as a lawyer. An anachronism

which has been created by this new Law School qualification, and the Government is feeling the effect of it as the community is feeling the effect of it.

I have said openly that the Government should bite the bullet and I should say that it is, domestically, as far as Barbados is concerned, the fact that we have a shortage of lawyers and the shortage will get greater, that we are going to change the method of qualification that after you do your LL.B. that service in the Government Service, or service in the Law School or service in.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what point does the Rt. Hon. Member rise?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. The Honourable Member was suggesting that my administration made it more difficult for people to qualify. He is referring to the establishment of the Law School in Trinidad where people who wish to qualify in the legal profession have to spend two years and before we had to spend three years in England. Is he saying that two years in Trinidad is more expensive than three years in England plus air passages and everything? It is now being lowered to fifteen months and that was done within the University.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I have always heard that the Rt. Hon. Member is not with it, I am now convinced that the Rt. Hon. Member is not with it. Not only do you have to spend two years in Trinidad, you have to spend three years in Barbados first. So, it is five years in all before you can qualify; before you would have qualified in three years. (ASIDES) Five years. The Honourable Member belongs to a profession which is known for its narrow based training. The Honourable Member is well-known for that profession, so that the Honourable Member should not try to pontificate on other professions which from the very beginning had a better basis of training.

All of us recognise that Governments now in these countries since Independence are facing a difficulty in getting lawyers into the Government Service. Before we used to have a Colonial Legal Service and people would join the Colonial Legal Service in one of the smaller territories and work their way through by movement from territory to territory on promotion until you eventually ended up as a judge.

I well recall the Rt. Hon. Member in a speech, I could not give you the exact date, but I well recall the Rt. Hon.

Member for St. John in a speech when he was in power saying that we should have a unification of the Legal Service in the Caribbean. I remember the Rt. Hon. Member saying that. Well, the Rt. Hon. Member now in a *sotto voce* remark says that he agrees with that. But, he is going to criticise the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he expresses exactly the same fundamental concept maybe not in the same words that the Rt. Hon. Member is expressing. From what the Rt. Hon. Member said, all the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was saying is that Barbados, because of the fact that our standard of living is higher and our level of remuneration is greater than the level of remuneration within the Caribbean with the exception of Bermuda, with the exception of the Bahamas, with the exception of Trinidad and Tobago is in a position — three positions, that is well known. It is better than Jamaica or Guyana — that the lawyers here should recognise that they are not in as strong a bargaining position as they think they are because the Government is prepared, if necessary, rather than accept unreasonable demands to open the job opportunities in Barbados from the pool of talent from which we hitherto drew.
1.55 p.m.

We must look at the position in relation to the magistrates *vis-a-vis* the lawyers also in the context of the fact that we have increased greatly the jurisdiction of magistrates in Barbados. The magistrates are called upon to do a far larger burden of the litigation in Barbados than they did in the past when the jurisdiction of the Petty Debt Court was \$250 in things of that kind now from my memory. I have not been down there for a long time, and it is now \$2500, I believe. If you look at the statistics and the number of law cases that are filed civilly and criminally in Barbados you will find that the magistrates do probably about 75% to 80% of the total amount of adjudication in Barbados.

Now for a long period of time the Bar Association was calling for the creation of the post of Chief Magistrate. The hon. member's administration did absolutely nothing about it. There was a persistent call at every Bar Association dinner in Barbados. Every time we had a meeting between the Bar Association, the Judiciary and the Judicial Advisory Council there was always a persistent call for the creation of a post of Chief Magistrate. This administration created a post of Chief Magistrate, and having created a post of Chief Magistrate we have to evaluate the position of Chief Magistrate *vis-a-vis* the position of the top posts within the Attorney General's Office on a comparable grade. Now when you get that you have to have a relationship between the magistrates and the Chief Magistrate, otherwise you will create an anomaly in that area.

Mr. Speaker, the problem has arisen where people who transferred from a Magistrate into what was thought at the particular period of time as better and greater opportunities by going into the Attorney General's Office

will have a lot of personal difficulties. But the Government is not closed to any reasonable argument in relation to the parity between the magistracy with its expanding jurisdiction matched against the specialised skills that are needed to do certain advocacy or drafting, but there are a number of grades within the Attorney General's Office to which any aspirant could aspire. That is a fact, but the trouble is that they are not looking at the promotional opportunities there.

I understand the position, Sir, I will resume later.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. It is now Question Time. I am advised that there are no replies to Questions ready; consequently we go into Private Members' Business. There being no items on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business, this brings us to the end of the time for Private Members' Business and it is now time for Government Business to be resumed.

When the suspension was taken the hon. member for Christ Church East Central was addressing the Chair. The hon. member may continue to address.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there is only one other area I would like to deal with that the hon. member for St. John mentioned. I believe he mentioned the question of the Civil Aviation and Tourism Division with respect to air traffic controllers. I do not believe that that is a matter that is the subject of any provisions in the order with which we are dealing, because my understanding of that matter is that that was dealt with as a separate and distinct exercise. As we know, Sir, air traffic controllers all over the world now are people who believe in speed, so that the recommendations with respect to their situation was dealt with in consonance with this conception, and the House on a previous occasion dealt with that so I am not permitted to reflect on the vote of the House in respect of that.

Subject to that, Sir, I believe that I have explained quite clearly how these matters can arise and that the Government's position is that if a just case can be put forward matters will be looked at again, but one must remember that one must look at this in the context of the legal profession and the enlargement of the jurisdiction of the magistrates and the creation of the post of Chief Magistrate. If there is one thing I would

have to say about the magistrates, Sir, it is that my own constituents have brought to my attention that it is very difficult to get a magistrate to sit in the afternoon after lunch. Now I do not believe that it is correct and proper in the context of Barbados for magistrates not to sit in the afternoon; just as I think also it is very important that at least they appear to dress properly when they are on the Bench. A number of complaints have been made in my area, Sir, especially when a particular magistrate is sitting, about the fact that my constituents are very surprised at the standard of dress that a particular magistrate uses in Barbados. That is not a general complaint in respect of all the magistrates, I am dealing with a particular magistrate, but there is a complaint that they do not like to sit in the afternoon, and especially when people have to come from Pegwell and go to town and catch a bus to go to Boarded Hall, they object to that. They say that they will go out there and when 12.00 o'clock or 1.00 o'clock comes they are told that it is over for the day. I hope that this situation will be changed.

One thing I have noticed though, Sir, is that there are not as many people going to the courts as, say, 15 or 20 years ago. I believe there must have been a tremendous drop in the number of bastardy cases. There has certainly been a drop in the volume of contentious cases in relation to village fights and things of that kind. I believe, now that the magistrates' work is taken up with a lot of the more commercial work and a few specific offences so that all in all, Sir, I believe the Government was correct in the regrading of the magistrates.

2.50 p.m.

It is perhaps a little unfortunate that one or two people in the past did not anticipate the regrading that would have taken place and decided to move to another area and now find that, had they not made that move, they would have been in line for regrading. As I understand it, Sir, there is nothing to prevent them from moving back, and in truth and in fact from reading the newspapers I see a number of them have moved back, so that the promotional opportunities are there.

Mr. KING: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel myself with the regrading or upgrading of magistrates nor do I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers themselves have any concern particularly about the regrading of magistrates only. What they were concerned about was that the whole exercise had the effect of catapulting above the heads of senior persons in the Attorney General's Chambers persons who had previously been in a lower grade having lesser salaries.

Now I believe that the officers in the Attorney General's Chambers were not concerned that the regrading exercise had been done, because we all feel that the

magisterial grade itself should have been upgraded long ago, because it is a very responsible position and we know that magistrates do by far the larger part of the criminal work in the country. I believe too that the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers had made a request that they be given allowances to compensate for the fact that the magistrates were now placed in positions above them as far as salaries were concerned. They were asking to be given compensatory allowances and I heard the Rt. Hon. member for St. Thomas made the comment in an intervention when the hon. member for St. John was speaking to the effect — I do not like to misquote people — that allowances were given to the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers.

Now I myself thought that the whole problem was that the allowances had not been given and that this is all that the lawyers in the Department were asking for when we had the sort of letter responding to their requests which was read out by the hon. member for St. John. So that from my own personal point of view, I would like to know if allowances had in fact been given to the lawyers in the Attorney General's Department, what are the allowances which were given; and could the hon. member for St. Thomas when he rises to speak again if he does do so, or could perhaps one of the Ministers, either the present Attorney General or the former Attorney General tell this Honourable House what are the allowances which the officers of the legal department get as a sort of compensation for the loss of the position which they previously held *vis-a-vis* the magistrates.

Now the other point which the Rt. Hon. member for St. Thomas made in the course of his statement was that he had requested the National Union of Public Workers officials to present whatever anomalies had arisen and that they would have been given the fullest possible consideration. My understanding of the position is, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of anomalies which existed and which were drawn specifically to the attention of the Establishments Division, and that the rejection of those anomalies together with the rejection of any thought of compensatory allowances was part of the total rejection contained in the letter which was read earlier in this Chamber by the hon. member for St. John. So that it seems to me strange that these positions could be taken by the officers of the department earlier on and yet we have the kind of letter which was introduced earlier in the sitting rejecting out of hand all representations which had been made by the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers.

Now when one considers also that in the magisterial service the magistrates receive certain allowances — they receive, as I understand it, a commuted travelling allowance of \$300, they get a housing allowance, they get a station allowance and they get payment of their telephone bills — I believe that the officers of the Attorney General's Department were asking that some of these considerations

be given to them specifically in relation to the payment of telephone bills, maybe housing allowance, I am not too sure; but the point is that the magistrates themselves got an allowance which totalled some \$560 monthly in addition to their basic salary. So that in addition to the regrading exercise putting magistrates in a position which we all accept they should be in, we have a situation where in addition to their basic salary they have certain allowances given to them, and the officers of the Attorney General's department were asking that some allowances be given to them, and all these representations were totally rejected out of hand in a letter which, to put it mildly, has been very unfortunately written.

Now the hon. member for Christ Church East Central made some comments on the Resolution and in typical fashion, where you cannot deal with the issues head on, you cannot confront the position as articulated by the hon. member for St. John, dealt with certain irrelevancies, because the whole question of the Legal Profession Act creating an elitist profession and people having to spend five years in a Caricom country doing their law exams rather than spending three years in England in my respectful view has nothing to do with the case. The comment about the effect of the comments in the Chief Establishments Officer's letter to the officers of the Department, the suggestion that the effect of that was to create disunity in the CARICOM region was again absolutely ridiculous, because what the letter is in fact saying is not that we are going to create opportunities for movement among Caribbean lawyers; that is not what the letter is saying; it is not saying we are going to create opportunities for advancement and for movement among lawyers who practise in the various regions of the Caribbean. What it is in fact saying is that you fellows in the legal office here are such disgusting people that if you do not work and if you do not behave yourselves as we want you to behave, we are going to import scab labour to do the job. That is, to put it crudely, what the letter is in fact saying; so that when the hon. member for Christ Church East Central suggests that this is an attempt to create disunity in the region among lawyers of the Caribbean, it is obviously not the sort of feeling clearly and squarely on the issue which is before us.

Now some comments were made about the position of the Chief Magistrate. I believe the profession itself may have no great quarrel with the designation of a position of Chief Magistrate, but one has to be sure that when you designate that position and appoint someone to that position that you create the necessary supporting staff for the Chief Magistrate to function as has been intended. Now the fact of the matter is that in the present circumstances the Chief Magistrate functions just like any other magistrate. As far as I can see, he does not perform any specific or particular administrative duties which should be the position of a Chief Magistrate. You are saying you are appointing one who would be in charge of the whole

magisterial service, so that you need to provide for the total support staff if you are going to talk about creating a Chief Magistrate with a view to streamlining the administration of justice in that particular area.

Now the whole point about the representations being made by the officers of the legal department was that in the legal office you had persons with certain specific skills, certainly people who had specialised skills in drafting and in prosecuting perhaps by long experience who would figure that these skills had to be taken into account.

3.00 p.m.

A lot of money is spent by Government from time to time in sending persons from the legal department on drafting courses overseas and in the Caribbean. It is only but reasonable to expect that those specialized skills will be taken into account because people with those specialized skills cannot so easily move from the position of the Attorney General's department to the magistracy because it is just a different sort of discipline altogether. So when persons like that are asking that these issues be taken account of, they are only asking what is reasonable and to me the sort of rebuff which the letter from the Chief Establishments Officer states is in fact doing them a very serious injustice.

Now there is just one other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. Honourable members are aware of the fact that a regrading exercise always tend to create certain anomalies whenever they come. The whole object of regrading in the Civil Service should be obviously designed with a view to ensuring that the best possible advantage is got out of the service and we believe on this side and we have stated specifically in relation to our concept of the Civil Service that no major review of that service has been conducted in recent times into the structure and its operations. We promised in our Manifesto to carry out such a review of the Civil Service in order to discover areas whereby the efficiency in the Service may be improved.

Now, I would like to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the exercise which has been gone through in the regrading in the Service is just a temporary measure and that all of the anomalies that exist will be taken care of and that due consideration, of course, will be given to the representations and fair consideration be given to the representations which have been made by the officers of the Attorney General's department.

We would like to think that in the short term some serious consideration will be given to a review of the whole of the Public Service with a view to ensuring that greater efficiency is derived from the expenditure of all of the money which is necessitated by payment of Civil Service salaries.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I have no great quarrel with the Order as it stands except that we express the view that it should be a short-term measure only and that the fullest possible consideration at the earliest stage be given to all problems which the reclassification has created and to deal with them in a full and clear manner to all officers concerned. (*Applause*)

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down, the hon. member for Christ Church West Central on making his maiden speech in this House. I think it is a tradition that when a maiden speech is made, although one does not necessarily agree with all that is said, that one should, of course, congratulate the speaker and I wish to commend him on the competence with which he has spoken. obviously, Mr. Speaker, he has profitted from his years in the Other Place although I cannot always promise him that the words which I pass on his speech will be congratulatory but I must confess that on this occasion I think he has made a good review in the House.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I merely intervened in this debate with great trepidation because it really is not easy having moved from the front bench to the back bench to even appear to speak on a subject with which I was associated particularly since I recognise that my successor in the office is more than capable of handling any problems which should come before this House on this subject. Indeed I would not have spoken on this subject were it not for the fact that part of the events referred to in this Order took place during the period of time that I had responsibility for the subject of the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, I had better begin by making it absolutely clear that the classification of the Judiciary and legal services still always continue to suffer from the fact that they are treated in the same way as the normal administrative service. This is a matter that occurred prior to the Barbados Labour Party becoming the Government of the country and I am indeed very surprised to hear the Rt. Hon. member for St. John, the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition taking up the cudgels of any lawyer since he, more than anybody else, has been most vituperative if I may adopt a remark of my learned and honourable friend in his approach to lawyers and has done more than anybody else to run down the legal profession in this country so that one must begin by accepting his words with a great deal of caution.

In his usual stance political expediency always guides his words in these actions and one must say this because he said that he would never be seen near lawyers if he could help it, but his advice to people is to stay away from the law courts. I regret to say that I heard he made his appearance again as a lawyer before the hon. Chief Justice with an appearance in court. He has gone back on his words as usual.

When I hear him speak in here expressing concern for members of the Attorney General's office I would tell them in the words of the Greek Roman Poet, *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. That is what I would say to them, Sir. That is really what I have to say to them, Sir. (*Asides*) "I fear the Greeks and the gifts which they bring" (*Asides*) The hon. member for St. Michael South Central seeks to give a translation from the Key. What I seek to give him is a literal translation of the words and he must know that. As a classicist myself, and I believe he did classics, he must recognize it.

Sir, the position is that when we took over in 1976, the legal officers were not as well looked after or graded as they are today. That is a fact. It has been an uphill task and I think that for some time it will remain an uphill task as long as we do not have a separate legal service to try to get them in the right grading that they are entitled to.

Let me give an example from this Order. The Chief Parliamentary Counsel was only graded "A" after 1976. The magistrates who had been suffering for years under the past Government never got any improved terms. In fact, the hon. member for St. John knows that within his department he often did not reply to letters coming from either the Bar Association or indeed from the very judicial officers themselves. That is a fact.

We asked for a Chief Magistrate at a Conference called in which the judicial officers appeared. The hon. member for Christ Church West Central knows that too. We did not even have the courtesy of a reply from the Rt. hon. member for St. John. No support, and that is not surprising Sir. The hon. member has fear of carpenters' sons, as you will recall, Sir, and it is significant that in this debate he advises the Rt. Hon. member for St. Thomas that those words could be said to a carpenter from the MCW but not to a lawyer. Now that is the sort of inverted snobbery that you will get in treating of these matters. He must not come in here and get away with that.
3.10 p.m.

If they are not good enough for lawyers, they are not good enough for carpenters' sons. That is the whole point when you have to deal with somebody like that for inverted snobbery, so he is in no position to correct anybody. I do not agree with the words myself, but he is in no position to correct anybody if that is the manner in which he is going to conduct a debate and he cannot get up here and attack in one breath and himself show the same snobbery of which he accuses the Rt. Hon. Member because he never had a proper approach himself to the officers concerned.

Now, Sir, I still believe — this was my view and I have expressed it on numerous occasions — that the Legal

Officers in the Government Service are not properly paid given the supply and demand situation and unless we have our own separate structure for them, they will continue to be badly paid. That is the whole point. There is nobody who could tell me that with the capability that we had in the Legal Service that many of the officers, almost all, could not do as well as any lawyers with the number of years they have been doing at the Bar, Sir. I can say that they can do as well and that they do as well. I know that there is the fear that if you open them, then you have to open the architects, you have to open the quantity surveyors, you have to open the doctors, but it must be remembered that now they come with two degrees. They come with a basic degree of LL.B. followed by two years of professional training and that must be borne in mind consistently in looking at the problem. I believe that the Government has made a creditable start in trying to grapple with this problem of a suitable remuneration of the lawyers in the Government's legal service.

There are other methods of approaching the question and I will hope in due course the Honourable Minister in charge of Establishments will be able to break away from the strict advice that is often given by the Civil Service structure on matters of this nature and look at it in the light of demand and supply because I became very concerned and I remain concerned about our not being able to retain middle management lawyers in the Service. The Government is today the biggest spender of money and the Government also has in the realm of dealing with legal problems the like of which very few of us ever see in legal practice at all. In fact, I had come from the private Bar with something like sixteen years behind me without seeing some of the problems that confront a Government legal officer and I believe that Government legal officers in a very junior level are sometimes dealing with problems more weighty than the problems that Queen's Counsel or solicitors or Attorneys-at-Law in practice for twelve and fifteen years have been called upon to deal with and that is one of the reasons why I have consistently urged – and we have had some movement on it not as full perhaps as we ought to have – but some movement and the Government has to be commended for that on this area of the Law.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say very much more except to revert to the point I began on. I can accept a statement on this from the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central because he comes new to the position only with the qualification that he has never articulated these views from the Other Place when he was an appointed Senator on behalf of his Party, but he was not a Member of the Cabinet so I do not associate him with the whole policy. But, I cannot accept any criticism on regrading of the Judicial Service in this island from the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John because

he did very badly when he was in charge of Establishments in trying to give members of his own profession within the legal service any proper recognition, and, in relation to lawyers of a class, he is outstanding in having attacked them viciously and I think he has little regard for carpenters and from his words he seems to have had less in those days for lawyers. That is what I would say about him, Sir.

I end with the words of John Connell, Sir, "he does not remember that our Lord Christ had the closest connection with carpenters and you might still see a carpenter's son a Prime Minister of this country one day." (APPLAUSE)

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the Honourable Member who has just taken his seat should speak with such emotion on this subject because it is well-known that under his Administration there was a complete breakdown in morale within that department. If this is an opportunity to try to regain what he lost during that period when he had the opportunity to bring some administrative component to lifting the morale in his department, I suspect it is a little too late and I suggest that this is probably the origin of his deep emotion.

However, Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised when I heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church South Central (ASIDES: East Central now). They are cut up so badly, you do not even know, it is going to take us a year to realize how badly they are cut up. East Central, anyhow, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central suggesting that there is something wrong with a better quality of training of lawyers.

My own feeling is to have a basic degree in Law and then have further professional training can only be for the good of the profession. There are many areas in Law such as research, many developmental aspects of Law which have been neglected for many years largely because many people entering the profession did not have the kind of academic background to embark on those areas of legal development. This stands out in stark contrast to what has happened in the medical profession down the years where one always had to have had that basic training before one get involved in the professional exercise and I would think that the Honourable Member was not thinking very clearly when he was suggesting that, nor indeed could he seek to defend a letter of this kind which must be an insult to all Barbadians and I am thoroughly shocked and feel a bit ashamed that anyone in Public Office should be writing a letter of this kind, or, worse, directing anyone to write a letter of that kind to public officers.

However, Mr. Speaker, for years when I myself was a Public Servant in the Service, I have always felt that there should be a professional stream in the Public Service as dis-

tinct from the administrative stream whether it applies to doctors, lawyers, engineers, surveyors or whatever you like. The time is going to come when one is going to have to recognise that if you wish a neuro surgeon who has had twelve years of practice and you need him and you have to pay him a hundred thousand dollars a year and the Permanent Secretary in that department according to your grading is earning sixty thousand dollars a year that the man is worth a hundred thousand dollars a year and you are going to have to pay him a hundred thousand dollars a year. So, I am all in favour and look forward to the day when we see an administrative stream and we see a professional stream and in this regard I can support the concept not only of supply and demand, but also look and see what has gone into, the kind of expense that has gone into producing the person, the capital expense involved in producing the particular skill that you require for the Public Service.

3.20 p.m.

It might take, Mr. Speaker, two or three hundred thousand dollars, may be more, to produce a particular professional of a given quality. When he returns to Barbados you will always lose that man because you cannot, or you refuse, or you do not have the mechanisms in order to give him an appropriate remuneration, or indeed sometimes you compromise in a way that is not in the best interest of the public service.

I have heard it suggested, for example, that officers in the Attorney General's Department should be allowed part-time practice. I have heard of an allowance in lieu of practice, I have heard of part-time practice and private practice as well. We have had a system where there was an option for an allowance in lieu of part-time practice or part-time practice. What has happened over the years is that the Government has got the worst of both deals. It is simple, and therefore I think that we just have to stand up and in due course get down and take the decision that you are going to have a professional stream within the Public Service and you are going to have to pay people according to their qualifications and according to their worth to you as a Government. That is my own feeling on the matter.

You get the strangest kinds of anomalies. If you take for example, Sir, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, there is much that can be said but I will just deal with this little matter here. I think that it is quite ridiculous that, for example, the Matron of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, probably the second most important part of that management team, apart from the Hospital Director, should be classified below a senior registrar. To become a Senior registrar it is perfectly possible to do your qualifications now in five years, and if you are pretty bright you can probably get your membership or your fellowship in another three or four years, and with no administrative experience, with little or no experience you can come

right back and walk into a position and obtain a salary ahead of the Matron of a major institution who has responsibilities far in excess of any member of the junior medical staff of the hospital.

Now this is the kind of thing that I am talking about. Not only responsibility, but when you think of the amount of work and the amount of experience, and when you think of a Government that is proposed to be committed to equality of women, committed to the promotion of women, here is one woman who in my view — although we have differed on many occasions, on many matters — the fact is at a professional level and from the level of contribution to the hospital and to the country she certainly deserves a much higher classification than that. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: She is at G). She is at G, yes, and a senior registrar is at F and a registrar 1 is at G. This is the point I am making. Now this is where you run into all sorts of classification problems.

You take the Hospital Director. He should never be classified as C, and I will tell you why, because we in this country do not fully understand the importance of management in the running of institutions of that kind. Out there in the outside world it is recognised that the most difficult component of management is hospital management. Of all management areas hospital management is the most complex. The hospital is a hotel to start with, but the people who stay in that hotel are sick people. On top of that you have to deal with doctors, you have to deal with prima donnas, you have to deal with all sorts of professional people, you have to deal with a situation where lines of communication and where lines of delegation of authority are very difficult to define. The Hospital Director may be in charge of the hospital, but what happens if a consultant surgeon determines that he requires X for a particular operation at a particular point in time? Where does that authority cross? That is the point I am making. It is recognised as the most difficult area of management when you look at the total range across the Board of Management. When you think of the amount of money spent on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, when you think of the amount of staff involved and when you think that the Hospital Director could have a C grading in a situation like that, then something is wrong. This is what I mean by the need for professionalism, and until you get it you will never recognise the second competent that is essential in management of public institutions, whether it be a hospital or whether it be your Statutory Boards or otherwise. That is when you have the right manager and you have the right board, whatever it may be, then no one should "interfere" except in respect of policy, because with the best will in the world when you interfere with an organism, when you pinch an organism it twitches at some other point. It is biological and it is alive.

When a Minister with the best will in the world suggests, for example that at the Barbados Marketing Corporation sixty people should be fired and sixty people should be hired, he might think that he has done a great thing, but what he does not realise he has done in that process is that he has made it impossible, even if the sixty people who were fired were bad people and the sixty people whom he hired were good people, in the act of doing so he makes it impossible for the management to function.

These are concepts, Mr. Speaker, which developing societies find it hard to accept, concepts which Governments for some reason or another would not get into their heads: what is their role and what is the role of the people whom they put on Boards or appoint to managerial positions. During this five years I would hope that we will be trying from this side to get across to the Government the concepts of this nature which I think in the long run could only lead to an improvement in the Public Service and avoid the kind of problems that we see here.

In summary and very briefly, one welcomes as outlined by my colleagues the attempt to increase the salaries.

3.30 p.m.

One recognises that the limitations are due to a failure to take a fundamental decision and that decision has got to be that you establish a professional stream right through the public service and in public related bodies.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, one of the most fruitful areas of debate in this House of Assembly is always the law courts, the lawyers and the police, and a lot has to do with the public's perception of lawyers in this community. The public image of lawyers in many cases is a bad one, and this image is created by a number of very responsible people in this community painting that bad image about them. I was a little bit amused when the Rt. Hon. member for St. John in his contribution to this debate made the type of pseudo-altruistic comments that he made in relation to lawyers because it goes very much against the grain and the record of the hon. member as a public officer in this country.

I well remember, Sir, in 1974 that the Rt. Hon. member speaking in a budget debate made some very interesting references to the lawyers, and I need to remind this Honourable Chamber of some of the things that he said on that occasion. The Rt. Hon. member said at that time, and I am quoting, Sir, from the 1974 Debates, Part II, at page 3788:

"I am saying that the trouble is that you get people who think that this is going to be some admission to the Elysian Fields just by qualifying as a lawyer, that it is going to lift them up from one social

status and put them up on another, that they are going to become imbued with all of this wisdom overnight merely by being lawyers, and all they do is to act as a kind of parasite and incubus on the society, and unless they are prepared to make some other kind of economic contribution, I am saying like Plato" — and Plato did not say this; this is what the Rt. Hon. member for St. John put in the mouth of Plato — "I am saying with Plato that they should crown all of us with laurels and usher us out of the State; put us on a boat and wave goodbye, goodbye, goodbye....."

Now the Rt. Hon. member in his contribution would point the finger at the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and say that he is inviting scab labour into Barbados. Well he has gone a little bit further he has made the deportation order; put them on a ship, sail them off and say goodbye, goodbye, goodbye. It is not only the reference to Plato that is inept, it is the reference to the Elysian Fields because I believe the Rt. Hon. member meant the exact opposite to what he was trying to say there. The Elysian Fields are not the place you put people who you are fed up with; I believe the Elysian Fields are the fields of the blessed. That is what I understand they were.

Now there are a number of things that have to be considered in the context of this debate. From as long as I know anything about the legal profession in Barbados, there was a consensus among private practitioners, public practitioners and members of the Bench, both the High Court Bench and the Magisterial Bench that the status of the magistracy should be upgraded, and this was based on the simple understanding that magistrates perform a very important and responsible role in this community; that some 80% of all litigants appear before magistrates, that magistrates had extremely wide powers, putting people in prison, taking away their liberty, taking away their money, and that you needed a person who was responsible and mature who had experience in the law and its application to fill a magisterial position.

It is a matter of common knowledge that any time you regrade any section of the public service anomalies will be created. If you are, as I heard from the hon. member for Christ Church West Central whom one knows better, as a result of the regrading of magistrates, going to pay the Senior Crown Counsel, Parliamentary Counsel, Principal Crown Counsel and the Crown Counsel more than the magistrates again, you are not really regrading the magistrates; you are putting them at the bottom of the legal hierarchy. You cannot have it both ways; you cannot determine to regrade the magistrates and put them in a higher position to reflect the responsibility they carry and at the same time say that the people who were above

them in the first place should get more again because it is self-defeating.

Another argument that is worth considering in this context is that the magistrates were already appointed. I do not care how senior or how junior they were in terms of legal service, if a man is appointed already as a magistrate and you regrade the magistracy, are you going to fire a man from his appointment? Are you going to take away his appointment? That is the so-called anomaly that has been created. What has not come into the debate so far is the fact that a magistrate has very limited opportunities for promotion, that it is quite conceivable that a man could be a magistrate for 20 or 30 years without going anywhere. The promotional opportunities for people in the Crown Law Office, the Parliamentary Counsel and the Crown Counsel are far greater than they are for the magistrates. It is totally inconceivable for anybody who has the slightest knowledge of the legal hierarchy to think that a magistrate can be promoted to be a Senior Crown Counsel because a magistrate has no training at all in legal drafting, and there is no possibility that he can be promoted to Senior Parliamentary Counsel or Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel and so on. To me it is a little bit farfetched to think of a magistrate being promoted to Deputy Solicitor General because during the period of his incumbency on the magisterial bench he would not have had the type of experience and exposure that would fit him in my opinion for that type of position.

All this business about regrading of magistrates and the anomalies and so on preceded me in my office. I found the problems, if there are problems, there. If there are anomalies and difficulties, I found them. I have had a meeting with the lawyers in my Chambers who are affected, a quite cordial meeting in which they explained to me in great detail the difficulties as they saw them, and I gave them an undertaking, and that is why I feel extremely disappointed today to find that after I sat down and talked with them, big men and women, and gave them certain undertakings, that they would find it necessary to copy documents in the files of the Attorney General and hand them to the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot think of anything more disgusting and deplorable than that; but I will be generous. I do not believe I should stand in here and condemn the whole set of lawyers in my Chambers because of the wickedness and viciousness of one particular officer. I am sure, Sir, that the other lawyers in my Chambers do not support the act of disloyalty perpetrated by that single officer. I am sure of that. What these lawyers have asked for and to which I am sympathetic and I do not expect hon. members on the other side to tell me anything about how lawyers should be treated in the Public Service.....when these people were in the Government six years ago, there were Crown Counsel who were taking home \$294 a month. I would like anybody on the other side to get up and

dispute that. They were taking home \$294 a month after the normal deductions.

Now what has happened is that there have been substantial regrading of the legal Public Service in this country since the accession of this side to the Government of this country, and there have been massive increases of salaries where those figures to which I made reference are a thing of the past.
3.40 p.m.

Now the lawyers I had promised something, Sir. I have promised them, the ones who are affected. I can well understand the way they feel. We have some lawyers who are working as Parliamentary Counsels, Senior Parliamentary Counsel and Senior Crown Counsel who were promoted from the magisterial benches to these positions some eight years ago and they now find themselves in a position where somebody working as a magistrate, a job that they were promoted from eight or nine years ago is working for more money than they are working for. I can understand that difficulty. I do not need the people on the other side to tell me about that.

I am saying to them that I personally would make a submission to the Minister in charge of Establishments to see if he would agree to pay them a personal allowance. That is a personal allowance to the holders of these positions, pay a personal allowance to the people affected so that they would not feel they were hard done by. I have given them that undertaking in a cordial meeting in my chambers and I believe they have accepted my words and I have made the recommendations to the Minister of Establishments in that regard and I have hopes that something will be done to correct the so-called anomalies before very long.

The hon. members on that other side can get up and talk if they want to. There are some of them like the hon. member on that side who talks a lot and says nothing and he need not heckle me over there because he can get up and talk when he is ready. It is important at this stage and since the debate has ranged far and wide for me to give some idea why I feel that the legal Civil Service will have to be better looked after. It is all right to hear a lot of Johnnies come lately jumping on the band wagon, people who exploited these lawyers as workers and now because they have no discernible area of responsibility, they can get up and make the type of comments they make in here today.

I have seen a case in my Chambers recently that went before the Supreme Court; a simple case in my humble submission where costs were set for counsel who were representing the people who sued the Crown. Costs were set at \$39,000 in legal fees for the lawyers. Lawyers appear against the Crown and get \$39,000 for one case and the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers who

did all the work on the other side have to work a year and a half before they can get any where near \$39,000.

Now I am not making any suggestion or recommendations that the salaries of people in the legal Civil Service should match those in private practice. I am not making that point at all because I know some people are good at distortion, so I am stating that quite categorically. I believe that in setting the emoluments for the lawyers in the Public Service that you have to take some look at what is going on in the private sector and I will be making a case, Sir, and I do not need anybody on that side to speak for the people who work for me (ASIDES: They do not work for you they work for all of us) I would hope that they do not work for.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I want very quickly to make certain references to the nature and conduct of legal education in the Caribbean because that has also come into the debate. It has always been that from the time legal education was established in the Caribbean there would be a three year LL.B. course. I think it was in 1970, Sir, at the university at Cave Hill and thereafter to become a lawyer you had to do two years' training in a Law School either at the Hugh Wooding in Trinidad or the Norman Manley Law School in Jamaica. We have had a lot of complaints about the structure and content of both courses, both the university course and the counsels' course.

They set up a Review Committee headed by Sir Roy Marshall, a very eminent Barbadian Lawyer who went through the region and had discussions with practitioners, public lawyers, teachers of law and so on. He had gone through and done a review and came up with a recommendation for reducing the two years in Trinidad and Jamaica to fifteen months.

Now I personally think that that is ridiculous. I do not really agree with that because it is a hybrid situation. It is not a year or two years and it is a situation that really epitomises the attitude of Caribbean people when they cannot take a decision. When they cannot take a decision they split it down the middle and seek foreign justification.

I remain as an adamant supporter of the law school that there must be some professional training after they finish the law degree. That is my position. I do not necessarily feel that it should be two years. Two years seem to be an inordinately long time and I do not know if I necessarily support that, but there must be some kind of training after your degree.

There is a view mouthed by many people, Sir, that you can do the training in law chambers. Now, Sir, I

do not agree with that at all. In Barbados you get into law chambers if you come from the right social background. I am strong on that, Sir. I do not mind you and that. If you come from the right social background you can get into the good chambers. If you are not known, you go into the law courts and survive by trial and error, and I am not supporting that, Sir. I am not at all supporting that.

I believe that there must remain something that is a level up where everybody regardless of their background will have the same type of common training to make them qualified professionals. I would abide by the year. I would accept the year but I think two years is a bit long but I will not join the school of thought that says there should be no school of legal education at all, Sir.

Now I want to make another reference to the course at Cave Hill, the LL.M. course that they tell me is in legislative drafting. That is a hoax. That is a hoax, Sir. There is a shortage of legal draftsmen in the whole Caribbean. There is a shortage in Barbados. There is a shortage throughout the region and the Government of Barbados on the initiative of the Government of Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica joined together and put up some money to train draftsmen.

I have taken a look at the course, Sir, and I am startled to find out what they are teaching up there. They are teaching Public Law, Administrative and Constitutional Law and what they are trying to do is to make some scholars out of some of the practitioners. We want some practitioners to do some drafting in the Attorney General's Chambers throughout the Caribbean and they are spending a lot of time up there, Sir, doing a lot of heavy concentration on Public Law, Administrative and Constitutional Law and I would be making noises in the right place soon, Sir, to try and see if I can influence a change in that course or we will have to review how we in Barbados are spending our coppers in relation to that course.

The need for legal draftsmen, Sir, is a very pressing need and it brings out forcibly to mind the attitude of that side in relation to lawyers. When we took over the Government in 1976, the then Government was not paying tuition fees for lawyers at the university. The only students in the whole university system that did not have their tuition fees paid were the law students.
3.50 p.m.

All this ties in with the view of the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John that lawyers are parasites and incubi on the body politic, or the society, whatever he said, Sir. Further, no law student could qualify for a bursary when we came into Government, Sir. Law students were treated like pariahs. We changed that,

Sir. We made it possible for them to come into the mainstream of whatever is going for students. We have done that, Sir, because we see the importance of lawyers in the whole developmental process. If you do not have an good lawyers in the Public Service, if you do not good draftsmen, a lot of the important legislation that is required for development would be frustrated. It is for this reason, Sir, that this resolution, I am supporting, Sir, very strongly, first of all as a member of this team and we agree on everything in this regard and also..(ASIDES)...Do not heckle me on the idiosyncrasies of Prime Ministers. Do not heckle me on that. I have a Rt. Hon. Prime Minister here who telling lies on Plato to cuss people, lawyers, telling lies on Plato to cuss lawyers. I cannot get into that, Sir. I am a humble Minister, Sir, I am no Prime Minister and I do not play in that league and I do not aspire to play in it like my friend over there, Sir.

I will wind up, Sir, with another quotation, page 3791 of the same volume Sir when the people of Barbados were told that:

"The Law Courts are no place for self-respecting people."

In other words, if somebody juck out your eye go home and put some aloes to it and call it Wally Smith.

"no place for self-respecting people". I also heard the Rt. Hon. Member had some very naughty, to put it at its highest, things to say about judges. Now, we on this Side do not support these things. We believe implicitly, I hope it does not sound too trite, but we believe implicitly in the Rule of Law, Sir, and I do not mean the Rule of Law by some strange rules and regulations, but the Rule of Law as some sort of living organism that ensures justice among all the people of this community, not as the Honourable Member for Christ Church West made reference to, one Law for the Medes, that is the lawyers, and another Law for the Persians, that is the carpenters, but that is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, and we will have no part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN: (APPLAUSE) Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the protracted debate on lawyers.

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have complete silence in this Honourable House.

Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN:...and it seems to me that the problems that were underscored with respect to lawyers do indicate the enormous complexity of the problem of regrading. Regraders have to tread delicately between the Scylla of the principles of relativity of supply and demand on the one hand and the Charybdis

of expediency on the other hand and I believe that unless we possess the wit and courage to carry through a thoroughgoing overhaul of the Civil Service, then we will always find ourselves with a hodge-podge of the anomalies which plague the products of every regrading exercise.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for Works, I am constrained to bemoan the fact of a paucity of engineers in that Ministry. It is a Ministry that is pilloried day in and day out by the informed and by the uninformed and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that no Ministry can do its work properly if it is not adequately staffed. The law of supply and demand, the iron law of supply and demand, if you will, seems to suggest more generous treatment of engineers because unless we have people like engineers and quantity surveyors the Ministry of Works cannot do its task properly. On the area of relativity, Mr. President, and I will not enter into any lengthy disposition because we have heard enough speeches on this already, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I am not accustomed to this rarefied atmosphere; Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whenever we apply the principle of relativity in matters such as this, it is very difficult to avoid absurdity because within the domain of relativity we find ourselves repeatedly comparing ourselves with like and unlike. The doctrine of relativity in regrading seems to me to make sense only insofar as it compares like with like.

Why is it that we find the same grade for the Deputy Postmaster General as for the Deputy Chief Education Officer? This seems to me to be a misapplication of the principle of relativity. Nor, can the explanation be found in an application of the principle of supply and demand. We can only conclude then that it is based largely upon a pragmatic expediency which is aimed at keeping the peace, the Government, the establishment and the workers' organisation. This whole process then seems to me to be highly old fashioned and out of date and I believe that we ought sooner to get down to the extremely difficult task of reconstructing the inefficient colonial bureaucracy with which we are saddled. I know it is difficult and it will require co-operation from the unions and all involved, but it is a task that must be done because, Mr. Speaker, this society is saddled with a class of mandarins that effectively intimidate politicians, and Ministers have to walk around on tiptoe and pretend that they are in agreement with the most idiotic actions that have been executed by members of the bureaucracy and I do not believe that as representatives of this society we can afford the luxury to permit the powers that have been invested in us by the people who voted for us to be abridged by a mandarin class of whose powers we are afraid. So, the sooner we tackle the problem of reconstructing the bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the better for all concerned. This is another step in that direction and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our Government

will move more speedily forward in achieving this most desirable end.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (APPLAUSE)

4.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to thank the hon. member who has just made a most distinguished maiden speech, the first of many which I am sure with their clarity and logic will both devastate hon. members opposite and put a human case on behalf of the Government, while thanking him, I will point out that perhaps in his short address he was the only hon. member who has spoken who has addressed himself to the generality of the resolution before the House. If anybody had told me that a debate which started at half past one would continue to 4.00 o'clock with the intervention of lunch to talk once more about the lawyers, I would have thought it unbelievable on the first full day of a Parliament which has seen the refutation of a most vicious charge relating to the elections, that has seen economic proposals, and after all is the first Parliament that has met for debate for many months.

This resolution before the House is not about a few disgruntled lawyers. I much appreciate everything that has been said on this side of the House in answer to the allegations raised by the other side. I appreciate all three of the speeches which were made, and all have made very sound and powerful points relating to legal education, not a matter that is before the House but powerful points nonetheless, relating generally to morale in the Attorney General's Chambers and exposing — I cannot call it hypocrisy, Sir — but the inconsistency of the arguments of the hon. member who took up the lawyers' cudgel.

The real trouble was that we are dealing with an Opposition that only sees things in trivial terms. You have a letter, the letter expressed my views that the lawyers behave like crabs in a barrel. Because Frank King was appointed Chief Magistrate they wrote a lot of letters to me and to the Chief Establishments Officer saying how few years of service he had, how many more years of service they had than he. All of that is contained in the original memorandum signed by nine lawyers calling for allowances, and two of them, Mr. Cox and one other, in fact were getting the allowances, because as former magistrates they got an allowance which they said they were entitled to because if they had known magistrates were going to be regraded they would not have applied for other jobs.

From paragraph 4 of the letter there was a complaint about the Chief Magistrate, even saying that the appointment of the present holder of the post is an infringement of a cardinal power of appointment as set out in the Service Commissions Regulations. This is what I meant; I meant no disrespect to the Leader of the Opposition in respect of general grasp of principles

on Establishments when I said that he was being misled by people who did not know and he therefore knew less, because what I was referring to was the issue, not the principle.

A long letter was written about 12th January this year basically objecting to the appointment of the Chief Magistrate and the upgrading of magistrates at a personal level. The present holder of the post of senior parliamentary counsel has 15 years' call. There are three persons holding substantive appointments as principal crown counsel, one has 17 years' call, one has 14 and the other has 12. The Chief Magistrate has 10 years' call. That is the tone of the entire letter, and without the background which is necessarily contained only in Government files, the Leader of the Opposition has picked up a matter of the utmost triviality in relation to the reorganisation of the Public Service represented by this resolution and detained the House with another of his sterile debates, these sterile exercises in self-examination on the part of lawyers.

There are a lot of things that can be said about legal education, but lawyers are not the most important people in this country and the legal profession is not, I think, to occupy the time of Parliament to such a great extent as it customarily does. I believe there are people who want me perhaps to deal with the hon. member for St. James South. No doubt there are people who feel that his infelicities on the Bench would be well exposed in a debate of this sort. I do not say I will never deal with them, but I will keep them in reserve, that will be leaving something to look forward to until after he has made a speech in this Chamber. There may be other things that can be said, but the whole point about this resolution is that it represents a major exercise in regrading and reorganising the Civil Service such as has been needed for a number of years.

All regradings are replete with anomaly, as the hon. member for St. Michael East has said. You can pick out a post here and a post there and ask why you put this post at this level and not that. In many cases, as the hon. member put it so well I could not put it better, it is a pragmatic exercise designed to appease whoever is making the loudest submission at the time. There are no other set of principles other than the three outlined that I can think of which will deal with every case in the Public Service. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made a point about having a professional stream and an administrative stream, and I took him to be suggesting that once you have a professional and an administrative stream there will be better acceptance by those in the administrative streams of higher salaries paid to the professional stream. With great respect to his argument, I personally doubt it. I would like to think that in Government Service you can pay engineers what

the going rate is for engineers. In Barbados, to do it we largely have to try to get engineers from abroad.

There are many examples that can be drawn. It seems to us that even a Government project is not enough if proper salaries for the carrying out of a specific idea are to be paid. You have to try and put it in a separate corporation and pay substantial salaries in the separate corporation. The Transport Board — there are all kinds of forces pulling on the Transport Board salary structure, but you and I Mr. Speaker, know that the Transport Board is one of the biggest businesses in Barbados, \$30 million a year in expenses, perhaps 1700 employees, more employees than Intel, and yet we cannot offer a salary comparable to the Manager of Caribbean Airways which is higher than any basic salary in here, I do not want to be tendentious, but a position occupied by somebody, I think, with qualifications less than anybody in the House. We cannot even offer the manager of our Transport Board that kind of salary to run a business vital to the economic health of Barbados. We should be offering a salary, bearing in mind salaries in our society, comparable salaries outside, we should be looking for six or seven thousand dollars a month for a proper manager for a major Government business, but perhaps the crab-in-a-barrel philosophy may even embrace some of us. I may be a little guilty of it when I identify an office which pays more than any of the offices of State represented in here, so these problems are difficult problems.

4.10 p.m.

This Resolution which represents an attempt to come to terms with one disgruntled ex-magistrate or perhaps now again present magistrate should not have the power, the influence to be able to turn a whole debate in the House of Assembly into an argument about senior parliamentary counsel and principal crown counsel. He ought not to have such access to the debating techniques of the Opposition. I welcome the speeches of those members of the Opposition, I think I have to say that member of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who addressed the general subject.

This Resolution introduced a post of Deputy Permanent Secretary, recognises the fact that Senior Assistant Secretaries — this is a confused title and they will now be called Senior Administrative Officers — are persons who have de facto been Deputy Permanent Secretaries, who have to substitute for the Permanent Secretaries, who have to know everything that the Permanent Secretary knows. It recognises their work and it improves the administrative structure; it gives new promotion opportunities.

The nurses on whose behalf the hon. member for St. Michael South took up the cudgels during the last Parliament are recognised by substantial regradings. The nurses have a powerful argument. Their period of training

lasts longer than that of a teacher and the same qualifications are required of them as teachers. They work all 52 weeks of the year and they work shifts, and yet they get paid less than teachers. This is a reflection perhaps of the pragmatic principle outlined by the hon. member for St. Michael East that you give way to trade union pressure in certain instances, and the teachers have brought more trade union pressure to bear than the nurses, and so they obtain better rewards out of the Public Treasury. All of these are matters which deserve consideration and deserve thought, and we believe that the Chief Establishments Officer and his devoted staff have given abundant thought and consideration to these matters.

It is fashionable on the part of trade unions and the their representatives to believe that an essential part of their duty, especially the trade union representing Government workers, is to attack Government. I say that in the widest sense. Under the previous Government the trade union organisation was very vigorous in assaults upon the then Prime Minister. The National Union of Public Workers is very vigorous in assaults on the present Government. I would suggest that there are a lot of goals which can be satisfied by cooperation. We on this side are not afraid of a fine, and if we have to say what we have to say about a trade union official, a trade union or as the case may be, we say it; and if we have to prepare for battle when battle is offered, we are prepared, but we honestly and sincerely believe that if the trade unions understood that a great deal can be achieved by cooperation, by drawing lines of discussion rather than lines of battle that we would be able to deal with the sort of exercise which is now before the House more comprehensively, more completely and more reasonably.

We are moving into a phase, I fear, where one of the trade unions is coming under the influence of ideologies not normally associated with either politics or unionism in Barbados, but that is a different story. It will be a sadder and sadder day for Barbados when conflict between Unions and Government becomes endemic, and I am very glad to say that in the case of the instant matter we think that we are opening lines which can lead to very satisfactory conclusions of this sort of dispute in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of these regradings will be some millions of dollars and back pay will be payable during, I suspect, next month. I think it is too late to consider this month at this stage; but backpay by itself will certainly be over \$1½ million. (*Asides*) After this Resolution is passed it will only then accrue. Over \$1½ million will be paid next month. I am glad to say that most of it will go to the lower paid workers in the Government Service. I hope that all concerned will appreciate when the time comes for the next salary negotiations both that the Government has been generous when the going was good and that the Government may

not be able to be so generous when the going is bad (*Asides*). I hear hon. members opposite saying that the Government should be imprudent and it should not in any way attempt to convince trade unions that they are Barbadians too and that they must take a reasonable attitude towards Government finances. I can say no more than that. You hear all kinds of wonders. I understand that before I made my statement on the state of the economy that a Press release answering it has been handed out to the Press; even without knowing what was in it, hon. members opposite had taken a certain stand. I cannot deal with people like that. I can only be thankful that for me as a citizen, not me as a politician, the electorate once more repudiated them and relegated them to the limbo where they will spend five, ten, goodness knows how many more years.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO REPLACE SCHEDULES B AND C OF RESOLUTION NO. 68/1980

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to replace Schedules B and C to Resolution No. 68/1980 to give effect to the reclassification of the unestablished staff and casual employees of Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar matter. There is only one very minor anomaly that has been pointed out to us by the National Union of Public Workers. It relates to heavy equipment operator. There is an outstanding anomaly in the key scale that electricians at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had for a long time enjoyed a special status. It was intended to upgrade the position of heavy equipment operator, but by an accident it did not appear to have been upgraded. The position has been moved. I understand that some of the heavy equipment operators are paid a responsibility allowance. We do feel they should be among the best paid workers in the Public Service because their responsibilities are greater. We understand that some are paid a responsibility allowance, but I would wish it to be known that the Government is looking at the situation to ensure that that grade which we think has been inadequately rewarded will receive proper consideration.

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

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of information, I was wondering if the Prime Minister who is responsible for Establishments could say whether with the passing of this particular matter that they are dealing with and the one we have already despatched most of the anomalies would have been dealt with or whether there are still anomalies outstanding, and if he could give us some idea of the overall pattern as far as this country is concerned.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The National Union of Public Workers have undertaken to write to us to point out new anomalies. That is all I can say. I believe there always will be anomalies, I believe that every time you put one group with the other, like the magistrates, you will get another group who will complain. (*Asides*) I am trying very hard to recall because I asked the Unions to consider everything that was outstanding. As far as I can recall there may be the question of welfare officers, but the Welfare Department clearly will have to be reorganised when the means test is abolished and old age pensions are transferred to National Insurance; so welfare officers are awaiting the restructuring of the entire department.
4.20 p.m.

I have mentioned this particular Item on the Key Scale. I think there may still be some at the hospital but I have to make submissions. I think there are outstanding matters which are not related to regrading. They are related to the conditions of service, leave, sick leave, un-certificated sick leave, perhaps one or two things relating to over-time, the relationship of a woman taking a husband, leave passages and that sort of thing and money matters relating to pensions, but as regards regrading I really cannot remember anything that is worth mentioning that has not been done.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3.

 RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF THE SUM OF £471,750 STERLING FROM LLOYDS BANK LIMITED AND £83,250 STERLING FROM LLOYDS BANK INTERNATIONAL LIMITED FOR FINANCING THE ADDITIONAL COSTS OF PROVIDING GOODS AND SERVICES FOR THE PURPOSES OF DEVELOPING THE COAST GUARD

Item No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the use of the sum of £471,750 Sterling from Lloyds Bank Limited and £83,250 Sterling from Lloyds Bank International Limited for financing the additional costs of providing goods and services for the purpose of developing the Coast Guard.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the nature of the defence contract — I have learnt that I must not use the words "defence agreement" because the use of those words might be misunderstood — is well known to the House. Perhaps there is only one member of the House who sees a zero where there is no zero but apart from the hon. member for St. Michael West I think there has been a thorough understanding of the nature of the purchase of the vessel for the Coast Guard and the building of the Coast Guard Harbour.

The instant Resolution is occasioned because the financing arrangement which the Government has adopted require that we return to the House on every occasion when we are drawing down or using these sums of money for carrying on the building of the Coast Guard workshop and doing further work on the Coast Guard vessel.

All that I would say is this, Sir, that the original cost of conversion of the former shrimp trawlers in Trinidad turned out to be less than was thought necessary because the trawlers were in a worse condition when they got to Trinidad than when they were inspected by the officials of Brooke Marine who are undertaking the contract.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, unless I am very mistaken, I think I am right in saying that one of the boats selected to go to Trinidad never went at all but the person then in charge of International Seafoods sent a different boat and the boat — it seems amusing, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that anything to do with International Seafoods contains much that is bizarre and none of it of financial advantage to the Government. Nonetheless, Sir, escalation of cost is not exceptional when one considers the escalation in any building contract at the present time.

For the two boats, the additional cost was £120,000. Fortunately when this Resolution was drawn, the pound was at a higher level. Now it is at a much lower level and I would not be surprised if the additional cost has not been absorbed in the falling of the pound but I cannot give you an assurance of that because I do not know when the money will actually be paid.

The extra work involved repairs to badly damaged hulls of the trawlers, both above and below the water line. There were faults in the rudder of one of them and there was some corrosion that had increased since inspection. There were various things missing and I still think, Sir, and anybody who sees the HMBS Enterprise anchored in the shallow draft facilities will think that the monies are being well spent.

The major component in this Supplementary, Sir, is for the cost of a workshop on the Pierhead where the old Baggage Warehouse used to be. The old Warehouse was hoped to have the capacity to stand the installation of a

workshop to repair the Coast Guard vessels but a structural analysis of the existing building indicated that it was not likely to take the weight of an overhead travelling crane and the building itself turned out to be a fire hazard.

We could have bumbled along with the existing screw dock operated by Central Foundry and with some equipment installed in the Baggage Warehouse but we think it very desirable that Barbados should have modern ship repair facilities capable of handling vessels up to the size of the Coast Guard Vessels. There will not only be repair services for the Barbados Coast Guard but we anticipate that vessels from the St. Vincent Coast Guard and perhaps vessels likely to be supplied to Coast Guard services in other Islands may also by agreement come to be repaired in Barbados.

The additional costs of a welding, a burning, and a blacksmith shop, fuel injection workshop, battery charging room, electronics maintenance workshop, wood-working shop, diving gear, repairs and so on, plus offices and other structures, the additional cost will be £370,000.

We think that in the long run, Sir, this will be money well spent. In terms of the cash flow of Government, this is money coming from abroad on concessional terms and so it does not impinge on the general difficult position in which the Government finds itself. This will be fully financed from the loan indicated in the Resolution, Sir.

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

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are discussing this Resolution against a background of very grave economic problems facing this country. We are in a situation in which our roads are in a very bad state of disrepair and novel methods of dealing — (ASIDES) I did not interrupt you while you were speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly address the Chair. There must be no heckling from the Government benches.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that our roads are in a very bad state of disrepair and that we are resorting to novel methods for the repair of those roads by means of levies on the salaries of workers in this country.
4.30 p.m.

We do not have enough units at the Transport Board in order to provide a modern, up-to-date and efficient transport service to service a developing economy. Workers on Government projects are being laid

off. I heard mention of some talk of a four day week and the Honourable Minister of Works said he was not in favour of any four day week. All types of problems including problems in the tourist industry where there has been a drop in arrivals and where Barbados has been said to be one of the most expensive destinations or the most expensive destination, providing a threat to our economy and the finances of this country. This is the background against which we are discussing this resolution before us.

Our sugar industry is in trouble. (ASIDES) Our manufacturing industry presents some problems. Although there are some efforts made, still it does not give us all of the confidence to take the slack that has been created by the other sectors of the economy. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has had a very high visibility so far, but we are waiting for the increased productivity as far as that particular Ministry may be concerned.

What concerns us, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that amidst all of the rescheduling of Government projects, the closing down of work sites whether in St. James South, I am not certain whether any have been closed in St. James South, a number of projects are being closed down and we are asking the question, instead of closing down the construction of housing which is a dire necessity in this country, can the Government not take the step to defer further construction of this particular naval establishment and direct those funds into other sectors of the economy which might be more productive? In other words, if we have to cut back in certain areas, should we not be cutting back on the guns and spending on the better? I would strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government seriously consider postponing further expenditure on this particular project and divert the funds which may be available into those areas of the economy which are in dire need of a new injection of capital.

There is no point in saying that these funds have been borrowed specifically for the purpose of developing the Coast Guard because in the end, the people of Barbados have to repay the loan. They have to repay it. (ASIDES) They cannot merely gloss over it and say, "well, it would not affect the general revenues because it is money coming from outside." It is the people of Barbados who have to repay it and if the picture that has been painted of Barbados is a very gloomy one of serious economic difficulties in which every man is called to his station, we must all come together and try to support this economy, if that is the situation. If we must pay a levy for the new Health Plan, if we must pay a levy to get new buses for the Transport Board, if we must form some new Board, I do not even remember what it is called, in order to study the state of our roads (ASIDES) and to carry out work on the roads — I do not know what is going on, if this is another responsibility for the Honourable Minister of Works, I do not know — if that is the situation and our economic situation is that grim, I

am seriously calling upon the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to consider deferring any further expenditure on these structures down at the Pierhead or wherever they may be, and on any further expenditure of a capital nature as far as the Coast Guard is concerned and direct all energies to the economy of this country in creating jobs for the people who have been displaced in terms of ensuring that those workers who now have to face the bleak possibility or bleak reality of going home to their families and to their children and not having a job; I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this Government should seriously defer any further expenditure on this military installation.

Mr. Speaker, that has nothing at all to do with the commitment of my Party to the proper defence of Barbados, but we do not believe that at this stage it is necessary to put this as a priority over the priority of improving immediately our road system, improving our transport system, of constructing more houses rather than fewer houses for the people of this country. We have got to get our priorities right. I really do not wish to say anything more on that, these points will be developed. But, I am certain that all Barbados, the workers of this country and those who have been deprived and face a bleak future in the economic chaos that may be facing this country, I am certain they will support the Government, if it took steps to defer expenditure in this particular regard and divert the resources into other areas of the economy.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is quite obvious that the Honourable Member has not looked at his resolution with his usual depth because the Honourable Member should recall that this Honourable House already in a previous Session voted for the major item of expenditure under this Loan Agreement. All that this resolution does now is to provide additional funds for carrying out the original contract, but for the reasons explained, the original funds provided were insufficient to carry out the whole of the contract.

4.40 p.m.

As the Minister of Finance explained, this is an agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of the United Kingdom whereby specific funds from a specific source were lent for specific purposes on specific terms and conditions. I am amazed that the hon. member with his full knowledge of parliamentary procedure, of ethics and of morality would suggest that the Government of Barbados, having regard to the specific terms of the agreement, would break the agreement and divert the funds and use them for another purpose. That is a matter of great surprise to me. (Mr. SANDIFORD: You know I did not say that). The hon. member clearly said that that is what we should do, that

we have our priorities wrong, that we should take this money and use it for housing. I know the hon. member is very anxious to hear the spokesman for the Opposition on finance, because he is not here, speak in reply to the proposals that were outlined. I know that the hon. member is surprised that they were not what he and what the other side expected, but no attempt by the hon. member or of the people on the other side to portray a situation in respect of employment in this country, in respect of Government finances, will dissuade the Government from frankly and honestly pointing out to the public of Barbados that in the construction industry in Barbados today there is more employment available than there are workers. No attempt by anybody on the other side, nobody on the other side can convince the public of Barbados that carpenters, masons or plumbers cannot get a job. You only have to read the newspaper every day.

I am also going to let the hon. member know this. The Government of Barbados has been trying for at least five years to convince international institutions such as the World Bank and others, the Inter-American Development Bank, that we would like to be able to borrow money for a sites and services programme and for housing for the lower income group. All of them say, with your per capita income you have no chance at all, so that we have to rely on our own savings and our own resources to get the capital necessary for the housing programme, and if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had not for all the 15 years he was in power told the people in Barbados not to pay rents, we would not be in that position today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member knows that that is an untrue statement and he should not make statements like that. The hon. member called my name, Sir, and said that for 15 years I told the people not to pay rents. The hon. member knows it is an untrue statement, I have corrected it several times on the floor of the House and he should not go on repeating that statement. That is pure unadulterated nonsense.

For the very last time, Sir, some time around 1956 — on a point of explanation — there was an attempt by the Bridgetown City Council to make the people pay occupancy tax and we told the people that occupancy tax had been abolished and they were not to pay any rates because they were occupiers of premises and they were not the owners of premises. They go on repeating the same lie day after day, week after week. It is on the records of the House, it is on the records in a letter to the Press with Mr. J. S. B. Dear — you can go and ask him about it — giving the same opinion, and the hon. member was in his Chambers and he knows of the opinion.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You know, Sir, there is always a bit of truth in what the hon. member says but not all of the truth. I well recall the hon. member saying that the occupancy tax is another rent and they should not pay any more rent. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not true). That is exactly what he said, that the occupancy tax is another rent and they should not pay it. The hon. member forgets that in the heat of his political campaigns he often says things that he doesn't really mean to say. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is nonsense. It is a lie, man).

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, now, now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The basic position is, Sir, that we must deal with these attempts. I saw in a journal that there were 1200 people laid off at the Housing Corporation and I rang the people at the Housing Corporation. The total employment at the Housing Corporation does not amount to 1200, yet still you can read in the newspaper and other people can say that 1200 people were laid off.

The basic position is that in a number of Government projects, whereas before the Government Departments were carrying out the totality of the work by direct labour under a number of the projects of the Capital Development Programme, the source of the funding had stipulated that the projects must be carried out based on competitive bidding. Now we had to fight, this Government had to fight to allow Government Departments to be bidders. Some of them did not even want Government Departments or the Statutory Corporations who were in the past carrying out work of a similar nature, and in our opinion had expertise, to be eligible to bid. They then stipulated that in their bidding they would have to contribute a percentage of the labour and materials as a contribution to overheads in order to equalise the terms of bidding. We had to fight over that percentage too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the position is that in some of these areas the departments and the particular statutory corporations were outbid by private enterprise. What was the Government to do? Explain to me what is the Government to do. What would the other side do? Refuse the loan and so not carry out the work, or accept the fact that we are under an obligation to see to it that the contractors who won the contract take over as many of the workers as possible who were working in that field of activity and who had experience? The latter is what we have done.

Now on the question of the roads, the hon. member is very worried about the roads, but his worry is that we have come forward with a practical programme to do something about it. That is the hon. member's worry. The

hon. member's worry is that the road between Brandon's and Paradise is actually under construction. 4.50 p.m.

The hon. member's worry is that the road between CDB and Haggatt Hall corner is actually under construction. The hon. member's worry is that the one from the airport to connect with CDB and the one from Haggatt Hall to connect with Warrens are now being planned. That is the hon. member's worry (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: We have been having too much cross talking

Hon. H. B. STJOHN: I like all this talk about planning. Hon. members on the other side were very good planners, but bad executors. That is the problem. They only plan, they have never been able to execute. In fifteen years they could not build the Post Office. In 15 years they could not build the road from Brandon to Paradise. In 15 years they could not build the road from CDB to Haggatts Hall. In fifteen years they could not develop Oistins. In 15 years they could not build the by-pass at Heywoods. In 15 years they could not build as many tenantry roads as we built in the last five years. That is the hon. member's problem.

Now, Sir, I heard the hon. member for St. Michael East make a very fundamental speech in here and that is that we are now in a position in this country where we have to look at the whole of our machinery in the Civil Service. We are no longer operating with a C. D & W. grant from the United Kingdom which was supplemented through our Public Works headed by another extension of the United Kingdom Civil Service. We are in the competitive environment of having to compete as a Government in certain spheres of operation with international contractors, so that if MCW, if the Housing Corporation, if the IDC building and construction departments cannot compete in accordance with international bidding after we fought to get them the opportunity, then, Mr. Speaker, the inevitable consequence follows that the work they formerly did is now done by private contract. They are either competitive or we have to get the contractors to get the people. So there is no substance at all in the speech of the hon. member when he wrongly suggests that is impossible to use these funds for a different purpose. That is not possible and I want to say this. Barbados, like the Eastern Caribbean is situated in a geographical position in which we are prone to a large amount of oil spills. We are prone to a tremendous amount of attack by many misguided people abroad who feel that it is easy to take over a small island. We are also in a position where we have to watch our general marine environment.

The object of this expenditure is to provide the wherewithal for us to police our boundaries, and when the hon. member talks about the workshop, the hon. member

should recognise that one of the cardinal planks in a Government's programmes and policies in relation to the Defence Force is that it must be used as a skills training institution as well. We have a skills training camp in St. Lucy, and this workshop will also provide the means of training people in Barbados in additional skills; so what does the hon. member talk when he is talking about this being a wastage of expenditure. The hon. member should recognise that when you have to take a decision in respect of scaling down projects, the first ones you look for are the ones which have not been started at all, and you do not look for a project which is 90% complete, particularly a project of the kind which has as an aspect educational benefits and a benefit in relation to the provision of adequate facilities for housing boats that are necessary not only for your own safety, but for the safety of your environment. It is a nonsensical argument for us to suggest that it is possible even at this late stage to change the terms and conditions of this loan.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that having won the election by means fair or foul that a different pattern of debate would have emerged in this Parliament. The hon. member for St. Michael South made the point that borrowing for purposes of this kind should be seen against the background of other priorities within the total economic situation in Barbados. Never at any time did he suggest that the specific funds involved in this loan contract should be diverted from this particular project to any other particular project. The essential point is that a country like Barbados is limited in its capacity to borrow, and if you borrow \$25 million for military hardware, no doubt dictated to by the kind of Reagan-Thatcher-Adams axis that seems to be operating with the Caribbean area at the moment, that is \$25 million less that you may be able to borrow to try and get the chaotic situation in agriculture back into some kind of reasonable shape. So it is not a question of saying that this money is for this purpose, and therefore if there is a question about why it is being used, you are suggesting that you are being asked to make some improper use of money for which you have entered an agreement for its use.

Mr. Speaker, every million dollars borrowed for military expenditure means that we have to be careful how you borrow another \$1 million for some productive purpose. That is a very valid economic point that my colleague was making, and I wish to give him my fullest support in that particular area. One other point. I am a bit upset by the hon. member for Christ Church East Central. One of the problems facing this economy is a decline in investor confidence in Barbados, and I will tell you what are the two major causes of this. Not only is it a consequence of the increasing deficits on overall Government expenditure from year to year, but another major factor is all this talk about plots and coups in the

area, and particularly the highly irresponsible statements made trying to link any member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition with any illegal act in terms of overthrowing a Government.

5.00 p.m.

As soon as you do that any potential investor in this country, although you make those wild allegations, every potential investor in this country begins to wonder whether he is going to invest in another banana republic. You are destroying your own chances and you should only get involved in that kind of exercise if there is some element of truth in it.

You will never know the extent to which you try to destroy a legitimate policy of price control as advocated by this party into a policy of racism. We will never know the extent under which that could undermine the confidence of people in investing in this country, even Barbadians. You will be very surprised but those little things mean a lot, apart from the hard economic situation in Barbados, but to get back to this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is better to get back to the Resolution. Let us get back to this Resolution.

Dr. HAYNES: I am responding to what the hon. member has said. He has further said that we are trying to seek an opportunity now to debate a statement made by the hon. Prime Minister here in this Honourable House on economic matters. We would debate that in a substantive Resolution in this House and you will not get away with using the device of a Ministerial statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member..... Stick to this Resolution.

Dr. HAYNES: I take your advice, Sir. I will take your advice from now, Sir. I am advised. Now, Mr. Speaker, we in this country have to be careful of the amount of money that we spend in non-productive areas. In the good times where you have surpluses around the place may be, but this is the most inappropriate moment even to think of bringing this measure before this Honourable House.

The other side has said that they have no option in that they have to go ahead with the contract as it stands, but we on this side must make the point that the Government has to be careful how it gets involved in further capital expenditure in non-productive areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a point only made by me. I recall there was some dispute during the last Session as to the exact interpretation of a very important article in a previous Central Bank Report by a Miss Zepherin, who I think has left the bank subsequently, as to the status of

our public debt and its proper usage and certainly, Sir, this does not follow.

The other side agreed with the position that future borrowings should be conditioned by investment in productive areas. Our borrowings should be in that area. Now, certainly, Mr. Speaker, that is not what they were saying. We are borrowing here now for what purpose? For the purpose of military hardware and I can only urge on the Government to be cautious and not to over react to all of these plots and schemes and so on and be very careful how they use the publicity in these matters because they are damaging us. In fact, they are damaging the entire country and not only the Democratic Labour Party.

I think that I have managed to clarify the position of my colleagues who simply sought to bring to the attention of the Government the need for a rearrangement of its priorities in its borrowings and in its spending policy and also the need to try to avoid the political contracts at this time and in the immediate future whilst this serious economic crisis is facing the country and spelt out clearly by the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, today because what he is telling us is simply this that the whole country is in a complete mess.

The final point I would like to refer to is the question raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East Central on the question of the role of capital projects in the present economic situation in which the Government finds itself. It is always difficult, Mr. Speaker, when you are debating not to respond to points raised on the other side and I crave your indulgence in this matter.

The basic problem is what we have been arguing all along and that is why we are challenging the Government to have a full-scale televised debate on the economy of this country because we have felt, Mr. Speaker, and we have good evidence, evidence of another Caribbean country, based on a very good paper produced by our own Governor of the Central Bank in 1975, as to the immediate causes of the kinds of balance of payments problems and a whole series of other things.

Mr. SPEAKER: All of this has to do with this Resolution?

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, this is relevant because this is a question of borrowing in relation to your reserves, in relation to your balance of payments and I am trying to respond to a very valid point made by the hon. member for Christ Church East, and I am inviting your indulgence to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Inviting an early debate?

Dr. HAYNES: I am only responding to the point of the capital problem. The basic problem is that they were clustered at the last moment in an inflationary situation, particularly with inflation hitting that particular sector of the economy, namely, the construction industry with the disastrous effect on our balance of payments position so the Government will have to listen to us. You will just have to begin to listen to the Opposition because I was terribly offended because of the type of response that I heard from the hon. member for Christ Church East Central just now reminding me of the same response that was made to a call by the member for St. Michael South before I was a member of this House in the same September of 1976 when he adverted to certain changes in policy. We will not get into that kind of thing now — but calling for an early Budget which would have prevented what happened in 1977 and 1978 if only you had listened.

It is that type of response where you relegate responses from the Opposition to nothingness that prevents this Parliament from functioning effectively and prevents yourself from sometimes getting into the pitfalls in which you find yourself because I know from my own experience that when you are involved in something very often you do not make the same objective judgment that you should be making as if you were advising somebody else or listening to criticism. It is a question of listening.

I think that most of these capital projects will either have to be postponed, rescheduled, and you can try to complete what you have ongoing and try to be most cautious in your borrowings over the next three or four years. That is all the advice I can give you for the time being. The rest will come.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: (APPLAUSE) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand here for the first time, a humble person representing the constituency of St. Philip South. This resolution.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you mean St. Philip South.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes, St. Philip South. This resolution before this Honourable House, at the moment, I am looking at it in an entire perspective. I am looking at this resolution as though I was looking at the entire Defence Force.

Now, as far as I can see, this Barbados Labour Party does not seem to have any clear policy as far as the Defence Force is concerned. The Party is on record as saying in 1976:

"There will be no need to maintain any standing army or Defence Force."

That is the Manifesto of 1976. In March 1976, the Honourable Member for St. James, I believe it is North said:

"A Coast Guard is not a priority."

Further, in March 1976, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition then, now Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said:

"The Opposition is still opposed in principle to a Coast Guard Service which is separate from the ordinary policing duties."

This is what the Leader of the Opposition said in 1976.

Now, since 1976, we have been hearing about plots and counter plots and that Democratic Labour Party personnel are involved, although none of these statements have been proved. We do not believe these things anyhow. We know that no person in the Democratic Labour Party would attempt to overthrow the legally constituted Government of this country, would never attempt to do it legally. (ASIDES) I have heard my friend the Honourable Member for St. James North, I think, misbehaving himself as usual..... (ASIDES: Withdraw that)..... but I will proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, the Honourable Member, you are accusing the Chair of permitting an Honourable Member to misbehave himself without taking action. You should withdraw that.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to withdraw that statement and I apologise to the Honourable Member as well. It is therefore surprising Mr. Speaker that last year or year before, we took our Defence Force and sent it to St. Vincent to interfere in the internal affairs of St. Vincent and the Grenadines without any debate in this Honourable House of Assembly. We have to look at this resolution as an entire thing and not just an extra bit of money that we want to continue for a project.

We are saying that since 1976, the Barbados Labour Party has spent about \$34.7 million on the Defence Force buying war ships, they have been buying planes, heavy transport vehicles, heavy duty guns and other ammunition. We are saying that when you look at this thing on the whole perspective, if the money being spent on the Defence Force could not be spent on things more productive to help poor people in this country?

I would like to say, ladies and gentlemen.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.....

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Alright, give him a chance. Please, you address the Chair on each occasion, "I would like to say, Mr. Speaker" and you continue. Mr. Speaker on this occasion is your "ladies and gentlemen". You understand?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is alright, go ahead.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your time.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN:.....as the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works has said, I am not accustomed to this rarefied atmosphere, I will soon become accustomed to it (APPLAUSE) and I would like the Honourable members to understand this.

What I would like to say finally, Mr. Speaker, is that my Party strongly objects to the way the units of the Defence Force are being used even in local activities and as far as this resolution is concerned, we look at it in that respect that if we cannot be guaranteed that the Force will be used only for the duty for which we think it should be used then we will have to oppose this resolution.

Thank you very much, Sir. (APPLAUSE)

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: (APPLAUSE) Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to stand and say a few words on behalf of the Defence Force of this country. I would like to commend the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister for his able resolution. I live north of this country and at nights going home, late at nights you see boats moored in the sea, you see all sorts of people on the beach, you do not know if they are people who passed through Customs or anything like that and I definitely believe that such a Coast Guard would be a tremendous amount of help to this country. (APPLAUSE).

I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, at times when you go into a district and you see a district that does not like the Police Force and does not like law and order; it is a very serious district to live in. This afternoon as I listened to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, I always had a big amount of respect for that Honourable Member, but this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I would have to think a little again.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Coast Guard is concerned I hope and I am sure that the Honourable Minister who is in charge of the Coast Guard will see that it carries out its duty fearlessly. This resolution, I would say, is a good resolution. I would like also that the Coast Guard will service the whole island around and would not service only around the St. Michael area because we have a nuisance over at the North Point, I have quite a few fishermen from the Half Moon Fort area who buy fish pots and all of you know the price of wire nowadays. On days when those poor men go to haul their pots, the fish are already there dead by the dynamiting of the sea all day over there. So, I am appealing that this money is

money well spent, I would say, Mr. Speaker, when you look around to see that we depend in this country on fish. Fish is an outstanding protein of this country and as we go on with this state of affairs, with men dynamiting the sea day after day, I am sure soon from now we would not have any fish at all. I am sure that we are suffering now on the South Point with the sea egg, we know there is a drop back there. But, I would tell you this that dynamiting the sea is a very serious point.

I heard the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John said about the.....I would have to stray a little from the resolution to answer the Rt. Hon. Member, as you would say. He said that he never went on any platform telling the people not to pay the Housing Authority the rents, but I would like to tell the Rt. Hon. Member, as he would know I am not one to practise telling lies. I cannot agree to telling lies.

5.20 p.m.

I am sure that the hon. member was at Half Moon Fort years ago and he heard leading members of his Cabinet, not one member, his number one and his number two members telling the people there not to pay for the houses at the Clincketts area.

Mr. SPEAKER: This resolution is really nothing to do with paying house rents.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: The hon. member for St. Michael South spoke about holes in the road. I would like him to know that in 1976 I was talking to a solid member of the Democratic Labour Party and he told me if I did not move from by the gang he would complain to Errol for me. I did not know whom he meant when he said he would complain to Errol for me. But do you know that that same member when you pass him on the same road at 10.30 in the morning is sitting foot over foot and not doing anything? Then you will hear some members of the Opposition coming in here and saying that holes are in the road, and if those people would encourage those members to do an honest day's work for and honest day's pay, I am sure we will have a better country.

Mr. Speaker, as far as this resolution is concerned, I support it and I believe it is a wonderful resolution and I am sure that the nice people of St. Lucy when they hear about this resolution will be very happy, because we do a fair amount of fishing, and I am sure that the Coast Guard will be a means of helping to support the nice people of St. Lucy.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in addressing this Hon. House this evening, I would like first of all to say that I am happy to see the jovial manner in which we are doing the people's business. But yet, seriously, I am here also to speak on a resolution before this Hon. House and to say

that I tend to agree with the member for St. Michael South as far as the caution goes for the borrowing of money.

As far as the Defence Force is concerned, I am very interested in that body for a number of reasons, but it seems to me that throughout this area we are creating a number of standing armies which can be detrimental in the future if not checked immediately. Instead I would prefer that monies spent on any Defence Force, whether you call it a Defence Force or a National Service Scheme, be spent in trying to discipline the youngsters of this country, as the hon. member for St. Lucy has mentioned earlier. In speaking about discipline, I would just like to say that I too intend to discipline myself while I am in this Hon. Chamber and do not intend whatsoever to become engaged or involved in any mud slinging matches. I am very appreciative of the remarks made to me, and if I were probably not a bigger man I might feel somewhat honoured, but at the same time all I want to say is that a Defence Force or a National Service Scheme can supply a lot of work for the young people in this country, and I believe that any Government which intends in the future to borrow money for a Defence Force should consider not only buying what seems to me to be a gun boat which is not necessary at this time in Barbados, because the launches which the Police Force had previously could adequately patrol our coastal area, and indeed if the gun boat is to deal with the sea and rescue, I would add that the boat in itself cannot cope with air and sea rescue, but indeed a helicopter is more suited for the job.

Nevertheless, also standing army presents a very grave problem to the citizens of a country, whereas National Service, by its nature, temporary, will discipline people, have them play sports, get them more community minded as we should get our youngsters in this country, and indeed to enter a proper skills training programme, not one based on a three month course as I understand is now being carried out by the Defence Force. Indeed a minimum of six months is necessary if one is going to train in a skills training programme.

Therefore, although the resolution as I see it is only to discuss a loan that has already been agreed upon, or a contract which has been entered into, I would just like to caution the Government that if they are to borrow loans in future of this magnitude, then the loans should be intended for what I consider to be creating a lot of employment for people as they are now losing jobs because of the economic situation.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this resolution which is before the House is a very vital and important resolution. We live in an age when we can no longer be complacent about our security. The sovereign

integrity of new and emerging States depends very much on their ability to defend themselves. We live in the open Caribbean sea, and as far as Barbados is concerned we are in an island State and we find it extremely difficult to defend ourselves without having the resources to do so.

We do not regard the Opposition as competent to advise us in security matters. We have had instances where the sovereign integrity of the country was threatened, and we knew it, and when we tried to alert the populace as to the position, the Opposition did not give us support on these matters. Therefore, as far as their advice is concerned, I do not regard it as very worthwhile.

As far as talking about diverting the money, which we cannot do, the Addendum to the resolution is clear on this. The resolution says what the money is for and what it seeks to do. It is part of monies for the development of the Coast Guard, and this area is going to provide employment as well as it is going to be a means of earning foreign exchange. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in the introduction of this resolution made mention of the fact that other States in the Caribbean may well use this service for the maintenance of their fleet and therefore it is important and vital that we for our part do not find that we are scratching when the time comes when we need to have repairs done. As an island State, to the East of Barbados there is something like 5,000 open miles of sea. Who is going to police that area for us? When you have the boats coming out here with oil spills and oil pollution, and you know that many of the boats that ply with oil from Africa and those States come and empty their dump within our waters, we must have means at our disposal whereby we can stop such a situation. We cannot rely upon what was then known as the police boats, which the hon. member for St. James South referred to just now. He certainly is not with it. The fellows will laugh at you, they do not even have to point the guns on their boats at you, all they have to do is to deliver something in the air and with that puff going off in the air your boat is already sunk. You need to have proper facilities whereby you can do it.

5.30 p.m.

There is no question of not having a Defence Force. A Defence Force is vital. The hon. member talked about the Defence Force and its attitude to the populace. If you have a well-disciplined Defence Force, I am not talking about a rowdy force that Sydney Alleyne would be the General of, or the type of rowdy Force that you get in the Central African Republic that will rise up every morning and will overthrow the lawful Government of the day or anything like that. It can be an asset to any country. People who are not law-abiding are always fearful of a Defence Force and always fearful of a Police Force. We have nothing like that to be afraid of. What are you afraid about?

You talk about having a National Service Scheme. The hon. member for St. James South has for years been an adviser to the former Prime Minister and then he became adviser to the present Leader of the House on the matter of skills training. I would like to know what he was able to accomplish in that period of time that he was employed by the Government, and I wonder if it was not money wasted by having him employed there. I wonder if he was not able in that period of time to evolve a scheme whereby we would have shed light by now as to what type of environment the children of this country should be in, and why he should wait until now we are moving forward with a Defence Force employing a lot of Barbadians.

I want to say primarily, Mr. Speaker, that a Defence Force is not to employ people. A Defence Force is for the protection of the sovereign integrity of a country. That is exactly what it is for, but even though it is so, we consider that a Defence Force must be involved in the developments within the community and therefore it must perform, it must go out there and train people. At the moment the Transport Board is finding it extremely difficult to get drivers. You are finding it extremely difficult to get people to drive heavy equipment in Barbados. You are finding it difficult to get people who are good mechanics, people who are electricians, welders and what have you, and the Defence Force is involved in that exercise; therefore I do not see the need to continually harp upon the fact that the Defence Force is something set apart. The people in the Defence Force are part of the society in which we all live. They have come from among us. One of them has a relative who is in here, I believe or connected with somebody in some way in here, therefore I do not see the need that every time you get up you talk about the Defence Force.

This Government has already taken corrective measures to deal with the problems that beset the country as distinct from the Defence Force, and we do not have to mix the two together. Those decisions are already taken, and we do not need to be further advised. What I would like to see the Opposition doing at some point in time is this: the time comes in any developing society, and I believe by now we can consider our democracy to be reasonably developed, when you reach difficult periods in our development, when you meet problems such as we are meeting at the moment, such as we had with Bishop in Grenada and his attack upon the Prime Minister and lawful Leader of our country, when we had attacks, coming via Sydney Burnett Alleyne; and the Opposition should not seek to discredit the leadership of the country and the party that is in power, but the Opposition should openly come out and back the Government of the day even if after that crisis is over you decide to break with us and part the ways. That is what I want to see, Mr. Speaker.

We live in a very critical time, and it is vital for our development that we have a standing Defence Force to protect us, and a Defence Force must have a security guard. You must have the means of repairs for your boats when they go out there. One hon. member mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that what we need is a helicopter. We already have a plane, and if they want to say we need an additional helicopter, that is more money you have to look for. They are not telling us to spend less. They are telling us spend more, but I would wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition would examine itself. They tell us to look at our priorities. In my respectful submission, Mr. Speaker, our priorities are correct. Theirs are wrong, and I want them to join forces with us at this very crucial moment and let the public know that on the question of defence, on the question of problems that confront the economy, we are all united in this Parliament.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what that applause means, but if it is intended to welcome me back here, quite frankly it is as though I have never left it. I have come back to find the same misrepresentations, and I find them carrying on after five years as though I have never left this Chamber at all.

I think we have just been treated to a very curious evangelical exposition from the hon. member for St. Andrew. The whole tenor of the debate as it has been evolving gives the impression that the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition are opposed to a Coast Guard. In fact if hon. members will recall, it was the same Loyal Opposition when in Government that established the Coast Guard. So it is not a question of the Opposition being opposed to the Coast Guard. It is a question, Mr. Speaker, of priorities in the kind of deep economic stress. I really rise here this afternoon in order to seek some information. I believe that the Addendum to this Resolution has not given us sufficient information on which we can evaluate the situation and make an intelligent decision. Maybe this was done at the time when the Resolution first engaged the attention of this Honourable Chamber in the last House, I do not know. But the first paragraph of this Addendum speaks about a contract. It says. The Government of Barbados, on 21st December, 1979, entered into a contract with a company in England. Then it goes on in the second paragraph stating that there is an increase in the original contract price by £555,000. I have read this Addendum over and over again, and I would like to know, because I honestly believe that this House is entitled to know, what is the contract price, and I do hope that the Hon. Minister in his reply would tell us. I have not myself been favoured with this kind of information. I understood the hon. member for St. Lucy to say that this is money well spent. He, I suppose, is in a very much more fortunate position than I am, because I believe he

probably has the information. I have not, and I would like to know how much of the taxpayers' money is it we are committing this country to. I see mention here of £4,350,616. Now, again, that refers to a loan. This does not necessarily refer to the contract price and I honestly am at a loss having read the Addendum over and over again, having heard the Minister of Finance introduce this Resolution, to know how much money in fact it is we are talking about, how much money it is we are committing this country to. I think that we are entitled to this information, and that is what I am asking this House for.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this Resolution paragraph by paragraph and give the history to it. In the Addendum to the Resolution it is stated that on the 21st December, 1979, the Government of Barbados entered into an agreement with Brooke Marine Limited for certain things to be done and so on and certain services to be supplied.

I want to make it clear that as far as the Opposition is concerned, it was an agreement between the Government and Brooke Marine. There was no discussion on what was going to be done or what was going to be ordered, all those missile carriers and that kind of thing. Nothing at all like that was entered into.

It was an agreement between the Government. I want to come to the agreement. For, as the hon. member is afraid — the Minister of Finance does not like the term agreement, because it has some connotation that President Reagan inspired him to inflict certain burdens on the taxpayers to undertake the defence requirements in the Eastern Caribbean — I would use the word "contract".

Now it was not a treaty because Brooke Marine is a commercial firm. We had coast guard vessels, four of them as far as I can remember, the George Fergusson and three others purchased between 1973/74 and 1974/75 by what they call the previous administration. We came in here and discussed the Resolution for the purchase of those vessels over a long term before the vessels were purchased.

In the Estimates in 1979 my recollection is there was a heading for the purchase of ships, aircraft and ammunition under the Defence Force. The following year I drew to the attention of the House that it was deleted and that is the year, the very year as far as I can remember, Sir, in which, — I may be out by one year because I do not have the Estimates right here in front of me but this is the history of this matter — we had the first official undertaking that we had after the contract was entered into including the purchase of a large vessel. Call it a war-ship. It certainly is many times larger than

anything we have had here before. That was in July, 1980 when notice of a Resolution was given approving the borrowing of £4,563,372 for the supply of certain instruments of war.

The conversion of the shrimp trawlers, which, we had when our administration had been earning hard currency which now has gone into limbo, in order to protect, as a result of some agreement to the precise nature of the terms, of which we are completely innocent, to protect the coastal waters of St. Vincent and other territories, conversion of trawlers which were specifically built on the borders of Mexico, the place, Sir which is famous for building trawlers! I have forgotten the name of it now. We had twenty-one of them.

We had an agreement with Trinidad and Tobago for a joint venture whereby we could get cheap fuel. All of that was abandoned by the Government now the shrimp trawlers are going to be used for the purpose of protecting the St. Vincent regime, from, I suppose invasions!

The Coast Guard vessels were allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. On the 29th July, 1980, the Prime Minister came in here to discuss the matter for the first time with that Resolution. I take no responsibility for the voting that took place on that occasion because I was sent outside, Sir. As a matter of fact, Sir, I was not sent outside. I left before you sent me outside. I took what the Israelis call a pre-empted strike. I left when you were on the verge of asking me to leave so I did a pre-empted strike and I was eliminated from the debate on the 29th July when the original Resolution for this matter was passed but I had every intention of opposing it.

When the Estimates came up, it is remarkable that the whole of that thing about battle ships, ships, aircraft and ammunition, all of that explanatory note, I think it is from Head 161, so if I say something wrong, Sir, you must remember that I am on my feet and I do not have access to the Estimates capital Head under Defence Force. It can be checked by the Clerk and I stand to be corrected and I am happy to be corrected or one of my colleagues will check it, but it was deleted.

When I questioned the Minister of Defence about the deletion he informed me as I will say — I am not now dealing with the 29th July, a date of which I am sure because it is a date on which I was eliminated from the debate, by my own free absence, not by you, Sir. I eliminated myself from the debate to be more accurate because I delivered a pre-empted strike against you, Sir. Before you struck me I struck myself.

Now, when I questioned the Prime Minister because as you know, Sir, from your service in the House, when you do not intend to spend money under a certain Head which has been voted on in a previous

year, you still continue that Item for another three years, it was taken out. The hon. member agrees with me.

I went to him and I asked him. The Prime Minister is agreeing with me, Sir. He told me that the reason why he did not put in about the ships was because the British Government was giving him long term credit for it. The ship cost over \$30 million or \$40 million, somewhere around there. So he told me that is the reason why he did not put it in the Estimates and that it would not be delivered until October. I do not know whether he meant October last year or October this year. You know why he is shaking his head, because there was a person who was present at that conversation. There was a witness there to that conversation. The debate was the 29th July and that is the only reason.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister rise?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. On what does the hon. Prime Minister rise?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. Prime Minister rise?

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He was about to say that I was suggesting that was the only reason why I was agreeing with him because somebody was present. 5.50 p.m.

He says what we say is true that the ship was not to be delivered in October and that is why Parliament, now these are my words now, he is not saying this, this is what I am saying, and that is why Parliament was deprived of the opportunity of discussing munitions of war, war ships. We had an opportunity in July to discuss the contract, but the contract had already been entered into. Now, I have no recollection, I studied the debate and I do not see any record of the contract being brought in the Honourable House. I am now coming to paragraph two.

When I was Minister of Finance, on several occasions, people tendered for the supply of goods and

services and they were awarded contracts by the Tenders Committee. It was never specifically — whenever you were awarded a tender you had to carry out the tender in the terms of that contract. On several occasions people approached the Government and the Ministry of Finance to revise the contracts after they were rewarded the contract and I refused on the grounds that it was not fair to the other people who had tendered to quote a low figure and then come back and say that you want more money because the Trade Union, whether the Trade Union Congress in England, or the BWU or NUPW or anybody here had sent up wages against you, prices had risen, inflation or any of the nonsense that people who are tendering like to advance because one should take all of these things into consideration when you are tendering for Government work whether you are Brooke Marine, or the Crown Agents for overseas territories or anybody else or a local firm.

According to the debate, the contract was not on the table of the Honourable House, but in paragraph two of this resolution, Sir, we are informed that on the 24th February this year, 1981 an addendum to the contract was signed which agreed to alternations in the original contract. If that is so, that is wrong, that is illegal because this was an opportunity for the Minister of Finance saying, "well, I am beginning to have second thoughts, we have a Leader of the Opposition there who has been criticising the purchase of the boat. Anyhow, Elections are coming up and you now want to change the contract, well keep the boat." (ASIDES) I beg your pardon, I would not have signed any agreement to any of it. You did not come in here and ask our permission to amend the contract, I am positive about that. But, you went up there, when I say went up, I do not mean as he did in March. Is that what you went for in March? It says February, it could have been February when you were there at Lowestoft when they launched the ship? Did you sign this agreement there? Did you sign it? I am just being rhetorical. (ASIDES) Yes, because he sent you. The Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas was there and would not go down and sent you as the sacrificial lamb. (LAUGHTER) (ASIDES) So was I, all three of us were there.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:....in London, but I went to Brixton and you went to Lowestoft and he came back to Barbados. (ASIDES) All of us were there. The point is whether it was signed by the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas or not, Sir, the point is it could only be signed with his authority and I am saying that at that junction whether it is a British firm, a Barbados firm or anybody else, you sign a contract, you stick to it. You are supplying the same goods and materials, you should have anticipated all of these things when you were signing it, I am not giving you any more money. You did not come in here and ask our permission, I am not saying that you have to, but you must abide by the consequences. (ASIDES: 1986, by that time you gone.) Not me alone, I am taking some with me. (LAUGHTER)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have a younger son than me. If you think that you are going to eliminate, you better come from the East or the West and drawing fast too, shooting from the hip. (ASIDE: You do not know the old master has a cou cou punch.) (LAUGHTER).

Mr. Speaker July 1980, February, 1981. Now, the principle that I am alluding to, Mr. Speaker, is to agree to increase an original contract which they must have tendered to. I hope they went out to public bidding because there is more than one firm in England that builds vessels. I do not agree with the purchase of the vessel. I agree with having a Coast Guard, a modest Coast Guard in the way that we had it, but I do not scare easily. There are no Sydney Alleynes or this man, the foolish man that they have there in jail now in Dominica, the former Prime Minister. Those kinds of people cannot scare me or scare the average Barbadian. I think that these are tricks in order to instil a sense of insecurity in the minds of the electorate so that you spend without thinking seriously about it. Five hundred and fifty-five thousand pounds is over two million pounds is over two million dollars and I am coming to that now too because this is another aspect that comes into the matter.

So, they signed an agreement to increase the contract which they never could have gotten from me, \$2 million in February. What happens right after that? They come in here then, we did not discuss in the last Estimates Defence and Security at all because the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister had given us an undertaking that we would discuss it and then made it impossible for us to discuss it, so we did not have any opportunity to investigate this matter properly or tell the public what was going on, but you know what I find most remarkable about this whole venture? As I said, the three of us we were not together, so I do not want anybody to have any wrong ideas, I do not even think that Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was with the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, but, we both happened to be in the same City at the same time. When we were in that city the pound was \$4.74. (ASIDE: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Maybe more.) Thank you. The Honourable Minister of Finance says "maybe more" But, my recollection is, when I bought my travellers cheques, it was around that figure and probably \$4.89. You know what it is today. He signed this in February.

In March, we were there towards the end of March, all three of us, again three lawyers, like the four winds of the compass, the four points of the compass, far apart in the same city. You must believe it, Sir, do not think that we get together when we get outside there although the Honourable Member for St. James North believes so. He is always accusing his legal brethren that we are in collusion, we are not in any collusion. We are like the Jews and the Samaritans, have no dealings with one another, but we happened to be there at the same time. Four dollars and seventy-four cents or more. This is the point I am making

now. You sign a contract now that they want \$2 million more, a few weeks before it was \$4.74 or more. What happens now? The pound is three dollars and sixty something cents. (ASIDES) Is this the same amount of money that we are going to give them? (ASIDES) I only want to get it straight because what they had in mind in February could not be what is happening now and when you come with a resolution to this Honourable House, you have to come with a resolution to this Honourable House in terms now of how you should be converting this money into Barbados dollars because all of our currency is expressed in Barbados dollars. If not, you would say whatever the rate is tomorrow, if you get approval, you do not have to go to the other place, you get approval tonight, you know what the rate of exchange is today.

6.00 p.m.

But I am objecting. First, I do not agree. The aeroplane had a near disaster in Puerto Rico, a very serious accident. That was not reported. An aeroplane costs nearly \$600,000.00, what do you need an aeroplane for? The hon. member threw out an idea that a helicopter could do better surveys. He is right, but I do not think he meant that we should buy a helicopter, because a helicopter is much more expensive to maintain. I do not agree with the aeroplane anyhow, so I would less agree with the purchase of any helicopter in Barbados. They have a limited range, they only cruise at 100 miles an hour and I do not think that we need anything like that in Barbados either, so there is no way that I would agree with anything connected with escalating the burden on the taxpayers in respect of the Coast Guard for trappings which are irrelevant to our economic and domestic situation here in the country. We have had no opportunity during any of the Estimates, while this matter was pending, to properly canvass the advisability in going into these kinds of munitions at all, and that is the situation with which we are confronted here tonight.

Today is open day, today is the day when all the new members are getting up to make maiden speeches. Some of them are nervous and some of them are not so nervous, and some of them, like the hon. member for St. Lucy, are hallucinating all the time.

Certain remarks made by Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Speaker at this stage.

He was hallucinating because he made statements during the course of his maiden speech which could only emanate from someone who is hallucinating. That is all I am saying, Sir, and I was making it clear that if he was it was only inadvertent, I did not say it was deliberate. Imagine the member coming in here for the first time, the very first time, and instead of making a nice normal speech like the hon. member for Christ Church West Central and the member for St. James South on our side and the member for St. Philip South, he tries to

emulate some of his colleagues and launch into an attack.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is this to do with the resolution now?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because that is what the hon. member did, but I will leave it at that. I am saying, Sir, that this is the first time that this House is being given an opportunity to discuss, apart from the 29th July 1980 when all the facts, all the matters, all the accoutrements and all the trappings were not fully investigated. I was absent, we were denied an opportunity of discussing it during the Estimates and I am saying that we are unalterably opposed, even if the economic situation of Barbados had been better, to us adopting any militaristic stance in the Eastern Caribbean.

When I come to the member for St. Andrew, the member for St. Andrew suggests that one ship is going to prevent vessels from dumping oil into the ocean. (ASIDE). You referred to the dumping of oil as a justification. How many ships then? The Prime Minister referred to the purchase of one, are you buying more? Are you having a line abreast or echelon star-board? Are you doing a square search or creeping line ahead? How are you going to detect a ship at night passing 60 miles off the coast of Barbados cleaning its bunkers by this kind of expenditure? What kind of search are you going to do for it? Does one set off with one's radar to guide one in the hope that you will detect every ship that is passing Barbados cleaning its bunkers off the east coast of Barbados to pollute our beaches? There is no country in the world, with all the navies that they have, which has been able to detect, unless they had people on board the ship itself giving them inside information, that ships at sea are cleaning their bunkers, so do not let us use shallow arguments like that. If you want to buy a ship because you like to feel big and to feel that you want to stop an invasion, use that kind of argument, but do not tell us that you are going to stop pollution with one ship from Brooke Marine, or even 10 of them. There is no way you can do it, I just want to warn you, I know something about it. (ASIDE). You have an idea. You see, I am always willing to learn and I will bow to the superior knowledge of the hon. member in detecting ships at sea and that kind of thing. I do not know much about it, only three years of my life was spent escorting gun boats. Your modern technology now might be superior to my information, and since you are an expert now on everything, including agriculture, I would be glad to bow to your superior knowledge. That is all I want to say. (ASIDE). The best judge of that is the person who is on his feet. I will now call for a new guard.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has two minutes in which to wind up his debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not need two minutes, Sir. I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, personally difficult to support anything in connection with the escalation of cost, of expenditure of this nature, for I am a taxpayer, not on political ground, on economic grounds, on moral grounds, or on any other possible kind of ground. We were not given an opportunity before and that is the reason why I took the trouble to give a recital of the history of this unfortunate matter.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of introducing this resolution the Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Defence and Security indicated that — I am sure I heard him say the member for St. Michael West — had the capacity to miss a zero when looking at the cost and other information relating to the Defence Force.

6.10 p.m.

The Coast Guard forms part of the Defence Force of Barbados, and the Prime Minister has a technique which apparently finds favour within his own party and among certain select people in the community of being very flippant on certain matters which for reasons best known to themselves he would prefer to remain under a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the Defence Force, with the possible exception of the intervention of the Rt. Hon. member for St. John who brought us back to the reality of the fact that we have never had a full debate on the Defence Force Department or the Defence Force Ministry in this Honourable House, has never been discussed, and the Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution gets up and tries to give the impression that all and sundry in here, all hon. members are fully aware of what has been happening in the Defence Force. The fact is, Sir, that on one occasion during the Estimates when the then member for St. Lucy and myself were the only two hon. members on this side, near the hour of 10 o'clock an amount of \$10 million was attempted to be slipped through the Estimates, and I recall that the hon. member for St. Lucy and I raised certain questions about it. From that time until now we have been trying to get the Prime Minister to tell the people of this country whether he had any discussions with the then Prime Minister of Britain about a defence pact in the Eastern Caribbean. He has never given a specific answer. He has always tended to shroud it in generalities.

Then I remember the then Attorney General on one occasion seeking to shed some light on the issue, but the Minister responsible for defence and security has never faced this issue squarely in this Honourable House or anywhere else as far as I am aware and told the people of Barbados what the facts are regarding any defence arrangements between Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, St.

Vincent and the British Government. I believe that Barbados is not sufficiently important in the total scheme of things in the defence of the Western Hemisphere that any secrets which he has regarding defence pacts would suddenly put Barbados in danger. I believe that the taxpayers of this country have a right to know what the position is with regard to any agreements, secret or otherwise, we have made with regard to our security.

I shall say no more. I shall await the Prime Minister's word on this, but I give him fair warning that unless he gives sufficient explanation, those of us on this side who believe we have information would feel bound to go to the public and tell them all that we know.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point which the Prime Minister succeeds in conveying to the population. He manages constantly to give the impression the criticism of the Defence Department or Defence Force is somehow unpatriotic. In China, in Russia, in the United States, in Cuba, in almost every country in the world the greatest debate one can find is a debate about defence appropriation or defence spending, but every time the Prime Minister comes into this Honourable House or anywhere else in Barbados to discuss the Defence Force, he has to give the impression that anyone who does not get up and say "yea, Sir" is somehow unpatriotic. I feel, Sir, that I can continue to fall into the category of those who are by that description unpatriotic, because I believe it is my duty, not only a right, as it is the duty of all hon. members in this House, but I see it as my duty that where there is expenditure regarding defence, where there is expenditure of where, as my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South likes to say, where the debate is between guns and butter, I believe that we have a right to have it put on the table under the microscope and everybody in Barbados should be aware of what is going on.

When we talked about the \$50 million during the campaign, the hon. member in his broadcast which incidentally was illegally ten minutes over and no one said anything, sought to make hon. members on this side and those participating in the campaign appear as liars. At no point has the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security given us a systematic breakdown of the cost of supplying this equipment. At no point has he indicated when he will be receiving delivery of the ship. At no point has he indicated how he proposes to equip it because it is a missile-carrying vessel. The information published by the British Government says that it is a vessel of the type that is purchased by the Kuwaitis and it is capable of firing missiles.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member who has stated that the vessel is a missile-carrying vessel to indicate the missile

that it carries, because I understand that he is also a missile-carrying person, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, that is the calibre of obfuscation which is attempted every time we incline towards serious debate in this Honourable House. Whatever missiles I carry the hon. member must know about them. At this hour in the afternoon he sees missiles in every direction.

Mr. Speaker, the information that was published in a trade journal put out by the British Government stated that the ship which the Barbados Government was purchasing was a ship of the series purchased by other governments in the Middle East and those Governments have purchased this ship, and it was capable of firing missiles. That is what I read in a British publication. Let the hon. member get up and tell me it is not so.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister in passing what provisions he has made for training of the Coast Guard in the manning of this ship and while he is at that, he might tell us what provisions he has been making generally for the training of the personnel in the Defence Force. I should like to know if it is true that there are Trinidadians who come up from time to time to train the Defence Force. I would like to know that. I am given to understand that we have had Puerto Ricans come in to train members of the Defence Force. (*Asides*) I understand and it is strange that the hon. member should raise that in an aside, that we are getting a couple of Cubans in to assist in the training of the Defence Force. I do not know if they are coming from Cuba or if they are coming from Miami, but I am told that that forms part of the plan.

It is strange, Sir, how the other side was in expansive mood all evening until now. I seem to be hearing spatterings of questions and shouts. I wonder why! That an hon. member can talk about ethics and morality in the course of this debate is very interesting to me, and in the course of this debate the hon. member for Christ Church East Central talked about the Civil Service and gave the impression that that Government is interested in seeing a complete re-organisation of the Civil Service in the context of the spending of money for the development of the Coast Guard Harbour. The hon. member for Christ Church East can tell the whole world that that is not true. The hon. member for Christ Church East took the trouble to bring a Resolution to this House asking for precisely what the hon. member for Christ Church East Central is telling us now that that Government is interested in doing, and the Prime Minister kills the Bill dead. It never saw the light of day. (A VOICE: What are you talking about?) Do you wish me to say something else? The hon. member for Christ Church

East apparently will tell us exactly what happened to it.
6.20 p.m.

But there has not been any examination of any Civil Service by that government so do not let us fool ourselves. Do not let us confuse the people that this Government is interested in any organization or reconstruction within the Civil Service.

The hon. member for Christ Church East in his infinite wisdom might have had some great concern and would have liked to see something done by his government but he also knows that it is usual to see the matters on that side fall on deaf ears and apart from what comes forth from the hon. member for St. Michael East in his utterances that there is no one else on that side who can confuse us.

Mr. SPEAKER: There has been a great deal said about the Civil Service. I have heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition try to speak on a new Commission in this Honourable House and about a new member of this honourable House and this is what you are doing now.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it was only in the context of what the hon. member was speaking about on this Order and in relation to my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is difficult to support this Resolution. Apart from the questionable nature of the contributory arrangements, what is important is that the mechanics have been drafted and have been coming in little bits and pieces.

The hon. Prime Minister comes to this Honourable House for money in relation to the Defence Force in little bits and pieces. Therefore, when one looks at this Resolution or anyone who looks at this Resolution who does not take it and read it very carefully would not realize that this additional \$2.34 million that the hon. member is asking for is for the Defence Force. This is what the Defence Force will be spending.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine that the Prime Minister spoke of the wrong vessel going to Trinidad? This was taken as a casual joke because he said that anything to do with International Sea Foods creates problems. The Minister of Defence told us in a previous Resolution that he needs scarce resources from this country to convert the shrimp trawlers, that it may only be one vessel and he comes in here and says that they sent the wrong ship to Trinidad. He mentions that in passing and that is the kind of management that exists and everybody says that he is

a top genius, and that he knows how to manage the economy.

The hon. Prime Minister said that the wrong ship had been sent and that this is not surprising with anything concerning International Sea Foods and he laughs at it and everybody laughs at it also because they do not realize that this is their money that is going off the ground and he says that it was the wrong ship. Do you realize that if anybody had done that in any other government office they would be admonished for it? This has just been passed off casually.

Do you know what they have said, Sir? This is from a very very reliable source because whatever one hears is not necessarily factual that the people in Trinidad changed the engine but did not change the gear box so that it does not pick up speed. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about engines and gear boxes? The Prime Minister should check with the Commander of the Defence Force and find out if this is so. Not everything you hear from people are lies but the hon. Prime Minister should really check this out to find out whether it is really true.

The hon. member for St. Andrew said, and I do not believe he was fully cognisant of what he was saying, Sir, but he said that they do not need any advice from the Opposition. That is a very strong statement. It is a statement of arrogance and the hon. member is not known to be an arrogant person and that is why I will give him the benefit of the doubt that he was not cognisant of what he was saying. The whole system of the Government is that they will observe nothing that the Opposition says and to object to anything that comes from the Opposition by saying that they do not need any advice from us.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much more to say on this Resolution. We have made our point and we want it to be put on record that we cannot support this. We cannot support it because it demonstrates a certain level of incompetence. It shows the hon. member's casual approach to these matters. It shows that either he has not been given good advice or has not been taking good advice and we cannot afford to support expenditure of this nature at a time when we are in very serious economic trouble.

What is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, is that because of some spell which the hon. member has perfected on a number of Barbadians they are never told the true nature of our economic position. The true nature of the economic trouble that we have been in is now really coming home to him and to the people of Barbados and in time they will spend a substantial amount of money.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central spent a considerable amount of time telling the people that the economy was in trouble but they in their wisdom continued to ignore his advice saying that they would not accept anything that came from this side.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore very simply a matter of our voting for the way we feel and for the way our consciences dictate about it. We are unable to support this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have a long defence debate to reply to. Despite statements made by hon. members there has been, in fact, no subject over the last two years in Parliament that has been debated at such length as the Barbados Defence Force Coast Guard. Contrary to all the statements which have been made about how there is no information given to the House or any opportunity given to the House to debate Defence, Defence is the only subject on which a White Paper was brought to the last House. The only White Paper published and debated in here in the last five years was the White Paper on Defence.

The hon. member for St. Michael South spoke first on the Resolution. He said nothing; and I recall that in a statement made on Defence that it was carried in the Advocate and they took seven paragraphs in the Advocate to state what they said and the statement which I made only took four lines but something would have to be said about their reporting policy.

Subsequent to that, there was the incident which the Leader of the Opposition completely and correctly recalled. I do not recall that there was a third person but I remember all the circumstances and he has even given the reasons given to him and which were correct at the time and which I maintain are still correct now.

6.30 p.m.

Having lost through no fault of my own the opportunity of participation by the Opposition in a Defence Debate in Estimates — it was then debated in full, the Standing Orders were suspended — it was the day that the results of the Law School exams came through for the Honourable Member for St. Michael South West and I recall his self congratulatory speech when Honourable Members congratulated him. He was not content with Honourable Members' congratulations, he had to add his own. On that day, the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition is mistaken in thinking that he was not sent outside. What happened was he was not put outside, but the Speaker said, "Outside, outside" and there was a tense scene and the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition left when the Speaker was perhaps about to embarrass the Marshal by calling on him to do his duty. That was also the debate in which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West said that Colonel Lewis should go back to Jamaica and go into the jungle and join forces and kill people as they were accustomed doing.

So, Honourable Members cannot say that this matter has not been debated.

In that debate, all details for which Honourable Members now ask were given in respect of the cost of the basic contract. The basic contract — admittedly that is no help to the Honourable Member for St. Michael North — but the basic contract at that time is £5 118 372 as the Honourable Member, indeed, has calculated from the documents which I sent him. The very point about sterling and dollars was made on that occasion. As it turns out, it was of great advantage to the Government to have concluded the contract in sterling because this supplementary is in fact costing us nothing since the dollar has appreciated more than the additional amount, but that is only a detail and we are certainly not claiming any credit for skilful economic management in this particular regard, although we might argue that in letting Brooke Marine carry the entire exchange risk of sterling depreciating, we made a good bargain because nobody seriously believe that sterling was going to stay at \$4.80 or in that region for any length of time. So, I am well satisfied, even in the long term, that this is a sterling contract rather than a contract in our own dollars. I do not think the economy of either Barbados or the United States will collapse to the extent where we have anything to suffer from the sterling denomination of the amounts now sought.

Now, perhaps, I should tell Honourable Members what the background to this is, to deal with the point made by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition about not changing the contract. This Government agrees entirely and completely with the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition's advice and argument that when a contract is tendered you should not tolerate any question about wage increases or changes in the exchange rate provided that:—

- (a) the contract does not provide for it; and
- (b) there are no extras which we call for as a Government.

Now, the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John and Leader of the Opposition is perhaps mistaken in thinking that any of this money relates to the Trident which will be the Flag Ship. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is wrong when he says that at no point has the Prime Minister indicated when he is receiving this ship. The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition himself basically corrected that statement when he said that I told him, and this would be well over a year ago, that the ship was expected to be delivered in October, that is October of this year. In fact, the ship will be delivered to Colonel Lewis tomorrow, we are accepting it tomorrow and it will be going to Portsmouth for acceptance trials and very soon setting sail from Portsmouth for Barbados via

the Canary Islands and Cape Verde Islands. This ship is large enough to cross the Atlantic on its own, it would not have to come on another ship as the other Coast Guard vessels had to be brought.

Dealing with speeches — perhaps I had better deal with another frivolous point too, that it is a missile carrying vessel — I believe that you can argue that what comes out of a bazooka is a missile and a bazooka can be carried over the shoulder of an infantryman. A motor car can carry a missile. Missile is an expression. Obviously, it is a very emotive expression to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, but all ships, even the George Fergusson, are potentially missile carrying ships.

The advertisement which the Honourable Member had seen and which cost him \$27 080, which is what he had to pay the Advocate to put in a full page advertisement proving conclusively how untruthful he is; I am very sorry for that magazine, it did not cost him the pound he paid for it on the first occasion, it cost him a lot of money since then. When you advertise a vessel as a missile carrying vessel, it normally means that the manufacturer will build a missile capacity into the vessel for you. Now, when we were seeking tenders for the supply of a vessel, we got an offer from Sweden, an offer from France, two offers from Britain, I think that was all. (ASIDES) We got offers from Israel for missile carrying lorries to drive up and down the coast, coastal defence, that I think is what you mean.

I recall particularly, the French tender contains a missile system which would have cost more than the hull of the vessel. The basic guidance system would have cost US\$4 million by itself, but of course, it would have fired missiles that would have enabled that relatively small patrol vessel to take on, if it could catch it by chance, an aircraft carrier. That would have been a formidable system and we do not want a missile system, we do not even want the heavy guns that some other Honourable Member referred to.

We wanted simple armaments, well, perhaps I should not even tell you all the armaments, but small and simple armaments, nothing like the missiles that the Honourable Member is speaking of. But, all this has been dealt with already. The Deputy Prime Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has pointed out the passage of my speech over a year ago to this same effect.

Now, dealing with Honourable Members' speeches individually, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South spoke about this in terms of economics. His speech has really been answered. It is a speech that is made every time there is any mention of Defence expenditure and I think — if the Honourable Member does not mind

my putting it this way — that is the standard speech. Whenever you buy a rifle, you say that the money could be better spent buying a window for a house or butter. Hermann Goering really did not know what he was contributing to future orators when he said:

“Guns will make us strong, butter will only make us fat.”

It was Hermann Goering that said that. Neither the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central nor the Honourable Member for St. Thomas originated it, although he has said that I said it, but that is among the least of his misrepresentations, Sir, so I would not quarrel in this Parliament.

The simple fact is that this money is not available for the building of houses. It is a simple, straightforward fact. This money is available for one purpose only and that is to build a workshop on the Pierhead and to put some improvements, £120 000 in improvements into two shrimp boats. It is nothing to do with the Trident. The Trident is built, perhaps, I believe nearly all paid for now. It must be nearly all paid for now. Certainly, the funds have been drawn down and I imagine it is only the Engineering Certificates and the Inspection Certificates that are awaited. Certainly, all the money is in the hands of our agents to complete payment for the Trident, so the Trident is not involved in this.

In circumstances where the contract is 80% of the way through, you cannot then postpone it. What happened was that when the shrimp boats got to Trinidad, one had been exchanged. I think perhaps if you had argued at great length you would have found that just to do simple work there might not have had to be any variation in the contract. But, it was clear that the shrimp boats required more work than the preliminary inspection had agreed on. We therefore had a choice. Refurbish a shrimp boat, but leave the hull work on which there had been no agreement; or do it all one time.

6.40 p.m.

We could have had the shrimp boats refurbished but left the hulls in need of repair, because we had no agreement to repair them. Therefore we had a complete inspection, we had a discussion, we had engineering analyses, we came to the conclusion that certain additional work should be done, certain works not envisaged at first should be done. The few cases where something was missing when it got to Trinidad, that happens, all of that happens. We signed a contract in April to do this implying a further draw down of these funds. Indeed there was no guarantee, we could have presumably paid for it out of the Defence Force general vote, but we are bringing it back to the House, drawing the money down from the customary sources and dealing with it that way.

The other point, the workshop. The workshop is an addition. We freely confess that. We want to have a better workshop that can give service to the larger fishing boats which are now coming back into service in Barbados. There is really no point of our having a fisheries plan, as is outlined in our Manifesto, and having 37 and 44 foot vessels, and then having only a rudimentary crane there on the side of the wharf to haul them out of the water. We need proper fishing boat repair facilities. We are going to put some into the new Bridgetown fishing harbour, but at the same time we think we must have an adequate back-up facility at the Pierhead. There is no point doing things by halves, so the Cabinet took quite a time to decide on this as I remember, I think the whole amount for the workshop is over one million dollars, the Cabinet had a few meetings and thought about it, whether to do along with the oldest dockyard in the world, that dock that we have there in the Careenage, a museum piece that sooner or later I believe we could sell to an industrial museum somewhere, whether to go along with that or whether we should have new facilities. We decided to have new facilities. We decided to have a better workshop with lifting facilities. It will give work to Barbadians and it will persist and be there for a long time. That I hope deals with the points made by hon. member for St. Michael South. I admire his approach, he knows what is important, but there are other matters which the Government considers should be done and these are the matters.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central based his speech largely on economics. There is a limit to the amount which Barbados can borrow. That may be true, but we are so far from that amount that if true is no more than a truism.....Remember that in Brazil 60% of the value of exports of goods and services has to go on servicing debt, paying interest and repaying debt. In Barbados the figure is three or four percent, one of the lowest in the world. I do not know how we manage, Sir. We had some wild borrowing in 1973 and that did not succeed in destroying the economy, and we have had some modest foreign borrowing since then and that has not had any significant impact on our repayments position, and no doubt we will have to borrow a modest amount to restore our reserves this year and that is not going to destroy us either, and certainly a very modest loan such as this is the kind of loan that is not only useful for what it provides by way of service, but it is actually useful for the balance of payments. Because although the British Government, no doubt, would not want me to gloat, the foreign exchange that we get from this loan in today's world can be invested to bring in a higher rate of interest than we are in fact paying on the loan. When we put the foreign exchange into the Central Bank, Central Bank will be able to buy American Government paper giving a higher rate of interest than we have to pay back the British on this loan. The loan is actually a financial advantage, if you want to put it that way, and the hon. member for

St. John will understand what I mean. It can be put that way. It has long term implications, but it can be put that way, so that part worries us not at all.

The hon. member also said that agriculture is to be put in proper shape. I am getting a little tired of hearing about the bad shape of Barbadian agriculture. I am getting very tired of hearing about it. In the year 1980 we exported nearly as much in agricultural products as we imported in food. There are not many countries in the world that can say that, barring the major food exporters of the world in North America and Australasia. Very few countries can say that, and hardly any developing country can say it, hardly one. I do not know anywhere in the West Indies, in the Caribbean, that has the class of prosperous farmers that we have in Barbados. They cry out all the time but I do not know anywhere in the Caribbean basin, as people are fond of saying, or even in the United States where possession of two or three hundred hectares of land can make you into a prince. I do not know of anywhere where one or two acres of land — a little more in the case of the big vegetable producers — four or five acres — persons can have princely incomes because of the pricing policy of local vegetables and local chicken and indeed in the case of milk, particular local dairy produce. I challenge any hon. member to tell me where agriculture is more productive and more successful in CARICOM than in Barbados. Think of the typical St. Lucian farmer and think of the typical Barbadian farmer, at any level, the farmer on half an acre or the farmer on 1,000 acres. Because they perhaps have more of them in St. Lucia than they have in Barbados. At present, there are only two 1,000 acre farmers in Barbados.

I am very tired of hearing about the terrible condition of our agriculture, very, very tired. We have the best paid sugar workers in the developing world, perhaps in the entire world. I have every confidence that the hon. member for Christ Church East will be able to explain to farmers that it is in agriculture that Barbados, not only can hold its own, but indeed has been holding its own very well despite the cane blade speech, despite the cutting up of the plantations into two-acre lots, despite all of that.

The hon. member also said you must not talk about plots, you are destroying yourself. What about talking about rigging elections? A woman from Zimbabwe can meet me in an establishment here in Barbados and ask me what I thought of the Zimbabwe election. I explained to her that we had somebody present, we heard it was fair, and she could tell me she heard 25% of the people in Barbados were deprived of the vote. I told her I did not believe it was 25 people and turned out to be correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that germane to this resolution?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir, I am sorry. The hon. member said that capital projects should be postponed. We have postponed a number of capital projects, we have postponed the building of the Supreme Court. (ASIDE). The Government's revenues are not going to be charged with the cost of the Central Bank, the Central Bank will pay for the building out of its own resources. I have been approached indeed, so high is the reputation of Barbados and its Central Bank, I have been approached by overseas banks asking for a piece of the action. One bank has already rented some of the space and wants to participate in the building.

There are capital projects that are being stretched out. Measures have been taken and hon. members should not really think that the Government is so without economic sense that it does not understand that you must stretch the projects out. I read one commentator saying that we should stretch out the Post Office even without meaning that the Post Office has been stretched out. We are going to be paying for the Post Office over at least a year longer than we had anticipated.

Now the hon. member for St. Philip South made a speech. I saw the hon. member for the first time in my life, so far as I am aware, on the day of the Opening of Parliament.
6.50 p.m.

I had heard a great deal about this oratorical capacities. I have read one or two of his speeches. I am afraid the hon. member disappointed me a little bit. I wondered about whom the Leader of the Opposition was talking when he said a contentious maiden speech had been made. All persons who enter Parliament are advised against making contentious maiden speeches. Perhaps somebody has been unkind enough to tell the hon. member for St. Philip South that Disraeli made a highly contentious maiden speech and was shouted down and ended up by saying the time will come when you shall hear me; so the hon. member even introduced into his speech some phrase relating to what will happen when he is accustomed to being in here. All that will happen when he is accustomed to in here if he continues to make speeches that refer to the bad behaviour of hon. members opposite is that he will have a good deal more fire around his head than he has ever had in his life before.

He said the Barbados Labour Party has no clear policy on the Defence Force. He must be the only person in Barbados that believes that. There cannot be anybody else in Barbados who thinks that we have no clear policy on the Defence Force. We have defended it over and over again, we have stuck to it in the House, put it. We have explained that we came into power against a Defence Force, but that Sydney Alleyne

started out in 1976..... (Asides) Look, because Maurice Bishop pushed you into all kinds of foolishness, do you think Reagan can push me into things? I have never spoken to Reagan on the telephone yet. (Asides) Don't tell lies. Sorry, Sir, that is an aside.

Sir, the hon. member for St. Philip South said there is no evidence that there has ever been a plot. With great respect, that is a childish remark. Sydney Alleyne went to gaol in Martinique for plotting to invade Barbados. He spoke of interfering in the internal affairs of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. We were invited there by the Government of St. Vincent. That is not what is called interfering in the internal affairs of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. He talked about the \$34.7 million we had spent. He read that out of the Democratic Labour Party's manifesto. He must take amounts from the Government, not from his party's manifesto. I think I noticed that neither he nor the hon. member for St. Michael North at any time took an amount from the hon. member for St. Michael West. The hon. member for St. Michael North wisely asked me what the amount was, and the hon. member for St. Philip South relied on the D.L.P's manifesto. But anyway, I do not want to deal with that.

The hon. member for St. James South said that he believes in disciplining youths. Well this is something I do know about the hon. member. I remember I was present one afternoon when he sent somebody to prison for trespassing on Sunset Crest although the law does not allow you to send to prison for petty trespass, and I had to whisper in his ear that he had done something very unwise, and he sent and got the boy back out of the cell. I know that he believes in disciplining youths. He has a hotel and he would punish any youth that trespasses in a hotel.

He says that the launches which the police had previously could adequately patrol our coasts. I cannot help that. If he believes that the Police Service launches could go around the East Coast, could negotiate the Animal Flower Cave, well I would like him to go in one and do the negotiating.

I have dealt with the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael North. I hope he is satisfied he got the amount, \$5 million and so on. I have dealt with the speech of the Leader of the Opposition except for something quite small, the question of oil spills and oil pollution. Perhaps he has not fully grasped the point. To begin with, the aircraft is the chief search vehicle that the Defence Force relies on and it has done much work already. The point about the oil spills is that one of the converted shrimp boats is going to be equipped to clean oil spills. That is the point. When we find an oil spill, even if we cannot find the vessel, at least we will be equipped to clean it. That is the essence of that.

The business about changing engines in the shrimp boats and not changing the gearbox is simply not true. It is true that there are Trinidadians who help with training of the Defence Force, and why not? We have exchange agreements with Trinidad by which Trinidadians come up. They do not only help train ours; they even help train the St. Vincent Coast Guard down at the St. Lucy base.

These are not matters which we seek to keep secret. This is all part of CARICOM cooperation. We have exchanges with Puerto Ricans from time to time. That is in the papers. Coast Guard personnel has been going on at Dartmouth Naval College in Britain. We have graduates who have received their commissions. The Defence Force has granted a number of commissions in the Coast Guard to young Barbadians. We have them training at the United States Coast Guard Academy. We have \$2 million in free training granted by Britain which has been available both to British officers in Barbados and Barbados personnel in Britain. The crew of the Trident is now in Britain and will take possession of the boat I suppose tomorrow and will be trained to handle it, and we have other training going on in Canada and of course there is training in Barbados itself. I hope I have answered all the questions, Mr. Speaker.

The question that the Resolution do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM; Mr. FORDE; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. TRUSS; Mr. ODLE and Mr. BOLDEN – 15.

NOES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Dr. HAYNES; Mr. BLACKMAN; Mr. SANDIFORD; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. FRANKLIN; Mr. KING; Mr. TAITT; Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. WEEKES – 10.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended until 8 o'clock this evening.
7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

The Hon. Leader of the House was seeking leave of this Honourable House to recommit Standing Order No. 10, subheads (g) and (h), Government Notices, to give

notice of Government measures. If there is no objections, the Minister may proceed.

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$177,500 from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1981-82 Part I – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1981-82 No. 1 which form the schedule to this Resolution;

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$858,084 from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1981-82, Part II – Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1981-82 No. 2 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Sub-head 5 – Treasury – of Head 73, Ministry of Finance and Planning to read "Provides for the purchase of a Data Entry and related equipment."

A Bill to amend the Town and Country Planning Act.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, a Bill to amend the Town and Country Planning Act was read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4.

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

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Rockley, Christ Church.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Rockley Beach is situated in Christ Church. It is one of the most popular beaches on the Island. It has attracted visitors yearly and at the same time most Barbadians go to this very popular beach.

We realize that this popular beach, which sees some 40% of the tourists that come to these shores assembled there, is without beach facilities, and, added to that, we find a number of beach vendors on the beach and this Honourable Chamber is well aware of the number of complaints that have been drawn to this Chamber's attention from time to time in regard to possible molestation of visitors by the beach vendors.

This Government has been looking at this problem with a view to relieving the situation and it has adopted

the policy of providing vendors' accommodation for those persons who now sell on the beach along the Rockley area.

It has become absolutely necessary to provide beach facilities since workers from the Parks and Beaches, who have also increased over the years, are without lavatory facilities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution is to acquire a portion of land some 6,000 square feet or 557.42 square metres on which a facility or facilities for changing as well as vendors' accommodation can be provided.

I would seek this opportunity to make it known that the policy of my Ministry in respect of an open window is, wherever possible, to provide access to the public beaches of Barbados and at the same time to erect those facilities that are necessary for the public such as the one which this Resolution seeks to accommodate.

I would like at the same time to disclose to this Honourable Chamber that the area at Holetown will be made into an open window and beach facilities will be provided for the public for that area.

At St. Lawrence, to the south western side of the Worthing Police station, the Government will be providing another open window for people to serve in that part of the country and we have already put plans in to have some of the houses removed. Note it is Government's land and we would like to inform the public that we are pursuing this matter with a view to providing yet another open window.

I want to state the Government's policy, that is, that it is mindful of the wishes and desires of Barbadians to have access to the beaches and this will be part and parcel of the plans of my Ministry whenever we are going to look at providing facilities as well as windows to the sea for the public of Barbados.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite this Chamber's endorsement of this Resolution so that the facilities which are so urgently needed can be provided for not only those persons who use the beaches, but also for the workers and the vendors who I am sure will welcome such a move by this present administration.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second this Resolution and reserve my right to speak on it.

Mr. WEEKES: It is noticed that within the last few years the Land Acquisition Act in Barbados has been used very frequently and one wonders whether the owners or presumed owners are reluctant to part with their property. If this is so one wants to know if the failure of Government to explain its policies to these owners has resulted in the fact that they care not to sit down and go through the normal channels but to set up compulsory acquisitions.

I believe that Government should use all in its power to remove some of the difficulties that do arise when you have to acquire land compulsorily. I suggest to the Minister to make sure that in this Resolution where there are a number of owners involved this problem does not arise.

8.10 p.m.

Take, for example, my own constituency in St. Michael North West in which much land acquisition has been taking place as a result of the Spring Garden project. Some of the owners have expressed disgust and dissatisfaction as to the way in which, after having received the notice that their lands are trespassed on, sometime after the acquisition, without adequate notice, one morning or sometime like that too urgent for them, they are called to move off. Their dissatisfaction springs from the fact that it inconveniences them and in some cases where there is a financial involvement such as a renovation, they feel that they stand to lose on such an acquisition. Maybe, it creates a hardship for them at the particular time due to the fact that they may not have enough cash money. I said this primarily to suggest that we should try to remove some of the difficulties that do arise out of the unpleasantness in land acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself seeks to use this land at Rockley Beach for two purposes, a beach facility and a vendors' facility, and if any of you here are old enough to remember the time when in that area tourist development first started, one of the enterprises was willing to set up a hotel there called Blue Waters. They were probably giving insight to the fact that tourism would be a very important money earner in Barbados. I think it may be recalled, if not under the old Conservative Government, it may very well be under the old Barbados Labour Party Government where they were refused permission to do so and one of the significant things about the discussion at that time was that it was said that tourism would benefit only the rich people and that it would make the rich get richer and that the poorer people would not benefit significantly.

Now, some years later, we have seen that this land has been acquired for some development and, in this development, I want to suggest that it may not be the same old thing as it was said then, that the rich will get richer out of this development, I am suggesting that the vendors themselves should be given the first priority in

acquiring these places. I firmly believe that we should not allow any partisan approach to sort of avoid any of those who are likely to make a living thereon. I firmly suggest that they be given the first opportunity.

On the beach facility, I am not satisfied that this is a priority as against another beach which for a number of years has accommodated the poorer classes of people. I am not aware that the present plan for the development of the Spring Garden project has made provision for any beach facility there. But, I would consider that the majority of the lower working class people have been using the Brandons beach for a number of years and because of that development, people no longer would have even that opportunity, if they had to change their own gear in the bushes that were around because the project itself has removed some of that. I am suggesting as a matter of priority as against that at Rockley that those people should be given that opportunity. It is a long outstanding area where the people should enjoy these facilities.

The other aspect is the vendor facility. Because of the high tourist involvement in that area, one has got to look at the effects that have come about through the tourist development and that is none other than drug trafficking. One has got to be very careful in developing that area that it does not become the hub or the danger zone in the development of drugs and the people who are placed there ought to be people who are competent and capable to take full responsibility for that area. I will also suggest that that area will be bound to need further policing and further vigilance to make sure that that does not develop into any other area than it is designed for.

These are some comments that I would want to air because I myself have as much interest in the development of my country and the way our people enjoy themselves. I certainly hope that some consideration will be given to the idea of beach facilities at Brandons and Brighton that will be incorporated to assist people from that area as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (APPLAUSE)

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that I should as is customary congratulate the Honourable Member on having made his first speech in Parliament today.

I think that the Honourable Member is a little at sea, however, with respect to what is taking place on the beaches in Barbados with respect to vendors. This Government had the courage to bring down regulations setting out very clearly what was the Government's policy in relation to the use of beaches. I remember we were attacked when we brought the Bill in here to amend

the Parks and Beaches Commission Act to empower the Parks and Beaches Commission to make regulations setting out what activities could be carried on on the beach. I am pleased to see that the community as a whole now acknowledges the fact that where you have a public area used by a very large number of people very often with competing interests, there must be some regime to regulate these competing interests.

We have to have rules of the road to regulate the various users of the road. So, too, in a country like Barbados where the beaches are one of our great assets and where we have a number of people who use them, we must have rules if we are not to have friction among the various competing users. One of the regulations states quite clearly that before you can sell on a beach, you must have a licence, for which you pay \$5, from the Parks and Beaches Commission.
8.20 p.m.

It also states very clearly that the Parks and Beaches Commission assigns particular areas of the beach for use of the vendors. There is no question at all of any people interfering with the traditional users of the beach for sales. Everyone of the people, who were selling on the beaches before, was granted a licence from the Parks and Beaches Commission. As a matter of fact, where the trouble arises is that people would like to go and sell without licences. In addition we have a lot of problems where the vendors themselves quarrel when other people who have licences for other beaches try to come and hustle their beat, so to speak.

Part of those regulations were also very specific, because one of the great complaints that we have is not only from tourists but from Barbadians, particularly young Barbadians, or any young girl who looks good and who goes on the beach. They complain, tourists and Barbadians, of offensive remarks being passed at them by young people. (ASIDE). It happens in Enterprise, too, so we appointed wardens. It is still one of the greatest causes of complaints which we receive in the Ministry in respect of the use of the beaches, but the Government intends to enforce the regulations. We now have had a meeting between the Parks and Beaches Commission and the Commissioner of Police, now that the Government as a matter of policy has spent additional monies to create additional members of the Barbados Police Force, some 140 odd. The first time that the Force was increased since 1969 was since this administration came into power. There is an integration between the enforcement authorities of the Parks and Beaches Commission and the Police Force, and I would like to see them get walkie-talkies too so that they will be able to communicate with the police, so that a combined attack by the Police and the Parks and Beaches wardens will deal with a few, a very few obstreperous people that we have trying to give trouble on the beaches in Barbados.

There is a new breed now of salesmen with a little black attaché case that go from beach to beach sometimes selling black coral, sometimes selling drugs, sometimes hustling, giving out a card, explaining their prowess in certain fields of activity, and things of that kind. All countries in the world which have tourists have them. If you go to Italy and you go on a beach you have them, if you go to Hawaii you find them all around, but we have a regime to deal with that. We have done something about it, so do not let us try to make a class issue on this, because anybody who has been selling on a beach has been given a permit, and one of the reasons that we insisted that with the application you must have a certificate of character was for precisely the very point that the hon. member just made, that we recognise that you have to be careful in whom you invest that authority to sell on a beach in Barbados because of the fact that if you do not have the correct characters, the right characters, they would use their licences for criminal purposes.

I remember when we were attacked viciously in the Senate on this. But in politics sometimes you get attacked one day by the other side and the next day you get praised when they leave the other side. That is the law of politics and when you have been in it long enough you learn that you must take these attacks with a grain of salt.

If you will notice throughout both the south coast and the west coast the Government is systematically trying to improve the conditions under which all people in Barbados as well as the visitors use the beaches. The Hon. Minister spoke of Rockley. One of the problems that you will still find there is the problem of sewage on that coast. The whole of that Rockley coast is a coast which has been overbuilt. We do not have a sewerage scheme and difficulties arise with whatever method of sewerage they use.

There is also another disturbing feature about the whole area, and it relates to the fact that there are a lot of abandoned properties on the beach itself and on the opposite side of the road. This administration and the public of Barbados have got to face up to the fact that drastic measures have to be used against owners of land who abandon their land whether with houses on it or with love vine on it or with bush on it and create public health nuisances. Many people are resident in Barbados with this, many people have left Barbados and emigrated and they have no social responsibility at all to the community to clean up their lands or to leave an agent in Barbados to clean up their lands. I have absolutely no qualms at all about this. I feel the Government should either amend the law relating to taxes and charge them treble the taxes, I feel the Government should rigorously enforce the Public Health Act, the Agricultural Act, the Town Planning Act and the Housing Act. I feel the Government should compulsorily acquire the lands where

there are derelict buildings on them and let other people who want to rent the buildings put them in repair and have a statutory right for a long period of time to rent them, just to demonstrate and show that if you own property you must have some kind of responsibility to the community in this.

Ascanio's Restaurant just 10 yards away from this has been left abandoned. What has happened to the owners of the land? Right opposite Accra Beach Hotel there is another area of land. Right opposite this very land, between Chefette and Worme's apartments there is a property owned by one Gomes who has gone to Miami and there is nothing but a lot of bush in the houses, a big wall building. The Government should make an example of those people and acquire the land.

The hon. member talks about difficulties with acquisition. Once Cabinet makes a recommendation as a result of a submission by a Ministry, under the Land Acquisition Act the surveyors go in and they are the people who treat with the owners. They discuss with the owners the fact that Government intends to acquire. They discuss with the owners how much land it is. They tell them that they are entitled to make submissions with respect to the worth of the land. They tell them that notices will be published. A Section 3 — Notice gives them notice, one is served on the land. Then you have to have a Section 4 Notice after definite survey has been established. Then you have to have a resolution of the House, then you have to have a Section 5 Notice. Now there is a big difference in Barbados between people's conception of the value of land and the amount that the Crown is under an obligation to pay pursuant to specific provisions of the Land Acquisition Act.

8.30 p.m.

I well remember this Land Acquisition Act was the subject of a tremendous amount of debate during the course of the constitutional negotiations when Barbados was becoming independent, and it was specific that in the Land Acquisition Act in Barbados a measure of compensation is not the current market value of the land including its potential, but it is the current market value having regard to the existing use of the land, and that gave rise to a tremendous amount of argument in Barbados. Honourable members must have had some experience of this difficulty. They are very happy to pay taxes on the value that the Land Valuation establishes as the value, but when it comes now to land acquisition purposes, they introduce a number of new features which they feel should be taken into account.

Now the Government cannot break the law of the land. The Government cannot take potential into account. The Government cannot take into account features which the Land Acquisition Act does not allow them to take into account, but we get all these difficulties. Of course,

when there are people who have a building on the land and who use it as their house or business, there is some flexibility in the Standing Valuation Committee to make recommendations to Cabinet whereby the replacement costs of the building is used as a partial measure discounted of course by a depreciation factor to bear in mind that if a person is living in a three bedroom house and he wants to replace exactly the same thing in another area, that because of the rise in the cost of building the people will have a legitimate case that they will not get enough money to replace what they had. There can be accommodation in that, but when you have people who have land with absolutely nothing on it or with an abandoned building on it, then big arguments will arise, and these are the problems that we have been having.

I do not think that we should in this country fail to recognise that, if certain important developments are to take place for the benefit of the whole community, we should allow two, three or four people to hold up the developments. I am sure the hon. member is fully in favour of the road going down to Brandon. I am sure all hon. members are fully in favour of the creation of toilet facilities at a beach which is so popularly used. I have only one reservation to this and I have drawn it to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Housing as it was drawn to the previous Minister of Housing by the previous Minister of Health. There is a sewage problem in this area. I hope that serious consideration is given to acquiring the land on the other side which is abandoned. The man has gone to Miami. He cares nothing more about Barbados. The rats live in the house, it is over-run with vine. The public health inspectors are afraid to deal with it. Let us demonstrate clearly that this Government is very serious that land owners who have property must not abandon it without any sense of social responsibility, and treat it as abandoned property. Let him fight a test case in the law courts, and I would do the case for the Crown for nothing. I would like to cross-examine him or his expert. So this is another attempt by Government to ensure that the conditions on a beach which is a public area are such that all of us can enjoy, I am very glad that it is not only on the South Coast; it is now going down to Brandon. I am sure that a beautiful beach facility will be built at Brandon. After all, not only does the hon. member live down there or have property down there, not only may the hon. member have experienced the joys and delights of moonlight on that beach; I am sure that there are members on this side both on my left and on my right who are well aware of that. I hope the Government is not disturbing the honourable member by the fact that some of the bushes have been cut down, but that is one of the most beautiful areas in Barbados now, starting from Esso and driving right down.

I know the hon. member for St. Michael West will be pleased to know that it is hoped that at least

a hard court, at least some facility, within a fence of course, will be created on part of the area where Shamrock was. We really hope that we will have sufficient land there where the former hon. member for St. Michael used to live. There is a security fence that has to go up too, but we are really hoping that we will be able to have some recreational facility there. The hon. member has always been crying out that his constituency does not have a recreational facility. There are also two large playing fields that are being done now. A contract has been made and they are under construction now just between where the hon. member's friend of very long standing lived — I think his name is Mr. Pile — and the Farm. That area there which was a dump is now being levelled out with some of the excavation and there will be two very large playing fields there. For the horse riding stable, the gentleman who has been operating down there for a very long period of time will also be able to lease part of the land to carry on his horse-riding activities. This is a very low-lying and swampy area, but they can make it into a playing field and into recreational facilities, so that that road is for all Barbadians, and the beach there is for all Barbadians. It is a very large public area, a very good window to the sea; one of the best windows to the sea in the whole island. I understand that even at night you cannot even get anywhere to park down there, but that is the position, and these are the policies of the Government, and I am sure that this Resolution will not have any opposition from the other side.

Mr. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution poses very little problem to me, but I would like the Minister to explain a few things for me, and I would like to pursue the topic of compensation that was started by the previous speaker. The Schedule states the acquisition of 5,960 square metres and the Minister in his presentation said that the facilities would need 6,000 square feet. A conversion of 5,960 square metres is more than 60,000 square feet. I wonder if this is an error on the Minister's part or whether the extra 54,000 square feet would not be used in the development. I would welcome an explanation from the Minister in his final speech.

The procedure under the present acquisition as so well outlined by the member who just sat is precisely why I am saying that we need, and I would like to invite the Minister in an area which is not in any way controversial, to look at the human element of compensation in Barbados. Quite often, because of the Act, long drawn out procedures put a lot of these people at terrific disadvantages. We all admit that in the development of a country there are a few who would be disadvantaged, but there is in the Acquisition Act a very serious contention and contradiction in my view which states that compensation should be based

on market value, and then specifically states that the potential should not be taken when that compensation is being argued, and it is a well acknowledged valuation principle that the market value must contain potential, and therefore it makes it very difficult in any negotiations for acquisition purposes under this Act.

I am saying that in a small market like Barbados, it is time that a very serious look be taken at the Act in regard to the method of compensation, because very often when the market value is paid for a property, because the real estate market is relatively small, the owners cannot find a comparable property in a reasonable time, and more often than not they have to rebuild at the present costs.
8.40 p.m.

It is only fair that in this Act serious consideration be given to compensation based on replacement because it is causing a lot of problems. The problems are further aggravated when there is a delay in paying of the compensation because of the tremendous increase in the prices of houses in the market.

By the time owners are paid their compensation, even to acquire a comparable property, there is a considerable increase in the comparable property by the time that comes about and the interest is too small to compensate for the growth in the market potential. So my line here is that I would seriously ask the Minister to look at the machinery for compensation for compulsory acquisitions and do what is possible by way of personnel to make sure that by the time the notice is being posted the actual delay in payment of compensation be as short as possible to remove the present problems that people are having.

In most cases, the people, where compensation is taking place, are quite happily housed and they are very much at home. It is a human trauma for people to move from where they have been living for a long time, some of them having to move from places where they have lived all their lives. It is not fair to further increase the problems on them to place financial burdens on top of the human trauma that they have. In this respect, I entreat the Minister to see that negotiations be as speedy as possible and to have a serious look at the Act in those areas which remove any potential from being taken into consideration and seriously consider compensation by replacement value which I think is the only fair and proper thing to do for compulsory acquisition. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for St. Philip North on the speech he has just made which is his maiden speech in this House of Parliament. I know that he has already had some

exposure, although a very short exposure, in the Other Place and I am sure that if he learns even better than he has been in putting his points as succinctly as he has done on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, he will become a very popular speaker with yourself, Sir, certainly, and you would not be clashing with him or he would not be clashing with you at all in this Honourable House.

Let me first start, however, Sir, by dealing with the issue of compensation before I talk about the Rockley facility which is in my constituency which is why I am going to participate. Let me, Sir, remind the hon. member that it was his party, between 1961 and 1967, which changed the Land Acquisition Act in order to take out from the Act, on the basis of evaluation for compulsory acquisition, the potentiality of the land.

This was done after a study carried out by an expert who based his recommendations on the Law in Pakistan. It is a fact, and I believe the then Premier had in mind the Graeme Hall acquisition and he was concerned for whatever reason — but the saddle of Graeme Hall has probably now been finally ridden. He was concerned at that time about the Graeme Hall acquisition. Part of Graeme Hall was subsequently sold, as you would realize, to Mr. Bernstein.

He was concerned about the Graeme Hall acquisition and in the process of time he found this type of legislation which came before the House. That the legislation is now characterized as unfair I think is a serious indictment by members of that party against their own party for the actions that they carried out at that time. We warned him at the time about the changes they were bringing about in the legislation, Sir.

I believe that was one of the most controversial bits of legislation and indeed as the hon. member for Christ Church East Central has said, the matter figured again at the Constitutional talks in London in 1966 when it was attempted to get into the fundamental rights provisions some way of insuring that the potential of the land or the replacement costs, if you like, would be taken into account. Nothing happened.

You will see that that particular section of the Act is a pretty rigid section and indeed one of the issues that arose in the Graeme Hall acquisition was whether or not you could have a series of uses on a plantation because the Crown, through the then Attorney General, the Hon. Hilton Vaughan, was contending that there was such a thing as a plantation use and that if you had a plantation use you had to value the land as one plantation. You could not even take into account in that agricultural use that the use for vegetable production had a higher potential, for instance, than the use of sugar or the use for grazing. It was over-ruled by the tribunal and the full

Board upheld the contention of the applicant in that case. That is a long sad story. It has long since passed.

There are other areas in which I believe that the Land Acquisition Act can be improved. An area, for instance, in giving persons the right of appeal against an owner although I conceive that it might hold up the Government when it wants to acquire the land urgently and indeed, Sir, we have drafted in the Ministry of the Attorney General, on the advice of Professor Wade, some forms of changes in the Act which of course, the present Minister will deal with himself, to take into account the need to show more natural justice in the administration of the Land Acquisition Act.

Now, Sir, I think the problem there, too, is that people do not pursue their own remedies as swiftly as they should under the Act. That is one problem. The Government moves in and uses the Section 3 notice to send in the Chief Surveyor. Then there may be a Section 4 notice where the Governor-General allows the Government to go in and to carry out work on the land and then there is a lag between the Section 3 and 4 to the Section 5 notice where the final acquisition comes.

Mr. Speaker, the problem here very often is because the Surveying Section of the Government is not yet ready with the plan and therefore you cannot come down to the House sometimes with the final acquisition notice although the Government has gone into possession of the land and carried out work because of the shortage of surveying services. Maybe there has to be an answer to that.

Meanwhile, as well, the person whose land is being acquired cannot be paid although before I left the Ministry certainly we were looking at procedure whereby if the person agreed with the Government that the area of land was X square metres, the Government would pay on that basis with a mutual undertaking and indemnity of the Government to increase the payment if it turns out to be more on the final survey or the party to repay the Government if it turns out to be less.

8.50 p.m.

We drafted some such arrangement in order to get around this and I believe it would be pursued by the Honourable Minister and by, of course, my colleague the Honourable Member for St. George South as well. But, there are problems, administrative problems with the surveys which have held up payment in some of these acquisitions that I am very deeply conscious of myself since I had worked before I became a Minister and I am working now for several people, in relation to acquisition of this nature which are occurring from time to time and have occurred from time to time.

So far as Rockley is concerned, I want to welcome this resolution most wholeheartedly, Sir. Since 1971, I

have been talking about the need of the Government to acquire the balance of the Rockley area. It was this Party in the 1950s under the then Mr. Grantley Adams, the Premier of Barbados, who acquired the first Rockley Beach in order to make Rockley part of the heritage of Barbadians and he was not acquiring it for any visitors only nor was he acquiring it for any people of only one complexion, he acquired it for all the people of Rockley and, contrary to what Honourable Members may think, I can certify that a large number of the lower socio-economic members of my constituency use Rockley, particularly the people from Rockley tenantry and from Dayrells Road. Those are the people who go there. Some of them use it for fishing purposes, for selling purposes and for recreational purposes and, in many instances, it is their only outlet for recreation as well. That is a fact.

The Honourable Member, of course, for Christ Church West Central will recall that this very Rockley figured in the 1971 election as well, Sir. I have a catalogue on this one. At that stage, I understand that part of the Democratic Labour Party platform was that they would, if necessary, have allowed building on that part of the sea. That is what I understand was the position and I said then that if any building ever took place there that I would lead the people from Dayrells Road, Rockley and Forde's Road and lie down on the beach. We might have had a beach party. But even in 1971, I gave the undertaking that, if this Party ever won the Government, we were going to take over the balance of Rockley and put up proper facilities there. It has taken some time to achieve it, we never came in until 1976. This action was started before the Elections and is being so ably continued by the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands.

But, we need adequate beach facilities at Rockley, Sir. There are no changing rooms for the people who go there. You cannot even get a proper glass of water or anything of the sort on that beach and a lot of people use it. Now, Sir, one of the major problems was the one highlighted by my Honourable friend, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central. It is a serious sewage problem that we have on the South coast. (ASIDES) It is not only sewage disposal, it is a sewage problem as a whole. You can sometimes find raw sewage floating off that coastline. It is a serious problem and also on the beach sometimes you can find evidence of people having defecated on the beach. We have that problem. I walk on the beach, I go around with the people, I talk to them, Sir, I listen to the complaint. I have raised it on numerous occasions and therefore I have said to the past Minister of Housing and he acceded to my request that we would have to try to put up adequate facilities there in the interest of people and in the interest of public health as well. So, this is not a luxury flight that we are on. There are very practical problems on why we need these sort of facilities at the Rockley beach and

they are also benefits to the man in the street so to speak not merely the visitor that can flow from this type of action. However, Sir, that is not the only part of my constituency that needs this treatment.

As you know, Sir my constituency stretches from the St. Lawrence Church right down to the Defence Force Headquarters in Hastings and it is perhaps the most heavily populated part of Barbados on the South Coast. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will understand. He lives in my constituency, he does not vote for me but he lives there, Sir. (ASIDES) The Honourable Member when he voted had to say in the Polling Station and tell the people, "You see who I am voting for I voted for Mr. Daniel." I did that to show you who I voted for, Sir. But, that is heavily populated and, as a result, we also have the outside population which comes in to this part of Christ Church, Sir.

HOUR OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: We have now approached the Hour of Interruption and I would like to enquire from Honourable Members whether or not the matter under discussion is really controversial? (ASIDES) I have my own view. I invite the expression from both Sides of the Honourable House. (ASIDES) It is determined whether or not it is controversial by those voting "aye" or "nay" and it is whether or not either Side will give its indication at this point in time as to how the vote will go. (ASIDES) Not at all, you are not dividing the Honourable House on the matter, but it is not controversial so we continue.

Mr. FORDE: I am glad to hear that this matter is not controversial, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members no doubt will express their points of view on any matter that comes up for discussion. They all will not express it in the same tenor, but it does not mean that at the time of voting they will not all vote in favour.

Mr. FORDE: I anticipate that the Rt. Hon. Member will have to reply to changes in the Land Acquisition Act, which he made, Sir. If he wants his speech, I will bring it for him, Sir. (ASIDES) I am controversial according to the Honourable Member, Sir, very controversial these days, Sir.

The position is — I want to revert to my constituency because I am very serious about this — The Honourable Minister has mentioned that another beach facility is being established at what he describes is to the South West of the St. Lawrence Police Station and I take it to mean at the stream just between the sluice gate coming from the Graeme Hall swamp and going to what was the beach side of the Graeme Hall plantation. I welcome that, Sir, but I want to ask the Honourable

Minister for the assurance that he must recognise that some of the people who have lived in that area, and I am sure I will get his assurance on that, have lived there all their years. In the case of Mrs. Allan, for instance, she has lived there for upwards of 40 years, she is an old lady in the evening of her days and movement from there, I do not know how she would survive, it would be a traumatic experience. In addition, Sir, there is the case likewise of Mrs. Drayton. I would believe that the two of those persons, in particular, should be giving very special consideration, although I concede that something must be done about the whole of that area so that the tenants know their true position.

Either, we must make up our minds to give them leases of a certain set period that they can get on with developing their houses or the Government must sell them the area of land. I believe that policy is varied from time to time on this in relation to that beach area, but I have to put their position and their case. There are some of them who are making a livelihood out of living there and I am sure that those who are using it for commercial purposes would have no objection to paying a reasonable rent for so doing, but there are other persons who have lived all their lifetime there who cannot pay commercial rents for the area and who have got very strong family and other ties in that particular area. Government, in any plans which it has for the area, must take in their long connection with this part of Graeme Hall. Indeed, I think at one stage they were offered to buy it and at another they were going to get a long lease. It started since in the sixties, Sir and has been going on for some time.

9.00 p.m.

I have only been one of the four representatives who have been called on from time to time to put this case. The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister at one time, Mr. Peter Morgan another time Mr. Maurice Ward another time, and now finally myself, and I hope that I can get a satisfactory solution to the problems which they have in that particular area. I agree that we have around that corner very serious problems of traffic flows, and in fact there is a traffic hazard there and steps will have to be taken to improve the egress and ingress at that particular part of the beach facility if the people are to enjoy the facility properly. I regret to say that at the moment the manner in which the facility is being used, what facility there is there, leaves a lot to be desired. Again one sees some problems not only with vandalism and defecation, people playing their loud speakers to the detriment of the residents there and things like that. I believe the Minister must consider through the Parks and Beaches some form of warden service so that the residents will not be unduly or unnecessarily disturbed by other persons who are enjoying themselves, not to prevent anybody from enjoying themselves, but I think one has to regard the comfort of other people, so I also want the Minister

in the plans which he has for that particular part of the south coast to take into account the open area in front of the Pavilion Court and Pavilion House, Sir. That is part of the acquisition as well. That is the beach facility used by the people of St. Matthias at present, and the people of Harts Gap in particular, and it is one of the few open areas perhaps now available on that south coast which should be kept open. There has been never any building there, so there is no reason why we should have building on it in the future.

Finally, I would like to suggest to the Minister that perhaps he can give some consideration to improving the facility at the back of the Drill Hall, at the back of the Hastings Police Station, to the south west of the Hastings Police Station. Government does not own all of the land, some of it is owned by private persons, but Government owns a significant portion of the land there which from time to time has become overgrown with trees and shrubs and it is suitable perhaps for a proper beach facility as well. The people, as well, from Chelsea Road and the people from Gully Field Avenue and those areas also use that area. When you live among your constituents, as I do — frequently I am with them — I can talk with authority on these areas, so when I am speaking I know what I am talking about in the vicinity of Christ Church West, and that is reflected in the numerical strength in which this hon. member comes to this House at every General Election in spite of the Pele and the other issues, Sir.

I welcome the Minister. He has my wholehearted support on this, and all the other issues in which he is trying so hard, as his predecessor did as well, in order to improve the total beach facilities in Barbados. I would like to commend the former Minister on the sort of work being carried out in Fitts Village. I think it is a pleasure to see the foresight which he has shown in improving beach facilities for the people of that part of St. James and in St. James South in particular. I hope, as well, that the facilities being re-established at the Hastings Rocks, I am glad to see that is now being redone, that the Minister will be as generous in treating the Hastings Rocks as the Fitts Village area has been treated.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this area of land at Rockley has a long history in this House. Way back in the early fifties a development took place at a location called Blue Waters. On the land side between the road at what is now called Rockley Beach and Golf Club Road a firm of local businessmen, a family firm incidentally, put up what was described as a high class, meaning high income, residential development and reserved all the area immediately opposite Rockley Beach for the building of what would then have been the first hotel constructed since the Marine Hotel had been built back in the 19th Century as a hotel in Barbados.

The building of that hotel was frustrated by the then Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government of which I was a member on the grounds that the leader did not approve of tourism for Barbados. There were several debates in this Chamber to which you can refer in which from time to time the members of the Conservative Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, as they succeeded themselves in nomenclature if nothing else, criticised the Government for not allowing any hotel development on the land side of the road between Accra, which was the residence at that time of the Brooks family, and Skeete Hill. I used to live in the area at a place which is still a vacant lot just at the top of Skeete Hill, so I know the area well. When the buses passed there, you may remember, Sir, although you were in the other side of the island, they used to lower the canvas — this is relevant to the resolution — in order to prevent the passengers from being splashed by the waves coming up against the side of the road.

The hon. member for Christ Church East Central, or whatever you call it now, I am not really familiar with these boundaries, will be aware of that because after he left the country he used to live somewhere in the area. The point is that the water used to come up against the side of the road. This is a very important point I am making in regard to this acquisition. There was approximately — I am not sure it may have been 48,000 square feet of land which the Government, having virtually refused permission for any hotel development on the land side, as the hon. member for Christ Church West pointed out, sometime in the fifties decided, with our support, to acquire for public purposes from the same company, the Blue Waters Development Company, although that may not be the strict name in the Registry, but let me call it the Blue Waters Development Company. It was owned by the Goddard group, and one of the Goddards was a member of this House when the acquisition took place and we approved of the acquisition because the whole of that beach had no access from the time you left Hastings Rocks until you got to St. Lawrence, because the access that you had through a gap called Brazilliana that the hon. member is familiar with, Layne's Path, which he has since acquired, compulsory I believe, Sir, some right or title to, even that was not really a public access and you had to go all the way up until you got to the bridge by the Stream or to St. Lawrence. I used to live in the area and people used to pass through the yard of the house in which I had lived on the beach.

9.10 p.m.

Now there is a new hotel, there is a vacant spot and then just above that is the spot where I used to live as a school boy; so I know the area well. But the point is that the Government decided to acquire it and that was supported on all sides of the House because it was a fit and proper thing to do.

Now the reason why the rest was not acquired is because the property owners could not build on the area. There were several property owners. There is a restaurant facility called Chefette between the Rockley Beach Club including the gap between Rockley and the Riviera Beach Hotel, and from there right up to the end of Chefette the family of the late J. A. Haynes, who was a member of the House at that time, owned the land including Abbeville where they have a few hotels now on the left hand side of the road. On that area three houses were built by a gentleman called Mr. Worme of Plantations Limited and he subsequently sold one to a client of mine called Mr. John Periera whose name ostensibly appears on this acquisition, but he has been dead now a good fifteen to twenty years, and he has a son called John Pereira Jr. and one called Bento and another son who was in the war in Vietnam. He had three sons. Some of these houses have been torn down and only one of the original Worme houses remains.

The point which I want to make is this: contrary to what the hon. member for Christ Church West has said, several applications were made by the property owners to build or sever the land on the beach side, and it was the policy of the Government from 1961 to 1976 that no development should take place on that side. So virtually without any let or hindrance the public has had access although they never used it to bathe up there. If you look in the Statute Book of Barbados you will find that there is an Act called the Barnes Fisheries Act, and that was round about the early 1900s, and Mr. Barnes who, I believe, was the father of the Barnes' from Barnes & Company had built a construction which I believe you could probably see to this day in the sea in order to raise sea eggs and oysters. That is to the eastern end of the beach.

Now, nobody was allowed to build. My contention is that you are relieving the property owners there of white sand because it was the policy of our Government that nobody could build, and therefore when they bought their houses they bought a view to the sea. Now the hon. member has been representing Christ Church west for a few years in here. He does not know the area like me. He could never know that area as well as I or the former member for Christ Church, Mr. Edwy Talma, who lived on the beach down there and has been awarded medals by the Royal Humane Society for saving people's lives, he and his brother, on that same Rockley Beach, because of the current, during my time. I was not such a proficient swimmer, so I was not risking my life the way he risked his. They were good swimmers. I was too young at the time, but I have seen them conduct acts of heroism on that beach and rescue people because of the danger of the tide. But what happened after was this: the tide did not become so dangerous from splashing up against the side of the road. The sea receded, and all the land which the

Government is now seeking to purchase is land which the sea surrendered to the property owners on the opposite side of the road except for the Barnes fishery.

Now there is nobody who can convince me that there is anything like 6,000 square metres of beach there that the Government is now seeking to buy, and I suggest to them strongly to put back the surveyors there. That may show on the plots that some of them have. I doubt that there are 3,000 square metres because that beach is one of the beaches in Barbados which is subject to severe erosion, and in the past 18 months or so the erosion up there has been very heavy. That is the first point I wish to make. The Government should not be paying for land that does not exist. Secondly, I question the need for the Government to acquire the land at all, because all the property owners up there have is a view out to sea, and according to our policy and it should be their policy, and if you check the records of the Town and Country Planning Department you will see that no permission was ever given for anybody to build on that land, the public has never been prevented from using it. So if the hon. member remembers the case of the Mayor of Saltash up by this beach in the Wash in Norfolk, where the people acquired a right of common to the beach, the Government may be paying for something to which the people already have a prescriptive right. That is my contention.

Now the justification which has been given for the purchase of a questionable area of land from the adjoining property owners who cannot build on it anyhow is that you want to put up a beach facility for sanitation reasons and so on. The Government already has land in the shelter of the trees, unless you are going to put up more "Deli" caravans up there without going out to public tender. I do not see any justification for acquiring land to do something for which you already have land under the trees. That is an open area and the people are not going to want to go inside there. Furthermore I should invite the hon. member and the Minister to go and look at the beach at what used to be called Shot Hall at Gravesend. Wherever the Government has put up bathing facilities the people have not used them. What I suggest is that what you need are cubicles without roofs and some showers where people can change in decency, but not to put up any elaborate permanent structures. They lead to all kinds of problems and they are not like the communal baths that were put up in the past which have been completely dilapidated and torn down probably because of the improvement in the standard of living of people over the past twenty years; but people no longer want baths. Look at the one in the hon. member's constituency. He can go and see an example of what happens to public conveniences, as they call them, of that nature.

Now what I am suggesting is this. There is some requirement for privacy, particularly of ladies. All you need is four wood walls standing off the ground. They can be kept cleaner. Have an outside shower with a tap maybe, not even with a shower overhead because you tend to lose them, and that is what has happened at Shot Hall. Go and inspect the facilities that you have put down, these elaborate structures. Bajans like to get behind the car door and undress, nip in the water, put the towel around them and go back home. This is what they like, This is what I do on Rockley Beach myself when I go up there. (Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I have not seen you up there for a long time.) Well since you started polluting the water, I cannot swim up there.

Before I was interrupted, the hon. member made a point about our changing the Land Acquisition Act to prevent people being given re-instatement. The Act in that respect, the 1949 Act, is in front of me; these are the old Laws of Barbados, and there are precisely the same provisions in the 1949 Act as there are in Cap. 228 of the Revised Laws of Barbados as regards re-instatement, and I have both of them in front of me here. The hon. member now says that for the purpose of the Graeme Hall drain some time in 1967 we changed the Act to take out the provision for reinstatement. I invite the hon. member to look at the old Act dealing with assessment of compensation on page 818. You go first to page 818 and that deals with the rules of assessment.

9.20 p.m.

I am just giving the hon. member the provisions in the old Act but he said they were removed so he is satisfied that they were there, but they certainly are in the new Act and he has the new Act in front of him.

Mr. FORDE: If the hon. member will give way. The provision is Section 11 (2) (a) of Chapter 22 (a) because a change was made there that you could only take into account the use to which the land was being put at the material time and the material time is the date of the notice of the acquisition and therefore potential was cut out of the Act.

The hon. member might have suffered from the pollution from Rockley but apparently his brain is atrophied beforehand, Sir, but if he looks at it he will see what I am telling him and I am sure his former Minister of Home Affairs will teach him the law on this point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am trying to tell the hon. member is that the provisions of the old Act are exactly the same as the provisions in the new Act. There is provision for the reinstatement in the new Act as it was in the old Act for reinstatement where a person was dispossessed and he would have to go and find some land

somewhere else. This is all I was saying Sir. I am sorry I do not have my glasses, Sir, to find the precise section.

In the old Act it says "the value of the land, subject as is hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land if sold in the open market by a willing seller might be expected to realize at the date." That is the old Act and the same provision is in the new Act and then they go on to make specific provisions. Here it is Sir, section 11 (4) on page 819. This is the old Act of 1949-56 "but for the compulsory acquisition would continue to be devoted to a purpose of such a nature that there is no general demand or market for land for that purpose, the compensation may, if the Judge is satisfied that reinstatement in some other place is *bona fide* intended, be assessed on the basis of the reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement."

Now I think that this, although they did not use the word "reinstatement", neither the hon. member for St. Philip North or the member for Christ Church West, that this is specifically the point to which they are referring, the question of being reinstated somewhere else and there is the same provision for reinstatement.

In the old Act the provision was not what the potentiality of the land was because both in the new and the old Act it said that the purpose to which the Government was going to put the land is irrelevant, both in the 1949 Act and in the amendment, but for reinstatement the cost is that of relocating a person. If a person has a shop or something like that and they have to find somewhere else, quite apart from the market value of the land, both bits of the legislation provide, as you would have to provide for Mr. Pile at Brandons, the cost of relocating his shop in some other place, but the potential, what value the land will be put to by the Government in both Acts, is completely irrelevant and has always been so.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The time being 9.30 p.m. this House now stands adjourn until Tuesday, 15th September, 1981.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is just a procedural matter I would like to draw to your attention. There is no motion as such for the adjournment but a mistake appears in the proceedings. I do not think there is any fault of your own or any of the officers in the House, as to the membership of.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any objection to this. If it is a case where that Board will be meeting before next Tuesday by all means we should do it now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: And there is no objection from the other side.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It might be tidier to do it now and to get it out of the way.

Mr. SPEAKER: The adjournment at this hour is automatic and does not require a motion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am aware of that, Sir. That it is to Your Honour's discretion but it is just a question of tidying up the Order Paper. It is only a typographical error. I wish Your Honour would direct the Clerks to change that from the hon. member for St.

Philip North to the hon. member for St. Philip South. That is all Sir, and the people on the other side all agree.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot instruct the Clerk to do this. A motion has got to be made from your side to the House. A motion to the Chair has got to be put to the House.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 15th September, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon was put to the House and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.30 p.m.