
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 25, 1985.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, June 25, 1985.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)

Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Information and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning)

Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Minister of Commerce, Industry and Consumer Affairs)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour and Community Development)

Hon. A. Truss, (Minister of Tourism and the Environment)

Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.), (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.M., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs)

Prayers were read by Rev. I. Harewood.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, June 18, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before I move that these Minutes be taken as read, on page 3, the sixteenth line, immediately after "AYES" there is "Honb's" I believe there is an error there. I should like to have it amended. "Honb's H. B. St. John". I suspect it is Honourable.

Mr. SPEAKER: What that seems to me to be.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Honourable Members?

Mr. SPEAKER: is an abbreviation of the term, "The Honourable." I wondered why it has been done in this way. I hope we are not adopting the American standard to such an extent that persons do not really understand what they mean.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Well, Sir, I do not.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would seek to have the word corrected and written out, and not abbreviated in this fashion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I take it that we will have to postpone the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Postpone the Minutes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that the Minutes of June 18, 1985, be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Thomas seems to have another problem.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. On page 1 of the Minutes, under the subhead, "PAPERS", it says

"Hon. D. A. C. Simmons by command laid the Family Law Council....."

I did no such thing, Sir. I laid the Report of the Family Law Council.

I beg to move, Sir, that the words, "Report of the" be inserted before, "Family Law Council," to read "Laid the Report of the Family Law Council for the year 1984."

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other observations?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if there are no other omissions, corrections or observations, I beg to move that the Minutes of June 18, 1985 be postponed.

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

The question that the Minutes be postponed to be corrected was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of:

Accounts and Statements for the month of March 1985, prepared by the Accountant-General.

Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On behalf of the Prime Minister, Sir, I am commanded to lay:

The Defence (Rate of Pay and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Regulations, 1985.

The Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Port Authority for the year ended 31st December, 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, Black Rock, for providing recreational facilities.

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of the repayment of the sum of \$8 000 000 and interest thereon borrowed by the

Barbados Port Authority from the European Investment Bank for the purchase of one Container Handling wide Gauge Gantry Crane.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$354 070 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 3, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

I would like to inform the Honourable House that I am seeking leave to do this Resolution in all of its stages today. I have been informed that the appropriate Resolution has already been circulated and I will be seeking leave to do it later in the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, I propose to do Private Members Business immediately and, therefore, I am going to suspend the Standing Orders. I will be doing Government Business later in the evening.

The Government is quite anxious to have this Resolution completed. I would not like to indicate what time I propose to do Government Business, neither at this time would I like to put any time limit, whether two hours, three hours or four hours, in respect of when I will finish this Private Members' Resolution.

Unlike the other side, when they were the Government - it took us some years, you would recall, Mr. Speaker, to get a Private Members' Resolution done - I think this Resolution should have been disposed of right away. We are going now to the third meeting on this Resolution and the Government wants to have it completed. Let us put the views one way or the other and dispose of it.

Let me remind the House, lest the Opposition forgets, that there is not a single Resolution that is brought into this Chamber, as long as I am Leader of the House, and I dare say, I say this for my colleagues, that we are not going to deal with immediately. The Government will not run away from anything on that side.

I want to make this abundantly clear. We have suffered at the hands of the Opposition. When we were in the Opposition, there was a time, Sir, you would recall, Sir, you were in the Opposition, when they would come in and do Government Business and then would not come back and form a quorum for us to do Private Members Business. We are giving them the opportunity to bring any Resolution I do not care what it is - on the floor of this House. It is on that premise that I propose to do this Resolution immediately, and I hope to do it without committing myself as to the time I would seek to do this.

There are a number of Government measures to be dealt with. I will probably have to deal with them later in the evening. At that point, I will decide what time I will call Government Business. I just want to make this abundantly clear to all Members and in the interest of the public. That is of paramount importance to me.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, the Opposition already.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am rising to respond to some of the points made by the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member said he is going to deal with Private Members Business.

Even before that, I am waiting to hear the Suspension of the Standing Orders, so that we get the matter within.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. But he made some comments which referred to the Opposition, because the matter under discussion....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not the basis of a debate, is it?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It sounded like that to me, Sir. Some very controversial points were being made by the Leader of the House relating to the proceedings of the House, and some of the points being made were reflecting on the Opposition, and in any democratic institution, if the Government says something that is critical of the Opposition, the Opposition should be given an opportunity to respond, if they so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to give you the opportunity to respond, but no other Member would be able to make any further comments. If you want to respond, you may do so.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am very grateful, Sir, and I.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It was out of parliamentary courtesy that I gave way. Yes, I gave way.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I thought you were finished.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, no, no! I have not even started with you yet, furthermore finished.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42 (5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Speaking on the suspension of those Standing Orders — I take the point that that is what you were getting at, and appreciate that — I would like to make it abundantly clear that the Opposition is ready to debate this particular motion under Private Members Business which we have set out. From the very start, I indicated that it is not in the interest of the Government or the Opposition for this particular matter to drag on, and if it is indicated that the Government is ready to start on that Resolution now, we are ready to deal with that now. I do not know what all the extravagant statements concerning the role of the Opposition were about. If you want to get on with the debate, all you have to say is that Private Members Business will now be taken and let us get on with the debate.

But I would like to make the point that I am fearful for democratic institutions in this country when we can have the Leader of the House making statements which seem to suggest that we are no longer in a democratic institution, that he can call Private Members Business, he will start it now and he will not give any indication or intimation when that Private Members Business will cease. I believe that is not in the interest of any democratic Parliament, least of all a democratic Parliament that has been in existence since 1639. It is certainly my view that if Private Members Business is to be taken now, we cannot debate such a motion under the threat that at any moment, in the middle of a speech by a member from over here putting the case for the Opposition on this motion, or at anytime, a Leader of the House can get up and say that is the end and beg to move that Private Members Business be concluded at the particular time.

I submit that that is an anti-democratic statement and an anti-parliamentary statement, and the last person I expected to hear such a statement coming from is the Leader of the House, who is supposed to set an example in terms of the excellence of parliamentary Government in this country. And no amount of shouting from over there by the Leader of the House or anybody else can scare anybody from over here.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Unlike the other side, a Resolution is brought in the right place by the right people, because they have been democratically elected. As far as I am concerned, it is the right time. All that I indicated to the defender of parliamentary institutions overnight, the very person who is going to depressurise and remove an Opposition party, is that we would begin now. All of a sudden, the honourable Member who sat on this side and heard a member from his side say it would be good if Barbados would have a one party state and did not challenge that on that

occasion — that was the late Patsy Springer — he is now a defender of parliamentary democracy in here. All of a sudden, everytime you open your mouth you are the defender of parliamentary institutions in here.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order: I am submitting that no member of the Democratic Labour Party ever made any statement that Barbados should be a one party state. If the honourable Member is saying that, he must produce the evidence to support it. I am categorically denying that any member of the Democratic Labour Party on this floor of the House ever made such a statement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know that a member of that party indicated that Barbados should be a one party state. I did not hear a single word coming from the Member then in defending the ancient institution established since 1639. When you ran out of the House at lunch time and did not come back so we could not form a quorum, you did not know that democracy was at stake then. But we are going to stand up here with you and we are going to debate the Resolution, and when you are over here, then you can determine when you can stop Government Business or Private Members Business. That is all I said. You have an opportunity to debate it today, and when I believe that we should have Government Business taken, then I will introduce it. But I will give you a free hand today. You must learn how to co-operate too. Do you remember a couple of Tuesdays ago when you were in your peak? Every single thing you divided on. I think the Clerks got tired of ringing the bell, because we were short of members; all sorts of things like that. Now today you hear about democracy. Why this democracy all of a sudden? I know about it. I do not know about you.

Private Members Business, Mr. Speaker, is the instant Order of the day.

The question that the several Standing Orders be suspended for the day's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was speaking. He had then spoken for two minutes. He now has 28 minutes left. He may now continue if he desires to do so.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): In the first two minutes of my contribution to this historic debate in the Parliament, I pointed out the irrelevance of dragging into debate the business activities of private citizens, who purchase land at market price and sell it at market price, lawfully and under the protection of the laws, with such provisions as the laws may provide for the limitation of any such gains made in those circumstances.

This Resolution is a very specific Resolution. It charges that the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) did three things that were wrong. There are three counts to the charge and not one charge has been answered by any Member on that side who spoke so far. The charges were: (1) his failure to disclose his interest in Trents Plantation to this House for the purposes of incurring public expenditure on that plantation; (2) the unlawful expenditure of public funds for private purposes; (3) the abuse of ministerial office and public trust. The Resolution further calls for his removal from office as a Minister of the Crown.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) in an excellent presentation to this Honourable House laid the foundations of the charges by clearly indicating the date on which and the amount for which Trents Plantation was bought by the Honourable Minister of Transport. He also pointed out that there was never a declaration of interest before this House in respect of any developments on that land that would enhance value in the interest of the Honourable Minister of Transport, and he further pointed out that there was incurred an unlawful expenditure of public funds for private purposes on his own plantation.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) in his speech, further providing the foundation for evidence and debate in this Parliament, pointed out that the section of the road which serves the tenants of Trents Plantation is a section to which this Democratic Labour Party has no objection, but further applauds it, as is stated in the Resolution. The concern is about the two other segments of the road clearly demonstrated on a photographic map made available to this House; one road adjoining the road legitimately provided for the tenants, a road leading to one house, which, at best, amounts to a misuse of public funds, and the third segment, bringing that road back towards the original road for the tenants, which, in our view, represents an unlawful expenditure and the use of public funds for the interest of one person, that is, the owner of Trents Plantation. No person has questioned the fact that the expenditure of some \$200 000 or thereabouts additional to providing the road for the tenants constituted an enhancement of the existing asset of the Honourable Minister of Transport, that is, if you imagine the three sides of a triangle, the base of that triangle serves the tenants and there is only one house at the top, and even if you were to assume that expenditure was incurred to go to one house, there can be no justification whatsoever for bringing that road back and could only constitute an enhancement of an existing asset. No one has challenged that.

12.35 p.m.

In this entire debate there were three points of relevance raised by the other side which I must deal with right away. The Honourable Prime Minister pointed out

that the honourable Member had not applied for Town Planning permission. I would like to submit that that could only be a plea in mitigation of a sentence, because all that it says is that the honourable Member has not yet taken a further step to enhance that asset that has already been increased in value by the expenditure of public funds on those roads.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying that the asset has already been improved and enhanced with the expenditure of public funds, and therefore the whole question of Town Planning permission is only a red herring.

The second point made by the Honourable Prime Minister was that the Special Development Order can be applied. That is true. The Special Development Order can be applied, but making that statement is an admission of guilt and an admission that the honourable Member can benefit from the existing development, because all a Special Development Order would do is to allocate the profits or the benefit between the Government and the developer. So the invocation of the provisions of a Special Development Order is in itself an admission that there has been an improvement in the asset at Trents Plantation.

The third point that was made that was relevant to the debate was that the extension of the road was, or could be, construed to have been in conformity with the provisions of the 1982 Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act. This is not true, for the very simple reason — and I want to spell this out very carefully — that that Act would provide the Minister and Cabinet with the parliamentary authority to run a road through an area which was not a tenantry under the Tenantry Freehold Act, but which consisted of agricultural holdings, and therefore under those circumstances then a road can be run under this Act. It would be unlawful to do so at Trents Plantation for the simple reason that the Act designated the Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act, 1982, on page 7 sets out in its First Schedule the plantations that might benefit from the provisions of this Act. In St. Lucy the only three plantations are Bromefield, Husbands and Bourbon B. Trents Plantation is not a designated plantation within the meaning of this Act. In addition to that, there are other provisions within this Act which would exclude Trents Plantation from benefiting from such an extension.

I believe that I have dealt with those three points that have been raised, the only three points pertinent to the debate. In any event, as I said, any of the three points could only be in mitigation of the act and does not address itself to the morality, integrity,

legality or otherwise of what the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has done. Therefore, the case centres around a failure of declaration of interest, the use of public funds for private purposes, the unlawful use of public funds and the abuse of ministerial power and trust, and that case stands unrefuted.

It is not a defence to state that the Resolution was brought because the honourable Member was a poor boy and a member of the Barbados Labour Party. It is not a defence to state that the first house on a tenantry road is a mile long, while serving 100 houses perhaps, because the cost of that road would be amortised over the mile length of road and probably there would be no other access. It is not a defence to say that the Barbados Labour Party does not believe in removing houses, because they have removed more houses than all previous Administrations in this country. It is not a defence to go on a wild criticism of the policies in relation to tenancies of all other previous Administrations, whether it be the previous Barbados Labour Party, or the Democratic Labour Party. It is not a defence to recite all the perceived wrongs done by the Democratic Labour Party or any other party, whether it be in relation to Sidney Alleyne, HARP, Neils or Frere Pilgrim.

That does not address itself to the charges before us. The defence must demonstrate that he had no interest in Trents, or if he had an interest, that he declared such an interest in relation to this particular development. It must also demonstrate that the sum of \$200 000 or thereabouts spent in addition to what was required to meet the needs of the tenants was lawfully spent and did not improve the value of his land. And it is certainly not a defence to say that legislative instruments exist which can prevent him from further benefiting from what he has done. It is as if someone had broken into my house and had taken away my wallet, and under pressure from his family had handed back over my wallet to the police. All that would be a mitigation of the fact that he had broken into my house. The fact is that he would have broken into my house and that would be the charge one would have to answer, and any act done thereafter or any mitigation thereafter would have to be purely one of mitigation, not one to eradicate the primary act of breaking into my house.

This entire principle of declaration of interest has found expression in the qualification for voting, and indeed the fundamental principles underline executive authority down the generations ranging back from the famous ruling of Speaker Abbott in 1811. The principles are clear, that there must be an interest and that interest must be of a direct and financial nature, and that interest exists in the case of the Honourable Minister of

Transport. That interest must be owned separately and belonging to him as an individual or individuals benefiting from it, and that fact is clear. He does not own Trents Plantation in common with Her Majesty's subjects.

What is more declaration is the common linking thread throughout all parliamentary proceedings. From *Academy of Political Science* to *Canada* is a matter of fact, it is a constitutional ruling that determined subsequent rulings in relation to conflict of interest in relation to the executive arm of Government, which found expression in the 1975 Rules of Parliament in relation to all Members, and found expression in the Pierre Trudeau revision of the Rules of the Canadian Parliament recently invoked by no one less than the present Prime Minister of Canada. They are still the basic rules of the House of Commons, they are still the basic rules of the executive arms of Governments throughout the Commonwealth, they are still the basic rules for Ministers of the Crown, and I am submitting that the honourable Member has fallen short and is guilty of each and every count in relation to those rules.

12.45 p.m.

The Honourable Prime Minister is acutely aware of the significance of those rules. Not so long ago, though by error, he made a mistake when he said that an individual did not declare his cousinship with a member of a statutory board, which means that he must be aware of the importance of declaration of interest and the factors that flow from that. All I can tell the Honourable Prime Minister is that I strongly advise you, as Prime Minister — you hold the responsibility — to distance yourself from this kind of behaviour.

I watched with tremendous interest the debate that went on in the Canadian Parliament only two weeks ago, where the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Legal Affairs, whatever designation he is called, had appointed 15 law firms as agents of the Crown in respect of prosecutions in the state of Newfoundland. It so happened that two of his sons were employed by two of those law firms. The two cases which were handled by the two law firms amounted to a mere \$800 000 and \$1 500. When the matter was raised in Parliament, the Prime Minister of Canada made it quite clear that he did not consider the matter serious enough to merit the dismissal of the Minister, but he invoked the rules and regulations and rapped his Minister over the knuckles for it. He refused to associate himself with any attempt to reduce the standing of the Canadian Parliament in the eyes of the people or in the eyes of the world, and I am personally disappointed with the position taken by the Prime Minister of this country in this very grave and serious matter.

This Resolution was not brought because we want to harass the honourable Member. It is because we firmly believe that the whole process involves corruption. We

believe that it is important that this Parliament should disassociate itself from that kind of behaviour, and we have come here to urge the other side to try to look at this thing as dispassionately as possible, to put the integrity of the state and its institution before short term political gain and not allow themselves to be dragged down by any one Member because of any act he may do. We are concerned about what he has done and that is the essence of the debate.

The fact is that having spent some \$200 000 additionally to improve that property, he can sell that property tomorrow for more than he bought it for, taking into consideration the cost of putting in those roads, that is a fact, providing the market situation provides for it. The point is that \$200 000 has gone in there and that must, to any simpleton, represent an improvement of an asset, either immediate or at some time in the future, depending on what restrictions are placed on the Minister by the legislative process as a consequence of this Resolution being brought in here. He, for example, can put a house on that land, and because he has new roads inside there, it would increase the rental value of that house. He can go to the bank tomorrow and because of that additional expenditure at that site, he can use his improved asset in order to generate increased borrowings from the bank. Let us not fool ourselves, \$200 000 in roads put on any agricultural land in Barbados, whether or not it is immediate, with Town Planning permission granted there are ways and means in which the owner can derive advantage from that particular fact.

We are calling on the honourable Members on the other side, and I speak deep from within me, because I feel very, very strongly about this matter — I go so far as to say that I can see many other Members on that side who would not have done it — I urge you to take a stand for integrity and morality in public life, I urge you to take a stand against corruption. You all know, deep in your hearts, that what was done was wrong. You all know that that wrong cannot be erased by legalistic argument. You all know that there are fundamental principles that have been breached. You all know that it cannot be a proper basis for Cabinet Government or any arm of Government in this country if it is allowed to go on.

We will applaud you if you stand up as men and say we will join with the Opposition, because this matter is one that is above partisan considerations. This is one on which they have to clean the stables of corruption of the Barbados Labour Party. I urge you not to stand condemned by your speeches and by your votes. As an ordinary honourable Member of this House, I urge you to look at the facts and to see whether you can, in all honesty, support what the honourable Member has done. You cannot, and I am calling on the Prime Minister to take those steps which are necessary, and the first step

that you have to do is to fire the Honourable Minister as a Minister of the Crown.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South has also invited you to take the further step of establishing a further enquiry into the matter. I believe that because of what I have pointed out, either by transfer of titles, or by assignment to other persons to ownership, or by any other method, to heirs, assigns or otherwise, I believe that that can be stopped only in one way, that is, for this Parliament to pass a Resolution to acquire a section of land that was unlawfully developed with the misuse of public funds by the honourable Member — of course, minus the cost of \$200 000 spent inside there.

12.55 p.m.

In this situation that obtains in Barbados today, we have a Minister of the Crown who has violated every single principle of parliamentary Government, every single principle that should inform ministerial conduct in relation to how he uses the funds entrusted to his responsibility, and yet you find a situation where the Government of this country and Members on the other side might well be seeking to support him. I hope that they do not, because they will all stand condemned. In the interest of the future of this country, I believe that all members who support this Resolution would go down in the history of Barbados as taking a major step towards the enhancement of the dignity of public life in Barbados.

The people of Barbados are not satisfied with what has been done, and I will tell you why they are not satisfied. They recognise that the \$200 000 or so could have been used elsewhere in St. Lucy, certainly in St. Michael South Central, in order either to improve roads inside there, stop pot holes, and would have brought a lot of benefit to the people in any of the constituencies in this country. It could have been used in order to improve or repair the floors of those old people's homes which have holes in them, where the boards are rotting, and when their feet go through the boards they often break their hips, and that is a start to their ultimate departure from this scene here on earth. A broken hip is usually quite disastrous for an elderly person. It could have helped to repair the roofs of the leaking homes in St. Michael South Central.

How can you support a situation in which an honourable Member can get up and take up public funds and use them for the purposes of enhancing his own property, without informing this House and probably not informing many Members on the other side, many of his colleagues. How are you going to support it? What can be the grounds? How are you going to defend failure of declaration of interest in respect of this? How are you going to defend the whole question of expenditure of that nature on his own private plantation without parliamentary approval? What principles are you going to

invoke? Are we going to hear new principles being established in Barbados in respect of proper conduct in public life? Do you not realise that if you were to support him and not separate yourself from him that you would be taking a retrograde step, probably going back over 200 to 300 years of the total parliamentary tradition of Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth countries?

People all over the world are striving to get higher standards of behaviour in public life from those whom they elect. Here is a case where people can go and see what was done at Trents Plantation, and there can be no doubt whatsoever that that asset has been improved, that there is no need to improve it further to avoid the charge of having misused public funds in order to enhance one's personal assets. We cannot get into market conditions. If I had to buy Trents now, I would certainly be inclined to pay more for it now because it has those roads in — those two extra bits of roads — than before that. There are many businessmen in this House, and they would not be speaking the truth if they sought to deny that fact.

I applaud my colleague, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, for bringing this Resolution before this Honourable House. I applaud my colleagues who have spoken so far and who will speak in giving support to this Resolution, in giving support to the cleansing of public life in this country, and I urge, I plead with Members on the other side not to associate themselves with this kind of behaviour, because I know that they have grave qualms about it and that they cannot fully support this kind of behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: And that brings the honourable Member to the end of his time.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, the last Member who spoke, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, has tried at the beginning of his speech to deal with this matter somewhat in a legalistic way, and I am grateful that he has set a pattern for me to pick up the threads. The essence of the Opposition's Resolution, as moved by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, is that the Minister is guilty of a conflict of interest because of five things, certainly four: (a), that as Minister of Transport and Works he caused a road to be constructed at Trents Plantation in which he had an interest (b), that he never declared that interest, as they say, to Parliament; (c), that the road is longer than necessary and essential for the use of the tenants and (d), the reason for the excess length is that the road is for the private use and benefit of the Minister. That is the crux of the Resolution as I understand it, broken down. They further allege, (e), that the funds used to construct the excess length of road are unlawful expenditure of public funds for private purposes and therefore an abuse of ministerial office.

Since the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central wants to deal with the Resolution like a lawyer, doctor though he is, I say the question for this House to determine is whether these five essentials in the body of the Resolution moved by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) each and every one of them, have been proven to the House's satisfaction. In order to convince the House to support the Resolution, it is my submission that the Opposition must prove their case by fact, not opinions, not belief, not hunches, not emotion. When you make that call for proof by fact and not impressions, opinion or anything else, the Opposition's case breaks down, because if I could summarize what we have heard so far, and perhaps today is a good time since we will have an extended debate to look back at what has been essentially moved on the other side, the mover of the Resolution himself, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central said these words:

"Essentially we are complaining about extension of the road opening up untenanted lands and making them liable to development by the Minister himself; the Minister should have disclosed his interest to Parliament at Estimates time."

That was the contention of the mover of the Resolution.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), aerial map and all, said two things that defeat their case immediately, and from the first day the case was defeated. He said the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central had established two facts; (a), that the plantation is owned by the Minister and, (b), that he became Minister of Transport and Works in February, 1983. Those were the two facts cited by the honourable Member for St. Philip North that had been proven in here. When you examine those facts, you ask the question, so what? Can't a Member of Parliament own a plantation? Can't a Member of Parliament be a Minister of Parliament and own a plantation? Those are the only two facts that have been proven out of their mouths, not from here. If it were otherwise, it would be, can't the Leader of the Opposition himself be a shareholder in Turners Hall Plantation or have an interest in Pickerings Plantation even now or in the old days when he was Prime Minister of this country? I am not saying he cannot own it. What we must be concerned with is how he or any other honourable Member deals — more so a Minister of the Crown I agree a higher duty is imposed on a Minister of the Crown — with his own private interests in the discharge of his public duties. That is the crux of the matter, but the fact that one of us may own a plantation is neither here nor there if the matter is open and above board.

1.05 p.m.

(Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: True.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The honourable Member for St. Philip South is saying, "True." But look what he said last week:

"We are complaining because a Minister is benefitting from Government policy."

Do you know the implications of that wide and ridiculous statement? It has implications for any member of Government on this side. Let us assume that the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works was not Minister of Transport and Works, but any member on the front bench, other than the present Minister of Transport and Works was, and as a result of the calls of the gentleman in the Other Place, as a result of the calls of the Member for St. Lucy, he had decided, as a matter of policy, to deliver a road to the tenants of Trents Plantation, the charge would be different to them but it would still satisfy the honourable Member for St. Philip South, the characterization minimized. The Minister, as the owner of the plantation, would have been seen to be benefitting from Government policy, which is to help plantation tenants, but the road would have been delivered by some other Minister, and that other Minister would have been charged with corruption. We could not win, according to his principle that the Minister is seen to be benefitting from Government policy. No Minister on this side responsible for Transport and Works, by that argument, could ever have delivered the road and the other ancillary services to the tenants of Trents without running the risk of being accused of being in collusion and corruption with his colleagues. If Camie Tudor had anything to do with that argument, it is a masterful way he is putting it.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North, having said that his colleague has established only two facts, which in themselves are innocent, then proceeded to say that the road has been built either through gross negligence, inefficiency or in an attempt to benefit the Minister because the lands could be sold in future at \$1.50 a square foot. The mover of the Resolution called for resignation and alleged corruption. The Member for St. Philip North did not call for resignation but he alleged a different thing altogether; gross negligence, inefficiency or an attempt to benefit the Minister personally. Then, of course, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), to whom I shall return at the end of my speech, is not asking for resignation, he wants a full scale public enquiry. A nice set of words designed to attract the headlines, and he got the headlines the day after!

I said that in looking at the case for the Opposition, we have to be careful that we are not led away by emotion or opinion in determining whether they have

satisfied the House on this occasion. We have to be convinced of factual evidence presented by the other side. It is all well and good for the honourable Member for St. Philip North to say that it was done in an attempt to benefit. How does he know that? That is pure assumption. It is pure belief. It, indeed, may be pure opinion. It is certainly speculative. It is like my trying to say that the people at Pickerings Plantation.....

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Malice, Sir.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am coming to the malice. Leave that until later.

It is like me trying to say that the people at Pickerings Plantation in St. Lucy have not got their title deeds because the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does not agree that the land should be sold to them at ten cents a square foot. It would be a pure wild guess. It would be a pure opinion. I do not know if it is true. He has not told me that that is his reason. I can only guess.

Asides

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know. I mean they say so.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: It is true, too!)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see, somebody say it is true. I will not say that.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: It is a true guess.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He would not do a thing like that, not the honourable Member who I have known for some thirty years.

Asides

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am coming to Turners Hall.

If we accept the honourable Member for St. Philip North that the mover of the Resolution only proved two facts, could that be enough to condemn the Minister? I submit, 'No'. They have not proven the case. All they have proven is that he owns a plantation and that he was Minister of Transport and Works in February, 1982. That is not enough. I mean, by that reasoning, should we condemn the Leader of the Opposition because he is a 30 per cent shareholder in Turners Hall with Mr. Bruce Procope, the late Rowan Henry and Mr. Clyde Turney having 10 per cent. Why? That is the man's private business. I think we have to be careful about the lengths to which we want to extend the conflict of interest principle. Could we say truthfully and move in here some

Resolution that it was a conflict of interest for the Leader of the Opposition, as MP for St. John, but then as Prime Minister, to go to the United States of America in the Seventies ostensibly — this Resolution talks of "ostensibly" too — to recharge batteries? But on some allegation you heard about the place that he wanted to achieve a residential qualification for property ownership? All that is wild speculation, it does not amount to conflict of interest. I do not know, I am only repeating the rumours and showing them the ridiculousness of coming in here with the rumours and assumptions which they are not proving but asking us to come to a conclusion and assume that they are facts....

Is it right for the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Tait) right now to be receiving salary from Parliament and to be on a two months' lecture tour as a Visiting Professor in the States, moonlighting and drawing money over there, too? Is that a conflict of interest? Is that what the Opposition want to talk about? I say there are dangers in extending the conflict of interest principle too far. We must get out of the realm of speculation, or imputation of unproved motives to honourable Members. That is what has happened in here, there has been an imputation of unproved motives by honourable Members on the other side. They have not proven one fact, they are guessing!

Having disposed and made them understand that they cannot come in here with all kinds of wild assumption, there are two questions in this Resolution and in this debate. Did the Minister obtain a benefit? Second question. Is there a benefit that he will obtain? Let us look to answer this properly. To answer this properly, one has to look at what was done. Under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, the qualifying tenants who have been on the land, owning house spots for five years or more, are entitled to purchase their lands for ten cents per square foot. It happened that the Minister was the owner of a plantation, the notices of intention, the Form Ones, were sent to him and the people bought their lots. It is well known, and I am sure it is accepted by the Opposition, that each year an effort is made to do repairs or construction of tenantry roads. I think about \$6 million is to be spent on tenantry roads this year. The Minister did a road not for 25 — they said 25 — but 34 houses. That fact they gave was wrong. As I understand the contention, it is not that the road should have not been done as you come in off the main road from St. Lucy School and goes down to the last house on the left, but it is from there to the two houses up by the tamarind tree — it is not one; there are two houses by Miss Kate Griffith under the tamarind tree — it is that piece of road, and then it goes back towards the exit where there is one wall house being constructed. That is the fact. Do honourable Members know whether on those vacant lands — I call them vacant advisedly — between the last house and the tamarind tree and then around the corner again,

and then the other part of the road that goes up to the exit — there are not agricultural tenants who qualify?
1.15 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But you must write down the facts. You will get the details when the Honourable Prime Minister replies. Before you can run off and accuse people, you must be well seized of all the facts. If you were, you would know that there had been agricultural tenants down there. You have to find out the facts, not me. You bring the case, you have to prove it.

Asides

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He who affirms must prove, well known to you on the other side.

Whether the road should have been brought from the last house up to the last two houses by the tamarind tree or not seems to be in this debate a case again of opinion. Some Members on the other side feel that the road should have stopped and the tenants should be relocated. The honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) went so far to say that this Government has a great record in relocating tenants. But that submission that the people should be relocated betrays a certain amount of innocence of statutory interpretation; an innocence which drew Mr. Frank Alleyne to write about it in the newspaper a week or two ago. Section 29 of the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, 1980, says: (1)

"Where, on the application of the landlord of a lot within a tenantry, the Chief Town Planner certifies for the purposes of Part 1 that the lot is unsuitable for purchase of the freehold therein, the tenant may remain on the lot of the tenant; but, if the tenant so desires, the landlord shall relocate the tenant on any other lot suitable for purchase of the freehold within the tenantry."

The first point to note — the landlord can only relocate if the lot is unsuitable for purchase. Miss Kate Griffith, who raised the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when his grandmother, Mrs. Kate O'Neal, was out in Pickerings and was paying a dollar a shilling a month, she told us that she had always lived there and did not want to be moved. There is nothing wrong with the lot. How can the Honourable Minister, as landlord, go and say that the lot was unsuitable and invoke Section 29. Foolishness! They do not understand what they read, or they are incapable of reading.

Section 29(2) says:

"When there is no other lot available within the tenantry that is suitable for purchase of the

freehold, the landlord may offer to relocate the tenant mentioned in subsection (1) on any available lot within another tenantry that is suitable for the purchase of the freehold therein, in lieu of relocating under subsection (1)."

Clearly, the powers of relocation are restricted, and, clearly, the reasons for restricting the powers of a landlord to relocate was to prevent an unreasonable landlord who did not like your face from saying that you have a nice spot, like up on Kendall looking down and right across the whole of St. George and St. Philip pass Christ Church, and the lot is too good for you because you are poor and black — he is going to put you down in some dark hole. The reason for restricting was to prevent the landlord from having the freedom to treat the tenants badly.

That answers the question of relocation. You cannot relocate just like that. You have to get the Town Planner's certificate and the landlord must prove that the lot is unsuitable. If somebody lived there all their life, how are you going to argue that the lot is suddenly unsuitable?

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talked about the potential benefit. Before you can prove that the Minister was likely to have a benefit, or that there was a potentiality of a benefit, you have to set a substratum of facts from which you can draw the inference that he was likely to benefit. The Opposition has failed miserably to give us these facts. I ask these questions. Is it a fact that the development of vacant lands, even assuming that they are vacant lands for the purpose of argument, would need Town Planning permission? Has the Minister ever applied to the Town Planning for permission to develop the land or sub-divide it in any way? The answers to those are "No".

As recently as the Budget in April, or whenever it was this year, in his reply the Prime Minister gave the House the assurance that just as he had done with Colonel Drax in relation to Drax Hall, all these tenancies would be subjected to Land Development Duty Orders. If you are saying that you do not accept the word of the Prime Minister, come out and say so. Come out and say that you think that he is a liar and you are not willing to go along with his assurance. You dare not say it because you know when he says something, you can rely on it.

There are some subsidiary questions. One is the question of declaration of interest. The last Member who spoke castigated the Minister because he alleged that he had not declared his interest. What is this foolishness I hear about declaration of interest? Who are you to

declare an interest to? As a Cabinet Minister, you must declare your interest when the matter comes up in Cabinet, clearly. That is part of the ministerial convention. If the matter of Trents development and installation of roads had come before the Cabinet, the proper thing for the Minister to do was to disclose his interest there and then, and take no part in the discussion, far less vote. You cannot be wrong on that. We do not know from the honourable Members if they have information that the matter came before Cabinet.

Asides

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not for me to prove. You keep saying that we are to defend. You are to prove it, prove that it went before Cabinet and he did not disclose his interest.

Under Cap. 9, Section 30, that principle of declaration of interest is given statutory strength. Section 30(1) says:

"A member shall not in or before the House to which he belongs take part in the discussion of any matter in which he has a direct pecuniary interest nor vote on any such matter without disclosing the extent of that interest."

The first requirement under Section 30 of Cap. 9 in relation to the matter of Trents before this House, is for it to be shown that the Minister had a direct pecuniary interest, and if he was shown to be in such a position, he would have had to disclose the extent of that interest. There has not been produced to this House in this debate on this Resolution any evidence that the matter of Trents Plantation ever came before this House when the Minister of Transport and Works was Minister of Transport and Works. I am not talking about some previous time when he had another Ministry. Since he has been Minister of Transport and Works the matter has not come before this House to avail him of the opportunity to comply with section 30 and disclose. Do you mean you just come in any old day and disclose you have an interest? The law says when the matter comes before the House. Then is the time that you are required under Section 30 to disclose.

1.25 p.m.

So there are two aspects to the question of declaration of interest, disclosure and declaration. One as a Minister of the Crown, you must do it in Cabinet if a matter comes up in which you are interested, clearly; and two, if a matter is raised directly in the House in which you have a pecuniary interest, you are obligated then to disclose that interest. The honourable Members have not shown us any single occasion where Trents, installation of roads and other services, came up for debate and the Member was in breach of his responsibility under section 30. Failed again! You have not proved that he has not disclosed it in Cabinet, you have not brought any evidence to show that the matter came in here and he failed to act in accordance with Section 9. Failed!

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has had some interest in businesses and lands and so on, because last year we had the National Insurance (Amendment) Act, 1984-18 in here. Must he come in, or did he come in and disclose the interest of Turners Hall and the facts about Turners Hall in relation to National Insurance contributions that were collected? And now they come with a lot of moral authority?

The Opposition has a role, let me not be misunderstood. I am not saying that because there may have been standards of conduct less than ideal on your side that we should deny you the right, because that could lead to all kinds of confusion. The whole point is that when you see corruption, expose it, but do not do it on hunch. Come in here with some facts, otherwise this Resolution would always fail. The truth is that this Resolution is tainted by *mala fides* on the part of the Opposition, and I accuse them of coming in here with this Resolution for collateral purposes.

Mr. M. A. KING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for St. Thomas has accused me — because I am the person in whose name the Resolution stands — of having *mala fides* in bringing this Resolution. He says the Resolution is tainted with *mala fides*. That is imputing, I submit, improper motives to me, Mr. Speaker, and I think the honourable Member should withdraw that allegation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the honourable member the chance to answer that, but this brings him to the end of his speech.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. I want to submit, Mr. Speaker — and I am grateful to you, Sir, for your indulgence — that this road was finished on the 20th November, just before the Black Bess road started, and this road was being constructed during the St. Peter by-election and not one single word was said on it by Members on the other side. You had November, December, January, February, March, April, and as soon as the St. Thomas by-election came along, you had no issue, and this matter was raised for the St. Thomas by-election to create an issue by the other side, well knowing that it would have been difficult for the St. Thomas people to go down to Trents to see if what they were saying was true.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings the honourable Member to the end of his speech.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Speaker, normally I hold the view that in most of these debates it is only necessary for three or four persons on either side to make a contribution, but I consider that this is so important, and the Government in my opinion has so distorted the facts, that it is essential that every member on this side speaks on the motion.

Before I indicate my understanding of the situation, I think it necessary to reply to one or two things that the Member for St. Thomas (Hon. D. A. C. Simmons) said. Does he want us to bring witnesses here to indicate that the Minister in truth and in fact offered to sell the land to someone at \$1.50 per square foot? Does he want us to indicate that soon after the plantation was

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise on a point of order: I can inform the honourable Member that you, Mr. Speaker, have the power to bring anyone before the Bar here. You bring the evidence, let it come before the Bar and we will accept it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is an insult to you, because what he is saying is that you do not know what is going on.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable members are on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw to Your Honour's attention.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise, Sir, to draw to Your Honour's attention certain noises.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker,....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I say I rise to draw to Your Honour's attention that I am hearing noises. I am not quite sure if you, Your Honour, are hearing them, but as Leader of the House I am hearing noises which are not in keeping with this Chamber. I would hate, Mr. Speaker, to draw it to your attention again.

It is a very easy thing. Put \$250 here and come in here, thump the table, laugh and talk. I hear noises and I am not afraid to draw it to your attention that I would ask to have the Gallery cleared. I am prepared to face the public, I am not one of those cowards. I only draw it to your attention, Sir.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know I will get back my two or three minutes.

As I was saying, does the Member for St. Thomas want the Opposition to bring evidence to show that soon after the plantation was purchased that there was a fire and that nothing has been grown on the plantation since then? Which would indicate that there are no agricultural

tenants on the plantation? Because one would think that if there were agricultural tenants on the plantation within the last two years something would have been grown on it.

My understanding of my party's contention.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I am sure the honourable Member did not intend to mislead himself. An agricultural tenant is one who occupies agricultural land. It has nothing to do with whether there is something growing on it or not.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the last Member did not even visit the place. That is all right. I understand.

As I understand it, our contention is that:

(1) the principal party involved in this matter is a Minister of Government, and, more specifically and very relevant, is the Minister of Transport and Works.

That is important.

(2) as I understand it, the land, Trents Plantation, to which reference is being made, is owned by the Minister.

(3) that with the knowledge and approval of the Minister — and may I add my understanding is at the direction of the Minister — a road was built extending some 600 feet beyond which it should have gone as indicated by a plan.

(4) over \$200 000 of the taxpayers' money was spent on that extension.

1.35 p.m.

In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is stating that the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works misspent the public funds for his own benefit, and we are calling upon him to either resign or we are asking the Honourable Prime Minister to remove him.

A lot of play has been made on this question of a benefit. I am saying that the previous behaviour of the Minister would indicate to this House that he knows what a benefit is all about. If one were to look at the antecedents of the Minister, one could recall that some time ago there were a number of buses to be sold at auction and that the Minister, on his own admission, came to this House and said he bought the buses outside of the auction sale. One then has to conclude that he knows what a benefit is about because that was a benefit. We are not saying that nothing has happened before. What I am saying is that the Minister was wrong then when he bought those buses, he is wrong now that he has done this, and if this House had taken the Minister to task

when those buses were purchased, I am quite sure this behaviour which we see today would not have been exhibited, and I am saying, therefore, that he must resign..

Government has made a vain attempt to defend the Minister's action, but when a man is obviously guilty, no defence in this world can make him innocent. This debate is not on Canefield, as the Honourable Prime Minister would make us believe, and those of us who know Canefield would know very well that you have to travel a good few feet before you get to the development on either side, whether you come from Dunscombe, the Home, or Airy Cot. It is not that you had to go past the development to get into Canefield. I hope that an aerial photograph would be presented of Canefield because it would show that Canefield and Trents are totally different. There is no comparison whatsoever of the two.

This debate is not about Drax Hall. This debate is not about the last Administration, and in response to something which the Minister of Trade had to say — he said, as far as I understand, that we are trying to sully the good name of Barbados — I wonder what that party tried to do when they instituted the Duffus Commission. If they were not trying to sully the good name of Barbados, they were trying to destroy the Opposition and bring a one party state in this country. If that is not their alternative, that is my interpretation of it.

We are in a democracy, and, thank heavens, in the summary of that Commission, I think it is chapter 7, page 106, paragraph 9, the good gentleman said there was no evidence of anything corrupt, or fraudulent on the part of any Minister, or any official of Government, or any of the persons or companies concerned with the matters which were enquired into. He further went on to say — and I think I had better mention this — that it is not the duty of the Commissioner to say whether he thinks the policy was right or wrong. Even in the courts of law, matters of policy by a duly-elected Government ought not to be challenged. I mention this because they spent about \$500 000 on that Commission only to find that they had to come back and spend millions of dollars on doing things they should have done earlier.

Let us put aside the last Administration. Your Commission said there was nothing wrong, so forget about that. Reference to the administration is irrelevant. It is as irrelevant as if this side were to try and discuss the expenditure now being spent at Ilaro Court, scandalous as it is, some \$75 000 or \$100 000 spent on Ilaro Court.

(Aside: That is Trents?)

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: That is not Trents. I am saying that it is as irrelevant as if we mentioned that. That property also needs investigating, but that is not the

point here today. I am here because we are discussing Trents, but, talking about Ilaro Court, I was walking the road and a man ran up to me and said to me that I should check and see who sells tiles in this country and I would know where the \$75 000 is going. I told him that that is not my business. I am not interested in that, because if somebody comes to me and I am a tile seller, whether it is my mother, brother or sister, I would sell tiles, as simple as that.

But Ilaro Court, or Canefield, or Drax Hall is not part of this. The point here is that the road at Trents Plantation was built at the taxpayers' expense and that it was a benefit to the Minister. If one were to look at the road, one could look at it as though it were a triangle on two sides and we will concede that there are houses on two sides, but on one side there is no house at all and there was no need to build that extra 600 feet of road. We have produced in this debate aerial photographs to indicate what we are speaking about, and those points are crystal clear. Only those who do not want to see would not see. Only those who do not want to believe would not believe.

I want to make mention of the Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite). I have been watching him over a number of years and he comes in here and ever so often talk about christianity. We are all christians. As a matter of fact, when I was a little boy, there was a hymn which said, "I was made a christian when my name was given," so you do not have to come in here and say you are a Christian. It is when people have to emphasize or try to impress that they are Christians that I have doubts about them. It was said that he who says, "Lord, Lord," would not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. You do not have to impress me, you have to impress him. Furthermore, anybody who talks about christianity is hypocritical. We are all Christians.

We say that this is the highest court of the land. My experience in the courts is that those who come to give evidence you hear them say, "I believe in God, I am a Christian," are the first to tell the biggest lie.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member trying to indicate that the honourable Member for St. Lucy has been telling lies in this Chamber?

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: I have not said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would rather the honourable Member change his line of address because that seems to be what you are saying.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: I have not said that. All I am saying.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not said it, but that is the implication I am getting.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if that is the implication, that is not what I intend. I am only saying what my experience is.

Mr. SPEAKER: You started on the honourable Member for St. Lucy and you proceeded to say who are Christians and who are not Christians and who cry, "Lord, Lord" and who would not gain his place. I thought you were dealing with the Resolution about Trents. I would very much like the honourable Member to stick to the Resolution. If the honourable Member wants to bring a Resolution against the honourable Member for St. Lucy, I would welcome it and I would approve it; then he can deal with it.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am responding to things being said on the other side. That is all I am doing.

The honourable Member said, "What is spending money on a little road when you are spending \$621 million." I do not understand what he was saying there, as though it is okay, the road is not that big and therefore the money spent on it is very small, so it does not matter. But it matters if you are wrong, and in this case we are saying that the Minister is wrong.

Then we heard, I believe, the Minister of Information. He is better known to us in St. James as the Minister in Exile, but that is neither here nor there. I understand that the Minister said he was going to call my name. I wonder why. I never brought any cars into this country and did not pay any duty on them. What does he call my name for? I never had my car driven off without paying the \$75 000. I was not involved in that. We are dealing with Trents Plantation and Trents Plantation is the issue, and all I am saying is to reinforce what our side has been saying.

I do not understand why a matter which is so simple needs the type of irrelevant defence which is being put up. Even the Honourable Prime Minister as he spoke reminded me of a defence lawyer who has got a case in which he cannot have a guilty plea, and the man says "I am guilty, the facts are there". In the same way the Honourable Minister is guilty; the road is there, you cannot fold it up like a carpet. We can go and see it, and if anybody is in doubt, he should go down there and see it for themselves if that is possible. If that is the evidence we want, we can all go down there and see it.

The Honourable Prime Minister gave me the impression that because he had to speak, he spoke, so he spoke about Canefield, Drax Hall and other roads which have no bearing on this. Our case is crystal clear. The

road at Trents was built on lands owned by an Honourable Minister, the Minister of Transport and Works, the Minister who is responsible for road building. The honourable Member for St. Thomas said, "Suppose it was another Minister." We are not dealing with suppositions, we are dealing with facts, and you cannot alter the facts in order to prove your point. The fact of the matter is that he is no other Minister than the Minister of Transport and Works. To suggest that he might be another Minister does not come into it, and he is the Minister responsible for building roads, and we are saying that he should have taken more care of what went on down there.

He knew about it because he lives there. That is another point I make. He lives at Trents. It is not that he lives in St. George and comes down there occasionally. He had to know what was going on, and therefore we are saying on the basis of that that if he had knowledge or it was with his approval — and, as I understand, at his direction — that the road was extended, then he is guilty and he must resign or the Prime Minister must ask him to go.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Speaker, I was away when this debate started, but I took pains to listen to and read what was said by all the honourable Members on that side. Since the honourable Member who took his seat last took some time to talk about the Bible and christianity, I want to begin by telling him that the Bible warns against people who have mote in their eye. Look into your own eye before you can see that in your brother's. I am happy that it has not been proven or said that \$2.7 million were stolen by a brother of any of my ministerial colleagues. The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) should be aware of a lot of things before he got into this debate and talked and made allegations and accusations.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) must also take heed. I do not want to say a lot of things. The honourable Member knows that I know a lot of things, and I would not want to say them today, but I will say some, because the honourable Member talks about integrity and failure to disclose interest in certain deals, and that when matters come before this Honourable Chamber, Members ought to disclose their interest. The honourable member knows that he is an adviser on severance payment. He knows that he has been writing and representing a number of persons on the matter of severance payments, but when matters come before this Honourable Chamber dealing with severance payments, he has never got up and disclosed his interest. He works for the Barbados Workers Union, and there are some other things that I know of, because I have got evidence and I can bring it here too,

of persons who belong to the Barbados Workers Union for whom the honourable Member works, and on the other hand he turns around and works for members in his private capacity — and double charges them, too! You get up and deny it. I challenge you. You get money from the Barbados Workers Union and then take from the clients money from the money they receive for severance payment. I can bring them.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central were ordered to be struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Outside? Do not challenge me, brother. Deal with your company. I am not afraid of you. I have dealt with you already. I am going to strike you where it hurts and I am going to tell the truth. I am prepared to bring someone in here today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in here.

Laughter in the Gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to make it absolutely clear, as I have said before, that persons in the Gallery are allowed in here at the pleasure of Parliament. They are not allowed to participate in the debate. If I hear any more behaviour of that nature, I shall call on the Marshal and ask him to clear the Gallery. Please understand that.

The honourable Member will now continue?

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I would not want to bring the person in here. I will take your instructions, Mr. Speaker. I would not want to bring Mr. Downey before him because the honourable Member would not want to see him.

I have heard a lot about scandal. It is time that the public of Barbados understand that they should not take the Opposition seriously. I was a victim of scandal and rumour, initiated by the honourable Members from that side and supported by them right through. It caused me hurt, caused my family pain and caused this country lots of sleepless nights because of the irresponsible conduct and behaviour of Members on that side. They ought to be ashamed, and now they are trying to put my colleague here under pressure with yet another rumour.

1.55 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. James South was a Magistrate at the time. I remember you well. He called me before him. He was a member of the Democratic Labour Party, a paid-up member of the Democratic Labour Party. He was in breach of the Public Services Commission Rules and practices. It was very indecent and immoral of the honourable Member to be a member of a political Party and sitting on the bench at the same time.

He was also canvassing at the time, and little did this country know that he had political aspirations and sought to denigrate me, to drag me in the gutter, caused me to lose a life and cause my family hurt and distress.

You come in here today to say something about christianity. Let me say this to you, God moves in a mysterious way, and what has not caught you now will not pass you because you will live to see your misdeeds. You stand up talking about christianity — that is sacrilege.

This country realized what that rumour meant. I could not walk the streets. Wherever I went I was being accused of the most heinous crime in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the debate.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am on the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the debate.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am on the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get to the Resolution.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: We are talking about charges of immorality and corruption. That is what this motion is all about. But a Commission reported that nothing that the members had alleged was true. And what they did disclose was that persons involved were family of the Members of that side.

The honourable Member, true it is, is the owner of Trents Plantation. There are tenants who live on that plantation. I submit, I believe and am convinced that persons who live on all plantation tenancies have a right to an improvement in their way of life. I would be terribly unhappy with my colleague, or any colleague sitting on the other side, if he were a landlord and people needed their land improved and they had failed to address themselves to that particular matter. The honourable Member ought to be supported, and I congratulate him for taking the initiative to see that those persons' lot was improved.

I have said that we need not go far to understand this question of development. It is a policy of this Government that the lot of persons who live in the plantation tenancies should be improved. What is wrong with providing a road? Who determines how far a road should go? There is one point I have not heard. We have to make projections and if a road is built beyond where houses are, there is absolutely nothing wrong. Let me get this straight and plain; you have to anticipate where people will live, and where there are agricultural holdings, the law provides that the landlord or owner of that lot is

entitled to put a house. The way how things are developing in this country, I feel strongly – and the Opposition knows this too. Do not mind that they do not have the guts to get up and say so – that persons are taking advantage of the agricultural holdings to erect houses.

I know from my experience that persons have agricultural holdings and those holdings have not been cultivated over past years. It is not that the persons do not want to cultivate them. It is because sometimes they do not have proper access to their holdings. I know about this, because I was born in the country, and I know what is meant by having an agricultural holding in an area that does not have proper road facilities to it. My father had land, so I can talk about it from experience, farther away from where we live, and because of inaccessibility to the land, my father decided to abandon the working of the land. Once roads are put in, you would find persons who have such holdings reactivating the cultivation of such lands. So what nonsense am I hearing from the honourable Member for St. James South?

People keep talking about this Trents matter. I am beginning to wonder. Are there any other matters in this country that we need to address ourselves to? Why does the Opposition not find time to educate the people, to educate their own Young Democrats to try to understand that we should all try and conceive projects and take initiatives that help this country, and our young people?

A few weeks ago, just before I left the country, the honourable Member from the Other Place as well as honourable Members from that side made a lot of stir and fuss about the Child Care Board, there was need for an enquiry, and you would have thought that there was corruption and all things were wrong. The same one who lost his seat, the former Member for St. Lucy, was the one to the fore and the Right Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, had a part to play in it, too. But what has happened? Last Sunday, the Young Democrats of the Democratic Labour Party held a function and honoured the same Member for St. James South. You know, life has its strange way of disclosing and playing parts. The same young Democrats presented a Certificate of Appreciation to the Child Care Board for the outstanding contribution for the youth of Barbados. Do you know what that says? That while the honourable Members from that side were ranting, raving, criticising and making allegations about the Child Care Board, the young Democrats were saying that they fully appreciated the outstanding work of the same Child Care Board. Why do you not go publicly now and say you were wrong and you were unfair to the Child Care Board? But, thank God, the young Democrats have a little bit more sense than you.

The same way they were unfair to me, you are now being unfair to my colleague. But it is only a matter of time. If the Opposition thinks that by smear campaigns, they would be able to dislodge a colleague on this side, let me say this to you – I moved from a 73 vote majority to 240. I increased. All it will do is to help fortify my colleague because the people will see in you a group of people who operate on smear campaigns. The country does not want this. It does not deserve it. We have got more important business to discuss in this Honourable Chamber.
2.05 p.m.

The public of Barbados should not be subjected to this. It is a Resolution coming from frustrated people. They do not know which direction to take to assist the young people or to provide jobs in Barbados. It is time that they be told that nothing of this sort of smear campaign will stop the Barbados Labour Party and this Government from steering the course to recovering the economy of this country. The young people deserve better.

You are talking about morality. Morality has wide and far-reaching implications and meanings. Do not touch on the subject. It will not go down well with you fellows over there. You voted against integrity legislation. You did not want to see it.

This debate only helps to take up much valuable time that can be used to help discuss national issues. We have got lots of other important issues. There are other ways to deal with my colleague. You have to wait until the bell is rung and the time is right. But in the meantime, let us understand that my colleague has done absolutely nothing wrong, and I want the Opposition to understand that you are wasting time, and you must realize that people are very much disappointed in your debate and your approach to national life in this country.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m. today for lunch, which will be taken at Queen's Park in the light that the dining hall is not yet completely renovated.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on the motion, we on this side would like to know what is the procedure after lunch, whether Private Members Business is to continue or if we are to go into Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this will be decided, as I indicated, by the Leader of the House. I would advise the Leader of the Opposition that it would be his duty to return to Parliament so as to be *au fait* with what will be happening.

The question that this sitting be suspended for lunch until 3.30 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
2.13 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West was about to speak. If he so desires, he may now continue.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, my inclination to speak on this Resolution springs primarily from the performance of Members on the other side and my own feeling about parliamentary democracy. I am not going to be emotional, neither would I want to repeat many of the things that have been said in the debate, but I support this Resolution because I interpret it to be one which seeks not to destroy but to correct and keep on the straight and narrow path those who might go astray. Hence, the Resolution. If then the Minister involved has constructed a road far beyond the limits necessary and essential for legitimate use and requirements for the said tenants, and if the honourable Member has failed to declare his interest, it is fair that we ask on this side that some measure of correction be taken. It is because of that that I speak on this Resolution.

When the Government was in Opposition and they perceived that the present Opposition had been doing something which they considered corrupt and not in the interest of the country, they sought to correct it, and my recollection is that we on this side co-operated very fully with that. As a matter of fact, we are doing nothing more than what they have set as a precedent. What they did, they went to the country and held meetings and explained to the general public that they considered the seriousness of the particular complaint they had. We co-operated, we gave evidence, and one can clearly say that the general public has become satisfied, because since then I have not heard any of the allegations or accusations, such as that the former Prime Minister had two aeroplanes and things of that sort. It has settled that once and for all. What we in the Opposition are doing today is the very same thing, to make clear the way for the present Minister. After all, if we feel that there is something wrong, it is our duty to draw it to the Chamber, and certainly to set the electorate at ease so that our country would continue to function as we have seen it in the past.

It appears to me that the Government members continued in their speeches to dance around the Trents issue as bees unwilling to go into a hive. We had long statements and wide statements in respect of the law, we had statements in respect of what they feel is right. We on this side do not share that view, simply because to

call other people's names, to introduce other subjects which are not really relevant — because I believe this is about the first motion that I have been able to follow up where a Minister has been brought before Parliament in this way — would create a kind of stir among people in respect of this particular Resolution. So I am not emotional, I am not here to destroy any particular individual, but to preserve what I consider to be parliamentary democracy. The Resolution itself falls within the province of the Opposition and it will do the country very much good. There is nothing comforting about the Resolution itself, no more than to hope that the outcome of this Resolution will once and for all make a clear and straight path if the Minister so involved is able to continue or proceed with development.

My view on the matter is that, in dealing with matters of this sort, one has to take two things into consideration, the quality of the person and the facilities which one has at one's disposal. It has nothing to do with providing tenants with tenantry roads, for I can go as far back as the 1960s, when we were in the Government, and say that tenantry roads were a common thing. You see them, but they may not have proceeded at the pace at which most of us would have wanted them to, but tenantry roads are natural, and it is not fair to believe that this Government or any Government for that matter, or the Opposition, would want to take away the right. I, as a representative of a constituency, am seeking day after day to ask the Minister to put roads in that constituency, so I perceive the need and the necessity for such things to be done. Therefore, the tenantry road itself as pertaining to those who are there is no problem.

But we believe that the problem must have arisen when someone, whether the Minister was the one responsible for the planning forgot a simple mathematical, straightforward saying — the shortest distance between two points has always been the straight line. It has never been a triangle, it has always been a straight line.

If I understand the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) correctly, he spoke about discretion. You cannot use discretion in a situation like this by saying that you want to move from point A to point B and that you have to make a circle or a triangle. That does not appear to me to be logical, and it follows from that that since the Government has been complaining of its difficulties in finding enough finance to assist other areas, one obviously would be critical of any extra — or in this case extravagant — spending that might not be necessary at all where it can be diverted to another situation.

We are contending that the discretion used seems to have a motivation, and if I were in the honourable Member's place I would feel very uneasy, because none of the Members who have spoken on that side seemed to

have given him the comfort that he has proceeded in a correct manner. They all suggested that there are similar situations, but they have never said that this situation is so ideal that we can use it for any other situation that may arise. I feel that, with that doubt in my mind, they themselves are finding some difficulty to justify the present action.

It does not matter which Minister it is, the point is that we need to satisfy all those concerned with the process. Motivation has not been cleared up. I have not heard one of the Members on the other side suggest that the Minister was perfectly right in so doing, but, as I said, they danced around the issue by bringing other irrelevancies that seem not to square up with the same issue. I would suggest to any one of them who may speak after to bring an identical situation in which we can say that squares with the issue. We have not seen that.

Since we are not able to read the Minister's mind, or whether Government has been responsible for it, because it is a collective responsibility, even though the Minister is here charged before us, I believe that the Government in its own right would have to take some of the responsibility for it, and I am still awaiting those Members to speak to give us a very clear and definite reason why he did not choose the shortest distance between two points rather than the triangle.

I could start to develop that. If you go into a triangle situation, you have three sides, and there is the problem, which side is for whom and which side is not for whom. Clearly we would need to be very satisfied in our minds.

I would go a little further and say this. Apart from motivation, we live in a democratic society. We live in a country which has projected itself to be a model in terms of Government. These Resolutions do us good, but at the same time we have to recognise the dangers that are inherent in them.

One of the failings in Third World countries today is the fact that corruption and greed and graft seem to have overtaken many of those countries. If you go to the Latin Americas, you find that Governments are changed — and this is the real significance of this Resolution before us, not necessarily the Minister involved but the actions that one sees that can precipitate a more dangerous situation that could destroy the whole structure of Cabinet Government and probably democratic Government as well. In the Latin Americas this sort of situation is the ideal situation for military takeovers.

If you switch to Africa, you see the same problem there where Governments become, or appear to become involved in such actions that let in what we call the

military. In years gone by, perhaps the electorate could probably deal exclusively with all those involved, but we have an Army today, too, and those people themselves do watch the situation and they use as a pretence this kind of behavioural pattern we are talking about today as a means of disrupting our democratic process.

My main concern has always been to remain democratic. We must practise it in the way in which we can keep it going for the benefit of all of us. And so I feel very strongly on the Resolution in respect of the fact that we have not been able to get a good response from the other side. I think they need to get away from the idea that because the Democratic Labour Party might have failed in one respect, they should feel satisfied about that. That is not the answer. You are there to correct any misdeeds or misdoings on anyone's part, whether within or outside your ranks.

3.40 p.m.

There are many other areas in which this particular Resolution must be seen in. We must see it as the electorate sees it. They must not judge us by hearsay. They must be given the true facts of the case, and the facts as we understand them are that we have an unnecessary extension, and we also have a situation in which we have spent money which could easily be spent in another area.

There is no justification in believing that those who are following this debate today are satisfied that we are here for making a show. It is not a political show because the time and place for political ranting and raving, I believe, surely will come, and we will be able to say all we want to say on the political front.

This Resolution strikes at the heart of Government. It tells us the kind of people we are supposed to put to run our affairs and the kind of people who expect to be examples to us. Being a Christian today seems not to be the thing which people catch on very easily, because we have allowed some of the bad things from other areas to tarnish our way of life. Therefore, our very actions must be above suspicion.

The law must take its course. The honourable Member for St. Thomas made his case as he sees it; in fact, as other lawyers. We on this side are not disputing that the law is not placed in its right perspective or it ought not to be brought in the relevant situation. We must make sure that there is no kind of discrimination between one person or another. You must not make people believe that because you are a Minister of Government, you have a right to violate the law.

We are not encouraging the Minister to violate the law, or even to disregard the law. What we are saying is that we must operate within the law, and as long as we

are satisfied that any Member on that side could assure us that they, together, have given the Minister a free hand in going ahead, then we on this side, will have to make sure that that free hand is within the context of what is to be done. We have heard that there has been some misunderstanding between those who extended the road and those who have been given the authority to do so. These are the things we would like to know. We would like to know that that kind of development has had all the necessary agreements to make it a worthwhile one.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, most of the points raised by the Opposition are altogether embodied in what we consider to be the problem with that development. I therefore ask that those who get up to speak and to defend the Minister will clear up the whole situation, give us the reasons why they have deviated from the shortest route, what is the motivation for the development and, if any what advantages are likely to develop out of this whole exercise.

I am going to support the Resolution based on what I have heard from the Members on this side and the doubts which have been cast in my mind from the other side. I hope that we would be able to remove and correct, as I said, any problems that have arisen within this whole exercise and that this would serve as an example to any person who chooses to take another route other than the correct route.

Hon. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to place on record my congratulations to the Government, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House particularly, for entertaining this discussion here in Parliament. It shows you that when the Barbados Labour Party is in power, democracy is alive and well, because when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, there were several areas of public disquiet which when we were in Opposition and we tried to raise in this Honourable Chamber, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, then the Government did not give us the opportunity to raise those areas of public disquiet as we saw them.

I think it is quite right for an Opposition party to bring to the attention of the Government or, indeed, the people of Barbados, if they think that something is going wrong, but I must say I am very disappointed in the Opposition today because, as the Attorney General pointed out, it is politics that we are playing. I think the time has come in public life when we must separate politics from declaration of interest, conflict of interest, corruption among politicians and misuse of ministerial power, because we walk on a very thin line. The Attorney General very rightly pointed out that the road was being built at the time of the St. Peter by-election and nothing was said about it, and the Democratic Labour Party Opposition did nothing about it. They waited until the

St. Thomas by-election before they brought it up, because they did not have an issue.

3.50 p.m.

On the whole question of conflict of interest and declaration of interest, I would just like to add something to what the Attorney General said when he mentioned the present Leader of the Opposition's involvement in Turners Hall. I do not think there is anything wrong with the Leader of the Opposition having a 30 per cent share in Turners Hall. That is not the point. Nor do I care that the company that owned Turners Hall owes the Barbados National Bank \$1.243 million. I do not care about that either, because, as a private citizen, the Leader of the Opposition is entitled, like any other citizen, to go to the Barbados National Bank and to borrow sums of money. But we have debated the Barbados National Bank on many occasions and I have never ever heard the Leader of the Opposition declare his interest.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order: The honourable Member has made certain statements which are untrue. I have never been to the National Bank even for \$5 for any purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, it is a point of explanation.

Hon. A. TRUSS: I accept the point of explanation. I will still continue to make my point. Turners Hall Plantation is owned by a company called the Barbados Estates Limited, whose shareholder directors are Rohan Henry from Antigua — he is dead, he was murdered but that is not the issue here — I have not asked the Leader of the Opposition how he was murdered — he owned 30 percent — Bruce Procope of Trinidad, 30 per cent; one Errol Barrow, 30 per cent; and one Clyde Turney, 10 per cent. At the end of May, 1985, the company had owed the Barbados National Bank \$1.243 million. Fact.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation; I do not own 30 per cent in Turners Hall. The honourable Member said that is a fact. He is misleading the House. I will straighten the matter out when I get up, Sir.

Hon. A. TRUSS: Sir, I have a great deal of respect for many Members on that side, particularly for the Leader of Opposition, but the point I am trying to make simply is that because the Leader of the Opposition did not declare an interest does not make him a crook. He is entitled to borrow money from the Barbados National Bank like any citizen of Barbados. That is the point I am making.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, sometimes when he starts to talk with his piousness I wonder where he comes from. He talked

about abuse of ministerial power, conflict of interest, corruption, the fact that there is declaration of interest by members of Cabinet, that we could take a stand for morality and honesty in public life and, I am quoting him, we should return dignity to public life. Where was he when the Democratic Labour Party was in power and the M.V. Northpoint was bought, International Seafoods Limited was a scandal, Golden Mile Limited was in ruins, Carib West Limited was bankrupt and Bath Plantation Limited was purchased that drove the Barbados Development Bank bankrupt, because no lending institution would touch it? Where was he then? I did not hear a word out of his mouth.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of privilege.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anytime a Member rises on a point of privilege, it must be heard forthwith. Let me hear you now.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. A. TRUSS: I trust you will give me my time.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South quoted from the Duffus Report. I am not misrepresenting it. It is right here in front of me, it is already a document of this House and I will make it a document of the House again if he so desires.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Member should tell us what he is quoting from.

Hon. A. TRUSS: I have not yet started, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Tell us what document you are quoting from so that we know where we are.

Hon. A. TRUSS: When I start to quote from the Duffus Report, I will be telling you what page, and I will give you line, verse and chapter as well.

The important fundamental point, before I deal with Duffus, is that I do not think there is a Member in this Chamber who genuinely and honestly feels that the Minister of Transport and Works did something that he should not have done or did something in his best interest. I do not honestly feel that, because I believe it would be pulling down the Members of this Honourable Chamber. The people of Barbados have the opportunity

of voting, and when they do cast their votes, judgment is passed and we should accept that judgment.

What the Opposition basically is accusing us of is corrupt Government and dishonesty in Government. On page 106 of the Duffus Report — the honourable Member for St. Michael South in his contribution last Tuesday read from page 106, but he stopped after the first paragraph and I will continue — Duffus said:

"It must be pointed out that at the first sitting of the Commission, Mr. Moseley had made it clear that there were no allegations of corruption or fraud, and that what the present Administration " — meaning the B.L.P. — after we came into power "had said was that there were infelicities. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines 'infelicity' as 'unhappiness — misfortune —' etc."

Certainly it can be said that four of the enterprises under this investigation, according to Duffus, were infelicities. We never accused them of corruption. Even then we chose our words very carefully in Opposition and in Government, because we did not have proof and we did not think it would be right to go to the country and to come into this place and accuse anyone of corruption. The Opposition, as far as I am concerned, have let the country down. They have no facts, as we have been enlightened by the Attorney General, no proof, but they come in here with wide allegations, slanderous statements, swinging left, right and centre because they try to score political points.

Let me deal with some of the things that Duffus had to say in relation to the matters that when we were in Opposition we considered to be causing public disquiet. The Northpoint. Duffus asked on page 20:

"Was it a wise policy to have purchased the ship, reconditioned it at great expense and brought it to Barbados without any firm plans for its remunerative use until such time as it would be required to transport the machinery and equipment for the cement plant?"

He asked again:

"Was it a wise policy to have purchased the ship without any provision being made by Parliament...". That is the key. They purchased the ship; under Head 59 of the Estimates "Purchase of Assets", which was under the sole control of the then Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Member for St. John, where he could buy anything at all without coming to Parliament. Duffus asked:

"Was it a wise policy to have purchased the ship without any provision being made by Parliament for the cost of its upkeep, maintenance and operation? After all it was a very large and very costly item of capital expenditure requiring daily routine attention,

unlike, say, a mere motor lorry? Was it a wise policy for so much secrecy to have been observed?" Those are the questions that Duffus asked. In relation to International Seafoods Limited, why did Government agree so readily to guarantee a loan of US \$3.297 million?

Here we are talking about a piece of road for some people when ministerial judgment comes into play, as far as I am concerned, and if the Minister has made a mistake, his mistake was in his judgment, not in his dishonesty or his corruption, because as a Minister myself, I know that papers come before you, as some of those on that side would know when they were in Government, and you would have to make value judgments. You are only human. Sometimes they are right and sometimes they are wrong, but nevertheless they are made in the best of faith and in the best interest of this country. That is the fundamental point.

Why did the Government agree, the Democratic Labour Party, to guarantee a loan of US \$3.297 million for a private enterprise which was owned and controlled by three persons? Why did the Government purchase shares when it was proven that the shares were worth nothing? The Government paid the three persons exactly what it paid for the shares. The company, International Seafoods Limited, was bankrupt.
4.00 p.m.

On page 33, quoting Duffus, it says:

"Mr. Harcourt Lewis, who was then the Permanent Secretary (Finance) and is now the President of the Barbados National Bank, stated on oath that he would have paid \$1 for all 125 000 shares. Mr. R. St. Clair Stuart, formerly the Chief Accountant in the Ministry of Finance and who is now the Managing Director of ISL, stated "on a strictly commercial basis I don't think they would find anybody to buy those shares."

Yet, the Democratic Labour Party paid \$4 million for the shares of a totally bankrupt company to bail out three DLP directors. Now, they have the gall to come into this Honourable Chamber and to grandstand on the Barbados Labour Party when, beyond the shadow of a doubt, when you talk about integrity in public life and take a stand for morality and honesty in public life, we are the ones, with respect, and with humility if I may add, that have brought morality back to the domain where it is respectable once more.

(Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Is that true?)

Hon. A. TRUSS: I say that with a little humility, Sir.

Duffus said in relation to Carib West Airways on page 65:

"One can understand Mr. Barrow's reluctance at the start to commit Government to the heavy capital

expenditure which would have had to be undertaken, but, the question must be asked why did he suddenly decide to participate in the venture at a time when it was hopelessly in debt and quite insolvent?"

"The evidence indicates that Carib West was totally insolvent. The company owned no aircraft. It had no goodwill it is therefore quite clear that the Government of Barbados on the sudden change of mind of its Minister of Finance, and without the knowledge of Parliament, saddled the taxpayers with a liability of over \$1 million for which there was no *quid pro quo*."

Judgment, Mr. Speaker. I am not accusing the Right Honourable Member for St. John of being dishonest, but of having bad judgment. Mr. Duffus also accused him of bad judgment.

He went on to say, on page 66:

"What motivated Mr. Barrow in this instance?"

Was it the national interest? He continued on page 67:

"Certainly the personal and private interest of Mr. Went and Mr. Mayers required it."

Not necessarily in the best interest of the national interest.

This brings another point into focus. Mr. Went was so sure that Cabinet would have on the Thursday bought Carib West that he gave the bank an assurance the Wednesday before Cabinet that he could pay them. It came out quite clearly that a Cabinet Minister told Mr. Went, a Director of Carib West, that Cabinet was going to discuss the matter the following day and bail him out.

It went on to say on page 67:

"The Edghills and the American shareholders...(of Carib West)....were also extremely fortunate in being able to get their money back from the Airline and they too ought to be most grateful to Mr. Barrow and the Barbadian tax-payers."

It is a question of judgement. Mr. Barrow in his wisdom paid out Mr. Mayers, Mr. Edghill and Mr. Went millions of dollars for a bankrupt company.

That was one of the things that we considered to have been of great importance to this country, yet when we were the Opposition of the country at the time, and raised these questions, the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party, never saw it fit to give the Opposition the opportunity to discuss the Resolution.

That is why I congratulate the Government for entertaining any Resolution. As the Leader of the House said, the right people have brought the right Resolution at the right time and in the right place. We have nothing to hide, Sir, and we will continue with open Government, free and fair elections and morality and decency in public life.

In relation to Bath Plantation, on page 94, in the "CONCLUSIONS" Duffus said:

"The evidence indicates that the Board and the Development Bank erred when it gave the guarantee to the First National City Bank for \$2 100 000, as it had not given proper consideration to the matter."

It said:

"Slackness and incompetence of a high degree were shown in the Bank's officers in dealing with this entirely new matter, which involved one and three quarters of a Million Dollars by telephone conversations only – totally unsupported"

by any documentary evidence.

When the Democratic Labour Party was in power, millions of dollars in transactions by telephone took place between Ministers to bank managers, without reference to notes, without reference to signatories of contracts, or without reference indeed, to Parliament.

"The Chairman and the Secretary (of that Corporation)... erred greatly when he wrote the letter, supra, stating that the Bank would guarantee repayment of \$1.75 million." Sir.

Not only did they do the wrong thing. Not only did they take instructions from a Minister to lend out millions of dollars over the telephone, but enshrined in the constitution of the Bank is that it was against the policy of the bank to lend money or to guarantee loans for the purchase of land. These are the things which I believe we should address our minds to, and it is unfortunate that from time to time we have to bring these things back up.

I will reiterate my position. I do not believe that the mover of this Resolution, the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Opposition believe the foolishness that this Resolution brings forth. I believe that to some extent we in Barbados have been extremely fortunate when compared with other Caribbean territories, and the time has come when we, as politicians, must stop pulling the country down and stop pulling ourselves down. Whenever the Democratic Labour Party should find themselves in power, be it 1991, 1986, 2001, or whenever, we will have to assume, in the best public interest, that they will run the Government and

take decisions that are necessary in the best interest of the public of Barbados, and I do wish that the Opposition would show some political maturity by not attacking the Government on foolishness and at least giving the Government common sense.

We on this side are aware of our duties. I cannot say that in the eight years the Barbados Labour Party has been in power we have always made the right decisions, nor can I say it will continue to make the right decisions, because there comes a time when judgement comes into play, and a person can only make a judgement based on information or a particular document. We are all human beings, we are subject to errors and we are subject to making mistakes. I will go that far, but I will go no further.

I do wish that the Opposition would show some political maturity when they are dealing with these matters. I am sick and tired of hearing the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talking about abuse of ministerial power and declaration of interest. When he was with the Democratic Labour Party, I want to know where his voice was – a voice in the wilderness? – when Mr. Duffus challenged the judgement of the Democratic Labour Party on at least five counts. The conflict of interest has been pointed out by members on that side, by the Right Leader of the Opposition himself – a man the country holds to high esteem.
4.10 p.m.

The point is this. No one has accused anyone of corruption, so I take very strong objection to being told that we on this side must take a stand for morality and honesty in public life. It is dishonest, as far as I am concerned, for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who has not even served in Government, to be making these statements. He has introduced into this Parliament the sort of dirty politics I think this Parliament would do a lot better if we did not have that, and the sooner parliamentarians on both sides of the House, particularly the Opposition, recognizes that we are here to serve the people in the best interest of the people and that we are accountable to the people, we have to face the people, the better. I do think that the Members on that side should stop their grandstanding, stop trying to make cheap political capital out of a non-entity. I know the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works, and I will stake my life and I will swear on a stack of Bibles – that is how sure I am of the man's integrity, and I think it is a sad day in Parliament that the Opposition should be seeking to destroy this decent and honourable man by dragging politics into this Chamber.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): The honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Hon. A.

Truss) began by saying that he wants to congratulate the Government on entertaining this Resolution. I do not know what he means by 'entertaining this Resolution', because I do not believe the Government had a choice in this matter. It is entirely a matter for you, Sir, the Speaker, to determine whether this Resolution is important to be presented to this Chamber, and once you have so determined it, there was no alternative but to place it on the Order Paper and debate it.

Asides

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That is the position! It had to be put on the Order Paper and debated. You are talking foolishness! We have a right to debate. If you did not want to debate it, then you did not have to, that is entirely a matter for you. But we have a right under Private Members Business to debate matters, and I am surprised that we have to congratulate a Government on doing the things that it has got to do.

When we were in the Government, we did it. When the Government was in Opposition, it brought a similar motion against a Cabinet Minister. It was debated in this Chamber and reference has been made in this debate to the debate then about the wrong place and wrong time. When do you think that was said? Outside in the Public Buildings yard?

This debate seems to have taken some kind of a legalistic turn, and we are being told that we have not proved this and we have not proved that, we have not presented the facts. We are not here to prove anything. We are here as a matter of duty, drawing to the attention of the Honourable Prime Minister, this Honourable Chamber and people at large a problem that exists, and it is entirely a matter for the Prime Minister to take cognizance of the points that we have raised here and do his own investigations. We are not any judge or jury, let him make his own investigations.

We have not brought a Resolution here that the honourable Member must leave the Chamber and we have to prove it. We cannot dismiss a Minister. That is entirely within the province of the Prime Minister, and no other Minister, so we have not got to prove anything. We have got to present enough information seeing that we have presented a motion to this Honourable Chamber for the enlightenment and information of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) so that he can take the appropriate action, and this I think, we have in fact done.

We are here debating a Resolution that has some very important implications not only for the Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson). It has implications for the rest of us and, indeed, for the whole of Barbados. We contend that the honourable Member

for St. Michael West Central was guilty of excesses when he built that road, and we contend further that the honourable Member stands personally to gain by those excesses. That is not a change. I do not observe any change here. And we further contend that it is a highly improper conduct by any Minister of the Crown in any country that has a Westminster model of Government.

We do not consider it to be our case. This is a case by the people of Barbados for morality in public life. We consider it a strike by all Barbadians for propriety in handling the public trust. And we hold that those persons who consider this to be a mere storm in a teapot has absolutely no understanding of the institutions that have got us to this point and which we hope will take us far beyond this point. So the people of Trents, the people of St. Lucy and the people of Barbados, in fact, we in this Chamber on this side and on that side owe a debt of gratitude, first of all, to the Leader of the Opposition, who first alerted this Chamber of the problem that existed in Trents, and we also owe a debt of gratitude to the Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King), who has brought this Resolution here before this Chamber.

We have traditions in this country, traditions that we hold very dear. When the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull), in his feeble defence of the indefensible, said that the Prime Minister of St. Vincent, speaking not so long ago in New York, referred to Barbados as a citadel of common sense, I would like this Chamber to note this very carefully, because it is this very citadel that we want to fortify and we certainly do not want to break down, which is what we all will be doing if we condone the kind of excesses that have been carried out by anyone who holds public trust. I am not just talking about the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, but anyone who holds public office. It is not the creation of those who now hold power dating back to 1976. It was not the creation of the Democratic Labour Party when in power between the years 1961 and 1976, nor was it the creation of the Barbados Labour Party in its early days between 1948 and 1961. It is a citadel that had been built generations ago on the traditions of democratic principles and probity, and reinforced by successive Administrations.

4.20 p.m.

What is on the ground at Trents is not in the best traditions of public life in Barbados, this tradition that has made us the envy of the rest of the Caribbean, among those who are narrow-minded enough to hold that view, and an object of administration — and hope, I could add — by all those persons who genuinely admire and see virtue in our way of life. In this respect, we have a twofold responsibility. We have a responsibility to our own citizens to maintain and enhance our institutions in accordance with the best traditions, and we have a

duty to the rest of the Caribbean, who admire and look to us for inspiration, so that they too can build their own citadel of common sense and soundness. It is in this spirit that we have brought this Resolution before this Chamber.

I feel that we would be knocking our institutions if we take up positions in defence of a patent breach of public trust, and in order to do this we have strayed far from the facts. It is time that we get back to the facts. Trents Plantation was designated under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act as a tenantry, and by virtue of that designation the tenants of Trents are entitled to have their lands conveyed to them, provided, of course, that they have been living on those lands, the lots, for a minimum of five years. That is an important requisite of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. It has not been designated under the Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act of 1982, so I do not want to hear about these agricultural holdings that these people have, because it has not been so designated. It is not among those plantations in St. Lucy listed in the Schedule to the Act and therefore I hold that those tenants are not entitled to call upon the landlord to sell them any agricultural holdings. The reason is simple — there was none to sell. That is a fact.

We all probably went to Trents at one time or another and have been able to see what is there in the tenantry. The people of Trents were entitled to a road. There is no doubt about it. They have been denied this road which had not been given them for a long time. How can we oppose this when in fact the former representative of St. Lucy, now sitting in the Other Place, himself pressed for a tenantry road in Trents itself? That is not our problem. What we are saying is that the Minister, by his own act, interfered with the routing of this road. I am not saying that he did it for his advantage, but that is exactly what will come about as a result of interfering with the routing of the road. What we have now are two segments of road, or probably three segments of road, as the Member for St. Michael South Central said. One which serves the bulk of the tenants....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order: Am I hearing quite clearly that the Member for St. Michael North claims that the Resolution did not state that the Minister had built this road for his own benefit? Because this is the body of the Resolution, this is what the Resolution quite clearly states, if I may just remind my colleague:

"AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Transport and Works has constructed a road on Trents Plantation far beyond the limits necessary and essential for the legitimate use and requirements of the said tenants and in such a way as to facilitate the development of Trents Plantation for the private

use and benefit of the owners of and other persons interested in Trents Plantation."

He is the owner. Now you are saying that he did not benefit himself, but at some future date he is going to benefit.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. What he said was that the Minister interfered with the routing of the road. What that means I do not know. I am waiting to hear.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But a Minister is entitled to interfere with his own Ministry, direct the road from here to as far as the south coast.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let him develop his point. He said the Minister interfered with the routing of the road.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, what I said is absolutely clear. I have no uncertainty in my mind about what I said. I said that the Minister interfered with the routing of the road. He varied an order and by so doing it had the effect of benefiting the Minister himself, who is the owner of the lands. That is what I said. If the Leader of the House is unable to understand that, that is his problem. What I said is clear and unambiguous.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He assumes that it is going to be of some benefit to him. We want him to bring the evidence in here that it is going to be of some benefit to him, not that you believe he will benefit.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I have made my statements on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am making no assumptions. I am saying what I said, and I stand by what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not to understand what is going on here, but really and truly I am confused, because I am hearing so many different things, I wonder what brings us in here today. Carry on. You have a given time to say your piece.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Thank you, Sir.

I want to pick up where I stopped just now, and I repeat that by varying the order for the road and putting the road in place, that has had the effect of a potential benefit to the Minister and in fact had to benefit the Minister, an actual benefit to the Minister.

I want to ask a few things of the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister deny that the Works Order was for the building of 390 metres of road at a given price somewhere in the area of \$200 000? Does the Prime

Minister deny that what we have now on the ground at Trents is almost that amount again, over 300 metres of road which was not in the Works Order at the time that the road commenced? Has the Prime Minister satisfied himself that the additional portion of road was not built on the instructions of the Minister himself, as is genuinely believed and understood? Has the Prime Minister satisfied himself that a significant portion of the road is surplus to the needs of the tenants of the tenantry, and that the Minister himself stands to benefit from this surplus?

Has the Prime Minister satisfied himself on these points? I believe that he has, because he has made some very, what I would call, remarkable statements on this matter. He, first of all, gave an attitude of, 'so what? Surplus roads were built in Canefield, St. Thomas, too.' He said, "we do not believe in moving people. That is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party but we do not believe in moving people." Then he went on and said that if it was true, this is the attitude of the Prime Minister, what we can do is recoup some of the taxpayers money that was spent in building that road by placing it in a Development Duty Order.

4.30 p.m.

I would like to look at these things one by one. Let us look, first of all, at the road at Canefield. The road at Canefield in St. Thomas was an access road to the tenantry. What is it that the Government expects us to understand, that they would go inside Canefield and do the road and do not do an access road to it? How will the tenants get there, by helicopter? There is a long road leading in to the tenantry, yes, but then, when you get into the tenantry, there are tenantry roads. You need that long access road in order to reach there, so that is a non point.

Trents is completely different. In Trents you have at the very beginning on the eastern side near the school at Trents, Nest House School, there are tenants at the beginning of it and there are tenants down to the end. We are saying that it would have been economical for the Ministry to have offered the persons occupying the two houses to remove them to the services.

There is nothing wrong with bringing people to the services, and if that is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party, it is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party and we are not apologising for that. We do not apologize for putting in the infrastructure at Clapham Park to move the people out of Emmerton over there. We do not apologise for that in the same way that we do not apologize for putting in the road at Sion Hill for a whole community. It was not put in for that purpose, it was put in to serve persons generally, but the Barbados Labour Party moved a whole village from Springhead into Sion Hill, so do not come and say that that is not the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party. They have moved more people in their time than we have moved

around in our time. There is nothing wrong with moving people to services.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The honourable Member is misleading the House because it was made clear today that this has nothing to do with the general principles of acquisition and removal of people. Within the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act itself, the powers of relocation are limited by Section 29.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of explanation.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I have not come to that yet. I am dealing with the point raised by the Prime Minister when he said our principle is moving people to the services but they do not believe in it. I am giving the lie to what he said, and what they themselves have done. I will come back to the other issue later.

We come to the question of the Development Duty Order. I think that is the most ridiculous point made — do not mind the Minister is making money out of the taxpayers, we can get back some of that money by placing it in the Development Duty Order. That is the kind of attitude that we have here in this Chamber. The Minister can go and sell that land for \$3.00 per square foot and all the Government can recover, according to the laws as they stand, is 50 per cent of the net, not of the gross of the net value of the consideration.

I have in my hand a document showing how the net value of consideration is arrived at. You first have to look at something called the improved value at the price base date, that is, the approved value at the time when these services were put in. Then any other expenditure of the land, an amount equalled to 10 per cent capital expenditure referred to above, an amount equivalent to 5 per cent per annum of the value of the land at the specified base date. So if you hold that land for five years or three years, you are entitled to 5 per cent per annum of the value of the specified base date. If it is for three years, it is 15 per cent, five years 25 per cent, then there are other necessary expenditures like Stamp Duty and Property Transfer Tax. Then, before you make the deduction from the gross consideration to get the net position in order to charge your 50 per cent, in the meantime, the Minister would have made — I cannot say a fortune — a significant portion of money off the land that had been developed at the taxpayers' expense.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order: As I understand it, the Prime Minister has already told this Chamber that the land to which the honourable Member refers will not be sold under any condition for more than ten cents per square foot. It is unreasonable for the honourable Member to get up and suggest that the land can be sold by the owner for more than ten

cents per square foot. Why you do not tell them about what you did, sold yourself land when you were Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not got it in his power to direct that the land should be sold at ten cents per square foot. Only the law decides how that land is sold. The Act determines the price of the land, not the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister comes in here and says what he wants to say but that has absolutely nothing to do with the price of the land. The Act says clearly that only persons who have been there for five or more years can take advantage of that ten cents per square foot, not other persons now coming in; nobody else. Even if you had been on that land for four years, 360 days before you call for that conveyance, you cannot get it at ten cents per square foot, so the honourable Member clearly does not know what he is talking about.

These defences are not worthy of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister began by saying that the problem of this whole Resolution is that we do not like the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. What has that got to do with the Minister doing what he should not be doing? It is completely irrelevant — and untrue as well, because we gave it support in here. I was not in the Chamber at that time, but I understand the Record does so show. It is irrelevant, whether you like it or not, as to what the Minister did or should not have done in breach of the public trust. That is what is important. That is no defence whatsoever.

He further said that all subdivisions need Town Planning approval, and I tried to correct him. Not all subdivisions under this Act require Town Planning approval. I want to make this point here now. Town Planning has no role in this Act except in the circumstances as read to this Chamber by the honourable Member for St. Thomas, and Section 33 of the Act clearly states that notwithstanding anything therein contained, the Town and Country Planning Act has application to this Act only where it is so expressed by this Act, and it is expressed in Sections 26 and 29. Section 29 is virtually the same thing. It is only in cases where the land is transferable, but this does not prevent the landlord, in this case the Minister, from offering the tenants an alternative spot within that tenantry and letting the tenant make the decision as to whether he or she might want to move. In fact, it would have been better and more economical and a saving of the taxpayers' money if two comparable houses, even better houses, had been built on other vacant lots on the main tenantry road itself.

4.40 p.m.

The Prime Minister obviously has a problem. I think that his problem is one of perspective, and I call it the

American perspective. This is where I think the real problem is. I believe that those persons who have matured in the United States of America and have seen the system and institutions in operation in that country have become so enamoured of those institutions and those systems that they have not been able now to come to terms with the Westminster system that we operate here in Barbados. So the Prime Minister may have a fundamental problem here, and I think it is a problem which the Prime Minister should look at.

The Prime Minister has on occasion — and I remember one occasion very vividly, in speaking in terms of the honourable Member for St. Michael South — describe himself as Joe Blunt. Well, if the Prime Minister is Joe Blunt, let Joe Blunt now do the proper thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: And that brings the honourable Member to the end of his speech.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: This is a Resolution that I am going to support.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, on listening to the last speaker, I started to wonder at first if he were taking the line which this side is taking. I must confess that he has brought some order to the Opposition benches in terms of the tempered language which was used. At one stage, except for what I believe was a slight chastisement coming from his immediate right, he was certainly on the correct path, but I suppose when the battle is on and the lines are drawn, each soldier must answer to the clarion call.

This Resolution which is before us is one which the Government cannot support. When the Honourable Minister of Trade and Industry spoke on this Resolution, he characterised it as a Resolution which was based upon spite, upon wickedness and a determination to bring the Minister down. I, too, would like to say that the bitterness with which this Resolution has come before this Honourable House has certainly not done any justice to it, and when one takes into account the venom with which it was pursued in the country during the last by-election in St. Thomas, one must wonder why such evil is abroad.

We have heard a lot during these past few days. Unfortunately, I was not here on the first occasion when this Resolution was initiated, and I regret if I have to trespass on anything which was said before. I hope that I would not do so, because I believe that whatever we say would be along the lines which would normally be taken by any honourable Member who gets up to speak.

The Democratic Labour Party, by virtue of its posturing during its period of administration, has not been able to project a good image, and I must say to them on this occasion, as I have said in the past, that

those who come to justice must come to justice with clean hands. The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) was at pains to read certain conclusions of Sir Herbert Duffus in his report on the Commission of Enquiry which he undertook in this country, but what he did not seem to realise is that we were not at that time sleeping, but that we were studying the report and reading it quite carefully. We were responsible for that report and we would have been foolish if we did not look at that report very carefully. That report is replete with a number of bad examples as set by the Democratic Labour Party Administration, and what is particularly disturbing is what that report reveals. A number of things which you will read in this report will show in a very positive form that all roads led to the Prime Minister of that day.

One will recall, if you look at page 69 of the report, what Sir Herbert Duffus had to say in connection with the part of his findings, and I read from 54(ii) on page 69, and this is what it says under the headline "Mr. Steve Emtage."

"Mr. Barrow also charged Mr. Emtage with amnesia, as Mr. Emtage had denied being involved in any discussion with Mr. Barrow and Mr. Went in the Prime Minister's office about the purchase of the shares before the Cabinet decision of the 29th January, which Mr. Emtage had said was communicated to him on the 5th February and that it was only then he became involved in the Carib West matter. Again, I have reviewed the evidence of Mr. Barrow, Mr. Went and Mr. Emtage with great care and I have arrived at the firm conclusion that Mr. Emtage was not suffering from any form of amnesia, whether political or otherwise, and that his positive statement may be accepted as the truth. In this case if there is any form of amnesia it lies with Mr. Barrow and Mr. Went."

He did not say who was lying or who was suffering from amnesia, but he set out to put the facts as they were. He did not believe that Mr. Emtage was suffering from amnesia.

The honourable Member from the other side was pointing out earlier that we were dealing too broadly with the issues in speaking on this matter. It is important that we do so. If you are talking about malpractice, if you are talking about abuse of ministerial office, you have to take in the total thinking how the Government system works and look back a few years and see what has happened.

I live very near to Paragon in Christ Church, just about a mile and a half away, and I recall that on many occasions when the Harp gun went off I was nervous as to the effects which it would have on the old house that I lived in, and I was appalled and amazed when the Democratic Labour Party Government introduced legisla-

tion to exonerate HARP from prosecution in the law courts of this country. No citizen in this country had recourse to the law where HARP was involved. That was a serious denial of the total rights.
4.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker the honourable Member is misquoting me.

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

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

The legislation was introduced at that time because of a scientific experiment. It was to prevent an injunction, and it specifically stated that any citizen could file any action for damages, and indeed, several actions were filed against the company for damages.

The legislation was only to prevent an injunction, which would have had the effect of preventing the experiments from going on. It is not true, therefore, to say that we introduced legislation to stop people having access to the law court.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the most effective weapon in any court is the use of the injunction procedure. If an injunction is successful, goodbye Charlie — you go through the eddoes!

HARP was exempted. No matter what you tell me to the contrary, you were guilty of an offence against the innocent people who lived in areas surrounding the HARP gun that wrought havoc upon those people's buildings up there. It was disturbing. And what made it more disturbing was the fact that it was well known in this country that honourable Members opposite were closely attached to the HARP Project people. They were advisers to Gerry Bull, they were associated with him. They used to go up and stay at the house under the hill with Carlton Brathwaite. They had very good connections. I know well. I live very close to HARP. They have to pass by me at some stage or another.

Many people are aware of what was happening in Antigua at one stage when a picture was shown in Barbados — I do not know how many people saw it — of the Two Gainer Land, I think that was the name of it, that was moving out with a shipment of arms to be used in South Africa against black people. That was used to carry out the guns that HARP was developing in these areas. It is to our shame and discredit that HARP was allowed to develop those sophisticated weapons and had high people protecting them in high places in this country. If you want to talk about corruption, if you want to talk about dishonest dealings, let us deal with all of those issues.

We can say a lot of things. We had the disappearance in this country of a number of people and nobody could trace them. We hear a lot of things about them. This Government sought, when it came into office, to carry out investigations into people who were lost and could not be found. Do not only talk about the Duffus Commission. Do not only talk about the Hanschell Commission. Talk about the number of enquiries that we set about in order to bring an understanding and quiet in this country to the type of rumourmongering which we were hearing over the years.

The question is was the road at Trents necessary or was it not necessary? Has the road at Trents benefitted people or has it not? A Member said that it was only to serve thirty-four people. My understanding is that there are thirty-four houses and about 124 people. They are people and they are human beings, and under the Plantation Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, the tenants have rights. This Government gave them the rights under the Act, and if they opt to stay somewhere, they are free to stay where they want to stay. You cannot compel them to move. And are they not entitled to have roads too, like anybody else?

If Government is building roads anywhere and there are open lands, I support the idea of continuing to some extent, to explore further areas of our development. The reason is that Government has the machinery whereby it can impose a duty and it can take the necessary precaution to ensure that a number of things are being done. When you allow, especially in areas like St. Lucy, St. Philip, St. John and St. Joseph developments to take place beyond the point of residence, you are creating the opportunity for people to go there and live. It is my experience that once you put the necessary infrastructure, roads, water, electricity, telephones, bus service, people will live in such areas. It automatically takes the pressure off the Government not only to put in services, but to buy the land at high cost as well. It is a sensible thing not to stop at the point where the tenants are, but to go beyond, if there is a possibility of extension. It is entirely a matter for an intelligent and enlightened Government to do.

In my capacity as Minister of Housing and Lands, a number of applications have come to me from the Town Planner to approve lots not in the plantation tenancies, but in private tenancies, for which I have a substantial responsibility. When I get a report on the roads and the price, I ask what Government has done with respect to this? Has Government put in roads? Has Government put in the water? How long ago was it done? When I get the historical background of the cost to Government of the infrastructure, I then say to make a reduction from the cost of this land. The price to the person buying will have to reflect the things done by Government in terms of infrastructural development. It is not difficult for the

Government, in researching any area where there is development, to discover what it might have spent on that development and make the necessary reductions, and I commend any approach which is being made in this direction.

The other side said that no party has removed as much people as the Barbados Labour Party, so there should be no problem with respect to the removal of the one or two tenants who were to be removed and resited. But the fact is that they have a right to remain and do not have to subject themselves to be removed. The fact that there are possibilities for people to be sited on the land and on the roads to me lend itself to tentative planning for the future. Those two points must be taken into account.

5.00 p.m.

You hear this talk about the Government removing people. Yes, we remove them, but do we remove them from squalor and put them into squalor? A few years ago, the Democratic Labour Party moved some people from Speightstown in St. Peter to resite them not far away in the very Speightstown, St. Peter, and they put them on some old rocks and gave them pit toilets. The Barbados Labour Party does not do that. Somebody mentioned that they moved people from Emmerton Lane. You did not move anybody from Emmerton Lane, we moved them and put them there. We are the people that gave them nice social conditions in which to live. All the people that we have resited so far, we have given them all the facilities that are required by human-beings in this modern age. I expect that shortly after this Resolution is defeated in here, the same honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, who brought it, will very shortly after bring another Resolution to say possibly that the Government should be censured for putting these facilities to the houses which have been removed.

We have been removing over the years. We have no apologies to make. We do not like uprooting people, but if for the development of the country we have to move them, by all means we will move them — and give them good and better conditions than what they have had.

Somebody mentioned Turners Hall and insurance. I want to touch on that. That is particularly special to my heart, for the simple reason that although the owners were not special to my heart, the good people in Turners Hall, who used to work the land and who were disadvantaged by the dragging down of that estate are very close to my heart. I regard the Turners Hall area as my heartland and I believe that is the reason why you were treated so badly. That plantation was closed down with an outstanding debt of over \$1 400 000 — somebody mentioned \$1.2 million, it is more than that — not only to the BNB but to Barclays as well and with substantial sums of money owing to the workers of that estate.

Several have reached the point where they are no longer able to work for themselves, they have passed the best of their useful life, and it is distressing to me that up to now nothing has been done, although Turners Hall has been closed down for a considerable length of time, to bring some form of peace and satisfaction to their souls.

I would have thought that some honourable Member opposite would have brought a Resolution condemning the owners of Turners Hall for their failure to honour their commitments to the workers at Turners Hall. But, of course, I am not surprised about this. Long before we came to office in 1976, there were many plantations going out of existence in this country. Sanford was one, and up to now people who worked at Sanford have not been able to get severance pay or any pay at all. That is to the dishonour and discredit of the Democratic Labour Party.

The other side talked a lot about corruption and dishonesty. I would like them to tell me how many Ministers and friends of parliamentarians during their regime bought lots on Government estates — and by lots I do not mean one or two lots, I mean several lots — divided them and sold them at great advantage to themselves? When there were a lot of landless and dispossessed people out there who would have been glad to get a spot of land for themselves or their children who were abroad, they were denied any opportunity of going there. There was a special committee set up to deal with these matters of allocation, and unless you had the passport of the Democratic Labour Party, you were not able to get a piece of that land, none of the action was for you. This is not so with the Barbados Labour Party. Roads have been built and developments have been done, not only at Trents but throughout the length and breadth of this country; not only under the administration of the present Minister of Transport and Works but under every Minister who has held that position since 1976 under this administration of the Barbados Labour Party, and before it went out of office in 1961.

I recall when I came into office discovering that there were many people in this country who were disadvantaged. The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who is not in his place at the moment but who might possibly be hearing me, will recall that he went on his knees to ask the Democratic Labour Party to do something for him for his constituency and the deaf ear was given. Tell me what type of corruption that is? Only certain people could be heard. Only certain people benefitted from that Administration. Can it be truthfully said that is so under this Administration? Can it be truthfully said that Members of this Parliament had amassed wealth and benefitted as a result of their positions in this administration? The answer would be a straightforward "No."

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) talked about the development of the tenancies that the Democratic Labour Party set about to do in its time. He talked about some Development Duty Bill, the introduction of legislation, he said, in order to make provision for the tenants to have the lands developed with the co-operation of the owners. You wanted the goodwill of the owners and we thought we wanted the co-operation of the owners, but we did not think we should go cap in hand to the owners. We felt that the best procedure would have been to say they have to provide for the tenants, and to this end we set about to introduce the Plantation Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act in order to give protection to the people in this country. We did not do it by begging the landlords.
5.10 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. John during a very important debate in here said that what we did was to give the plantation owners money, which they should not have had, by way of selling the useless land to people and giving them money. We thought of making the people independent. We thought that, by giving them the right of ownership, we would develop in them the spirit of thrift to improve their houses, to feel secure in the ownership which is necessary, because if it is one thing that is sure, it is that all Barbadians like to know that they own what they are on or in. Barbadians take a special pride in land ownership, a special pride in home ownership, and a special pride in these things that mean so much to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings you to the end of your time.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I support the Government's point of view on this question with respect to this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Once upon a time, a man of great influence journeyed from the plains of St. James to the pastures of St. John and his eyes fell upon a young calf. He went to the lady who was tending her flocks and he tried to induce her to part with the ownership of that calf. This is a little parable which is very germane to this situation. The lady said, "this is my only source from which I will be able to accumulate a little capital and it is a very beautiful calf." The man of substance went on his way sorrowing and departed from the scene.

The calf grew and waxed strong, and then one day when the lady went to nurture her calf and give it water in the heat of the midday sun, it was no longer there. As time passed by, many moons, lo and behold one fine day a man came upon the widow, the lady who had owned the calf, with a beautiful heifer, and immediately the

heifer ran joyfully to the owner, and she said, "Whence came you?" And the man said, "From the plains of St. John, from the man of great influence and substance. It is from him that I bring this heifer and I would like to sell it to you."

Eventually the lady was able to retrieve her animal, and the man of great substance was asked to come before the people who dispense the law in order to assist the law in finding who had removed the lady's calf, and he never appeared. Eventually the lady in St. John, from the pastures of St. John, was advised by no less a person than her representative to drop the matter as it was clear that there was no way that the man of great substance would ever appear to give an account of himself, and instead of having to journey to the place where the law was dispensed twice a day to feed her heifer, she took it joyfully and returned to her home.

All of the people in the village rejoiced not that the prodigal son had returned, but that the prodigal calf had come back to its rightful owner.

The person who is a man of substance, no less a personage than the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, and the lady rejoiced in the biblical name of Rebecca.

Some time after, the Government Auctioneer was given the duty of disposing of certain vehicles which had become redundant for the purposes of a statutory corporation. Three of those vehicles disappeared from the custody of the Government Auctioneer, and the same honourable gentleman told us in this House that he had removed them. He has at no time admitted that he removed the calf of Rebecca, but he admitted that he removed the three vehicles and that he had given some kind of consideration to the authorities for those vehicles, and that they had been converted into cane carts.

A cane cart costs, as you will probably know, Sir, something between \$6 000 and \$8 000, and these vehicles had engines, and I believe that they were acquired by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central for the princely sum of \$800, not \$8 000.

We were promised by the then Minister of Transport and Works that an investigation would be conducted. The Opposition did not bring any motion of censure, because the Opposition felt that if a Minister of Government had promised that he would conduct an investigation, we could rely on him for it, and I have been informed that the Minister did conduct the investigation and that his report was submitted to Cabinet. But the Members of this House have not been vouchsafed an inkling of what was contained in that report up to now, and that was prior to 1983, when the Minister was invested into his private office.

If the report had been submitted, then we would be justified in asking — in order to keep this matter at a certain level to save any embarrassment — for an investigation into the construction of a road at Trents Plantation in St. Lucy and have a report just submitted to this House. But because of our previous experience, we felt that the only way to bring people to their senses was to table a Resolution of this kind which the Government members have clearly indicated that they intend, right or wrong, to vote against, and we are resigned to that particular position.

5.20 p.m.

There are certain things, unfortunately, which in the short time I have at my disposal I have to dispose of. First, I am very proud of my parents, my grandparents, my great-grandparents, all the way down the line. I make no apologies for the fact that over 100 years ago, Joseph Jacob Chadderton O'Neal owned a sugar factory in St. Lucy, and owned several parcels of land on which he grew sugar cane and which he fed into his factory, which he owned himself. He married a lady from Tobago, Catherine Prescod, who was my grandmother, and I am very proud of her. She had a great influence on my life. I heard her name referred to here today by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Hon. D. A. C. Simmons) saying that he had received certain information from her.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. The honourable member for St. John must not speak untruths. I never said anything about receiving information from his grandmother. I spoke of Mrs. Kate Griffith, who worked with the lady that he is referring to. Mrs. Griffith is the lady that has one of the houses under the tamarind tree down by Trents Road. His grandmother used to pay her one shilling a month.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of explanation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I apologize to the honourable Member. He said that my grandmother paid Mrs. Griffith one shilling a month. I do not know what the rate was in those days, but I know that my grandmother paid the people who worked with her so well that one of the last of her retainers died about two years ago at the ripe old age of 109. If she was subsisting only on what he said was one shilling a month, then she would not have been able to survive until that ripe old age. Anyhow, my grandmother has been dragged into this debate by the honourable Member, but I am very proud of my grandmother. I am very proud that my grandmother was able to pay some other people to help them to live, and I know that in my grandmother's house nobody went hungry, whether they worked for her or did not work for her.

When my grandfather died, by the terms of his will and my uncle's will, a trust was set up called the O'Neal's

Investment Trust. Having to raise a family, I received all that was for me and the rest of the members of my family, who did not immediately require cash money like I did, were able to repurchase Mount Pleasant Plantation, the factory having been pulled down, which then constituted part of Pickerings Plantation.

I want to say categorically that I myself — you did not have to call my name — my elder brother, my cousin Eldina Murray and the late Frederick Hamilton O'Neal had absolutely no interest or share of any kind, contingent or vested or otherwise in Pickerings Plantation. It belonged to the O'Neals, having drawn our own money and spent it. The others who did not require money, they are the people who are shareholders in Pickerings Plantation which, 100 years ago, quite a large part of it belonged to my grandfather. I make no apologies for that. I came along and found it so.

A debate which concerns the actions of the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central involves Pickerings Plantation! I should like to tell the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) — I have checked since I heard him speak, because I do not have anything to do with the management or ownership of that place — that like every other sugar plantation in Barbados, including the one in which the Honourable Prime Minister has what is described as a 24—120th share — I worked it out to 1/5th share, which is about 120th of a share; it would be, I can assure you, be 120 share of debt — I want to tell the honourable member for St. Lucy that Pickerings Plantation — you check with Mr. Harold Went — in 1968 told all of the tenants on that plantation that they could have all the lands on which they lived. There was a kind of indifference, and up to today not one of them have put in an application or notified the attorneys of that plantation that they wish to purchase the land on which they are on. That is a fact which should be checked by going to the Ministry. When the Bill was brought in here in 1980, the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, Pickerings was not in the Schedule because it had already been offered to the tenants themselves, and Mr. Harold Went, a sworn land surveyor, would be able to show you the plan in which he suggested there should be a realignment of certain houses and readjustment of the size of the plots which they have occupied to give them a proper habitable kind of plot.

Let me leave that, because my time is limited. Let me come to Turners Hall. We heard a lot of talk about Turners Hall, and I have to make my position clear. Several Members said that I am a Director of Turners Hall — news to me. Others said I am a shareholder in Turners Hall — also news to me. The fact of Turners Hall is very simple. A friend of mine, and I make no apologies for his being a friend of mine, because we have known each other from the time we were about eight

years old, Mr. Bruce Procope from Trinidad, was interested in Turners Hall, which has a very strange history, because the wife of George IV who was Mrs. Fitz-Herbert — she was the last of Richmond Hill — she was not his mistress, she was the wife of George IV — was given Turners Hall Plantation by the Prince Regent himself. The only title deeds to Turners Hall is what you call a Royal Crown Grant which, I believe, is an invaluable document.

Turners Hall went up for sale by auction sometime in the 1960s — I cannot remember the exact date — and Mr. Bruce Procope instructed Mr. Clyde Turney, a solicitor, to bid for him for Turners Hall Plantation because he was interested, having gone to Codrington College, spent much of his time and having a property in Barbados. Eventually at auction, a public auction — it was not stolen from anybody — it was knocked down by Mr. Bruce Procope.

Shortly after, Mr. Bruce Procope came from Trinidad in order to perfect the acquisition of Turners Hall, and Mr. Roland Henry, who was a close personal friend of mine, also a Queen's Counsel, was in the island, and in my gallery one day Mr. Bruce Procope said that he would need another \$40 000 or \$50 000 in order to perfect the purchase because it was a public auction. Mr. Henry and I agreed to lend to the company that he was forming, which I believe was called Barbados Estates, I cannot remember, \$20 000 each, on the understanding that at some stage later on, if we so desired we could convert those loans into shares.

I have never attended a meeting of the company, whatsoever it is called. I have never received any profit from the company. I have never been notified that I am a shareholder or received any document that I am a director, or been offered any shares, or received any share certificates, or attended any statutory meeting as a shareholder or director of that company, or acted in any capacity whatsoever.

5.30 p.m.

The person who was most involved in Turners Hall was Mr. Clyde Turney. The manager was the late Mr. Bob Cumberbatch. I am making statements which I am prepared to go into court and swear on oath. If I were a director, there are certainly legal requirements for a person to be a director. If I am a shareholder, I would have to have share certificates, and as far as I am concerned, if Turners Hall owes the bank money, they also owe me \$20 000, which I waved goodbye to a long time ago, because no sugar estate in Barbados is making any money. If they owe the Government money, they owe me \$20 000, but, unfortunately, it was never registered as a debt. I just want to put that one side. At any time I am prepared to have a public enquiry.

The honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) said that I am a friend of Colonel Drax.

Asides

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not understand what is going on. I do not understand what they are saying about Turners Hall Woods. We are supposed to be dealing with Trents, but they made certain accusations and now they do not want to hear the truth. Whatever I say can be investigated.

The honourable Member for St. George South, who is keeping so much noise right now....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Quiet please. Let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: said that I am a friend of Mr. Drax, the owner of Drax Hall. Drax Hall is the oldest sugar plantation in Barbados. Drax Hall has 237 acres, plus or minus 10 acres, of tenantry lands. Mr. Bill Mallalieu, from John Bladon and Company, approached the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) when, I believe, he was Minister in charge of Lands, and offered to sell to the Government the whole of Drax Hall tenantry at \$3 000 an acre. Now \$3 000 an acre is less than ten cents a square foot.

It is true I know Mr. Drax. I know a lot of people. I also know the owner of Kendal. They are friends of mine. I visit them when I go to London, even going back 25 years; it is not yesterday. But when I went by Ms. Nurse's shop in Drax Hall and Mr. Drax told me that he would offer the land at \$3 000 an acre, I told him he was crazy, and that was the end of it.

The honourable Member said I wanted to prevent people from building up there. There is a man called Reverend Williams who had built some kind of house in the roadway that leads down to Frenches. I told him there was nothing you could do about that, because we have frozen development in this land and you cannot put the people off, so anybody who gave the honourable Member information could only be giving him false information.

He said I cannot go into Drax Hall. I have got news for him. I was in Drax Hall Sunday before last, not the day before yesterday. I was measuring, and this is what I found. I found that from the main road by Greens into Drax Hall Jump was 2.1 kilometres of unpaved road, and from the same point in the main road where you turn off to go into Drax Hall to where they have begun to do about 100 metres of road, before you get to Miss Rudder's shop, is 1.4 kilometres. The honourable Member says I cannot go into Drax Hall; go and ask the people in the Jump, go and ask the people in Drax Hall Hope if I was

not there Sunday before last. This is the person who cannot go into Drax Hall! Long before he was, I was a representative for St. George. Not one yard of that road has been paved.

He speaks about coming up from Frenches. At the present moment I would not pave that particular road; I would go and pave the road where the people live, because I do not see why the Government should spend money paving one and a half miles of road on which there are no houses at all. And that is one of the most remarkable, what we call, white roads in Barbados, because it is not in a bad condition. It could be done later on.

What I want to say about this Resolution is that building roads is nothing to do with the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, because in 1965 we prevented plantation owners from turning the tenants off, under what is now called the Tenancies Control Act and used then to be called the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act. They removed the term "development" from it. I made a long speech, part of which was quoted by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), at the time when that Bill was being negotiated through this place, and I pointed out that we would carry on a programme of putting in roads because we had prevented the landlords from increasing the rents or carrying out any kind of development, because we froze the rents and said you could not put the people off.

Asides

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not understand what the issues are. It has always been the policy of the Democratic Labour Party to go into private tenancies and put in roads, but what we are saying is that we put in roads for the tenants, we do not put in roads for Ministers, and the point is that the honourable Member is the Minister in charge of that portfolio. And I am saying, if nobody has said it before — I think the honourable Member for St. Michael North came closest to it — that there was a certain amount of money allocated to accommodate the tenants in Trents and they were accommodated, and the Minister went down and told Barker, who was driving the D7 or D9, "you've got to carry this up there and push down a road for me from here to there." I am saying that categorically, and if the honourable Member goes and asks Barker, and Collins, the supervisor, you will find out that that is what he did. We are saying that it is obvious to all but the blind and purblind that there is no way that the lands on the left and the right of the road, depending on the direction you are going, come under the agricultural tenantry or under the Act of 1982; there is no way that it comes under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, because there is nobody living on it. There is no agricultural land rented by Trents on either side of that road to anyone, and nobody can qualify.

Honourable Members on this side have dealt with the allegations made by the Honourable Prime Minister that he can put on a development charge. The amount of money after he has put on his own price that the Government will be getting will be miniscule, and that is *ex post facto*. The fact that he has not applied for development permission does not mean that he cannot apply for such permission at some time, and the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central cannot come and tell me, who was practising before him, that he can make the honourable Member sell the land at ten cents a square foot, because it does not qualify, under either one of the bits of legislation dealing with this, for such treatment, and he would be acting illegally, because the Preamble to the Bill of 1980 had specifically to state that it was altering the Constitution, and he cannot further alter the Constitution of Barbados by saying he is now going to make the honourable Member sell the land at ten cents. He is only trying to throw dust in our eyes. That is the point which I want to make clear.

The next point which I want to make is that I am a taxpayer. A lot of people say, "Well, he only spent another \$200 000." If he spent another \$2.00, it is my money. This is the danger when you do not come in here with plans. You do not show your Cabinet colleagues the plans to show what you intend to do, because then they would be able to put their two cents in, apart from the Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) — I am going to deal with him in a moment — and say, "Well, look, you cannot spend all this money down here, you have to come and spend some in my constituency." That is what Parliament is about. Every single bit of road that was constructed when I came into this House, whether it was Vestry road, as they called it, or it was under the Central Road Board, had to come in here with the plans drawn for people to see. But he can get away with it. 5.40 p.m.

There was also a misstatement made, that I said that it came out of the Transport Levy. The bad thing about it is that it came out of the Consolidated Fund. And plans were submitted by the Ministry showing the amount of money which should have been spent, which is over \$200 000. Just so, he spent over \$400 000! And as much was spent on the MT road as was spent on the whole tenantry! That is the case that we are making.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is not true!)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And it is part of our taxes.

How much more time do I have, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member for St. Lucy said that he wanted a piece of the action.

The truth of this matter — this is a cookie jar — is that the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has been caught with his hand in the cookie jar — and unless you let go the cookies, you cannot get it out. The honourable Member for St. Lucy now — birds of a feather flock together — he is trying to get his hand in the cookie jar. Fortunately for him, he cannot get it in, and that is his problem.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of the time for the honourable Member.

Applause.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, Sir,....

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are going to cut off the man's hand? He cannot get it out.)

Loud and long laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, apparently, the Right Honourable Member's hand remained in the cookie jar longer than he intended.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am very pleased, however, that he got it out without any damage to himself.

This debate has generated a lot of heat and several allegations. Inferences have been drawn, and sometimes those inferences have not been reasonable. At this stage of the debate, I am amazed that some of the basic facts surrounding the construction of the tenantry road at Trents have not come before the notice of this House. In fact, I think that the speakers who followed the Mover of this motion have been less than fair to the Mover of the motion in trying to overstate a case by misrepresenting some of the basic facts before the House.

We heard that the number of houses varied from twenty-two to twenty-four, to thirty-four to thirty-six. I would have thought that an Opposition doing its homework would have found it very easy to go down and take a physical stock of the number of houses on that tenantry, and note their exact location. At the end of this debate, if I depended on the case that has been advanced to this House by the Opposition, I would remain uncertain of the number of houses that the Opposition contends benefit from the development of this area.

Likewise, the Opposition has not yet advanced to the House the amount of road which it is alleged has

been built, the measurement which it has taken to say how much of that road was necessary and why it was necessary. At the end of the day, the only evidence about the length of the road is an estimate given by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), in which he speculated that there may have been three hundred metres of road too much. I would have thought that the Opposition in presenting a case, a case in which the allegation amounts to a criminal allegation of a criminal offence, would have come before this House and let us know the number of persons who benefit and why they say that anything extra would not have been of benefit to those persons. At the end of the day I do not know what are the exact facts the Opposition is advancing here.

I heard several figures being bandied about by the Opposition as to the cost of the road, and the cost of what the Opposition say is extra. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is well known for overstating a case. He ended up with a figure of some \$200 000 additional. He has never said additional to what, what was the cost of the area that he said was essential, and what was this amount of money spent beyond the figures that were essential, to the benefit of the Minister, as he has alleged?

It is my submission that the Opposition, never mind the protestation, sees this as a political measure with which to hang a Minister before the House and the public. I do not accept for one minute, not even from one of my colleagues, the statement about not bringing politics into this, because politics is very much in it. The Opposition has targetted four Members in St. Michael whom they believe they can knock out in the next General Election. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central is one of those persons, and therefore, they are going to, at any cost whatsoever, relentlessly attack the Government and attack the Government Members in those constituencies with whatever they can find, wherever they can find it, and whenever they can find it. I think the public has to understand the debate in that context.

This is not a debate in which the Opposition is suddenly solicitous about corruption, integrity laws and whether or not people conform to certain standards. I recall very well, in the Session 1981–1985, bringing before this House and making the leading speech on behalf of the Government on integrity legislation and finding the Opposition voting against that legislation. The Opposition went further — they characterized to the public that the provision dealing with secret trust was for hiding wealth and pampering the nest of the then Attorney-General, me. I am very concerned when, all of a sudden, I can hear that the Opposition is interested in having proper standards set in this country for public life, when, less than five years ago, this Opposition was resisting and voting against two important pieces of legislation dealing

with the protection of integrity and the disclosure of interest of each Member of this House and of statutory boards.

The Democratic Labour Party is on record as historically having objected to the improvement of integrity legislation for the disclosure of private interest and abuse of office. That is history, so the Opposition cannot come in here and pretend, as my friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), that they are defending democracy in the public interest. Let us see this Resolution for what it is — a poor piece of political manoeuvring, intended at the moment, with elections statutorily due by September next year, to place the Government in the main St. Michael area in a position where the Opposition has a case to argue, and the easiest thing to excite the public is to say "corruption."

5.50 p.m.

It is not unusual to hear from the Opposition platforms allegations that members of the Government have got into drugs or that they have \$19 million in assets. They made this attack against the former Prime Minister, who is now deceased. It is not unusual to listen to a speech such as that coming from my friend, the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons), when today he made the allegation, impliedly, in this House, that spending \$75 000, as he alleged, on Ilaro Court is connected with somebody buying tiles from some relative. That is the level that one must expect.

I can get up and speak without any fear, because I had to face the full brunt of the Opposition from 1965, when I became an Under Forty, right into 1971, with all sorts of allegations and red herrings across the trail. So the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central must not be surprised. It is a well known technique of this Opposition. It is going to hurl stones and at the same time pretend that it is not doing so and that it has all of the best motives available. Therefore, we must be prepared to see the Resolution in the context that it is politically motivated for political reasons.

Not one honourable Member on the other side has had the decency to get up and commend the Government for its social policy for development in the tenancies in this country. Between 1976 and today, the Government has constructed over 216 roads in tenancies in Barbados. I would like to commend the successive Ministers of Transport and Works — the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite), the honourable Member for St. Joseph (His Honour C. L. Bolden), the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. D. G. Blackman), and now the Honourable Minister, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) — on bringing proper social development to the people of Barbados by a forthright policy of providing proper de-

velopment in our tenantry areas. Whether it be Cozy Corner in Haggatt Hall, Berlin Avenue in Woodbourne in St. Philip, Smith Road in Fairfield, Grazettes, Drax Hall New Road in St. George, Adams Road in Wildey, St. Michael, Rollings Road in St. Christopher, Canefield in St. Thomas, First Avenue, Belle Road, My Lords Hill, Lowthers in Christ Church, Kendall in St. John or Henley in St. John, this Government, between 1976 and 1985, have gone out of its way to put in proper development in areas that never had basic facilities.

In my own constituency, there were places where people did not have running water or light, far less proper toilet facilities, after 15 years of this so-called enlightened government by the Democratic Labour Party. You had to be begging. I heard the Right Honourable Member for St. John telling the then Member for St. Michael South Central, the Honourable F. G. Smith, when I asked for a road to help some of the poor people like there were at Trents, that my time is going to come. All roads led to him then, they did not lead to Trents, and they dispensed justice in a very lopsided manner.

One of the things which the Democratic Labour Party really had was no social development policy for the urban nor the rural tenancies. I know my friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, can look worried about that. They would stick in a piece of road without regard to the overall development of the area, if they stuck it in at all. What has surprised me is that despite the fact that we have had one of the worst recessions, in the last few years, we have managed to have constructed or to have under construction some 216 roads. More were built in a shorter period of time under this Government than were built in 15 years of Democratic Labour Party's rule, and with proper cost control, if one makes some provision for inflation.

We had the foresight to come with a Transport Levy. The Democratic Labour Party's policy is to deny the people in the tenantry roads, because they say they are going to abolish the levy. I want them to go on record and tell us how they are going to abolish the Health Levy and how they are going to abolish the Road Levy. They are going to abolish every levy and yet carry out the total development of Barbados that is called for! Where are they going to get these resources from? I believe that that is a hypocritical form of politics that we are seeing. They know that they cannot do it, but they will make the public believe that it can be done.

We have been a party of performances and a party of social conscience. The real Democratic Socialist Party has always resided in the Barbados Labour Party. No one who reads history correctly can doubt that the development of the Tenancies Freehold Act was not only a belief in helping poor people, but also a commitment to serious social democratic principles and development.

Trents is one of the developments. You will have us believe that the Minister came out of the blue, bought Trents, put it into the Act and went ahead to feather his nest. The truth is that Trents was placed as one of the tenancies in the Act by this legislature well before this Minister took office. The development of the road system of Trents was being planned since 1979, after Trents was included in one of the tenancies, well before this Minister became a Minister of Transport. The plans were there, with co-ordination between the Ministry of Housing and the Ministry of Transport and Works. The Minister, as a landowner, was treated no differently to any other landowner. He was notified by the Ministries of the lots which were being developed and asked to sign his consent to that development.

The Opposition has sat down, and not once has the Opposition had the conscience to tell the public of Barbados that the Minister has not got a cent from the public roads that now will be dedicated to the public forever and have used his land. If the Opposition's case was true, and you put in the cost of the land which has been given up free, it would come out with the Government probably owing the Minister money. What about that? You have heard about this hard conscience man who is stealing something here and there for himself. Never once have we been told

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member stop for one moment?

At this point the Speaker left the Chair and the Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Never once, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have we been told that this Minister has given to the people of Barbados, not only to the people of Trents, all of the roads within the Trents area for which he had to pay when he bought the land from the Ward family. You do not hear that. Nor do we hear that whereas normally in a plantation tenantry what you get is your house spot which you are on. Most of the tenants to whom I have spoken down there have admitted to me that they are buying at ten cents per square foot more than the house spot, areas ranging from about 15 000 square feet of land. You would not hear that, you would hear that he wants to speculate. If he wanted to speculate, he would not only have sold the tenants the land on which their houses are at ten cents per square foot, he would have sold them the balance way above the ten cents per square foot. I am talking about the areas about which the Opposition admits they have no quarrel, but still you hear that here is a man who has gone in to make a few dollars.

6.00 p.m.

I took the trouble to go down there — I do not believe that all Members on the other side took the

trouble to go down there and talk to the tenants — and I want to start with the area where the Opposition said there is one house. They said this western side leads to one house. That is not so. There are two houses you can see if you go down there and have a look on the spot, but I want to deal with the western road, because this is the one they are arguing about. Mrs. Griffith lives at one of those houses. It is a fact, and the honourable Member for St. Michael North West should know this — that that road was always a road used by people going into the tenantry. It was a white, marl, cart road from time immemorial. The Minister did not go and take up mud and is putting down a road there now, it was the traditional road for part of the tenantry.

You have not heard that the only thing that has been done to that road is that it has been simply asphalted. The road has no slipper drains, the road has no water mains. If, as they say, the Minister is going to be getting planning permission potentially for selling in the future, the main stipulation would be that he would have to put in water, he would have to put in proper slipper drains and he would possibly have to put in the other public amenities. You do not hear that. The public who have listened to this debate have got the impression that on that western side this was a new thing being made into a road, that slipper drains had been in, that the main water main was in, and that all the Minister had to do, if the Opposition were not on their toes, was to go and sell the house spots.

I have the greatest respect for the honourable Member for St. Philip North as a valuer. He is one of the best we have in this island, but I do not respect his judgment on this issue. I believe that he has allowed his political intentions to overweigh his professional judgment. He has not been able to separate the political implications of this issue from his professional position, because if he were doing that, he would in the debate, where he is normally a sober person, point out to the Members on the other side that you cannot get any permission to develop that area without putting in the other concomitants for the development. Certainly, I am sure that the honourable Member would never under any circumstances go forward with a project which he does by stating that that is ready for development merely because he has macadamised or tarred the top of the road.

I want to deal with the southern section. Again, the Opposition gives the view that this southern section only has the two houses at the end of it. According to the honourable Member for St. Philip North, you could have moved the two houses out. I have spoken to Mrs. Griffith. She told me that she was not prepared to move from that

spot and asked why they did not move the other people to her. She went on to point out something that the Opposition fails to recognise. In between Mrs. Griffith's house and the section going from the southern area right back up to the north is all rented to agricultural tenants. You can go there and see, if the Opposition will do their work. There are two houses being constructed, and I spoke to Mr. Rollock, who owns one of the biggest spots, of over 20 000 square feet, and he told me it is being sold to him at ten cents per square foot. He is applying for planning permission and he has already gone on to start constructing his house.

I am going to call the names. Mr. Rollock further told me that this case is only to hang Vic Johnson, but it is going to hang Evelyn Greaves, because he has pointed out to me that on the other side where the road comes down on the south, before you get to the agricultural land owned by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central and going back to his house, that strip of land is also part of the agricultural tenantry. The honourable Members should put these facts before the public.

What am I being told? That the Government is going to be so senseless in its development that it is not going to take into account the fact that agricultural tenants are going to build, as Rollock is going to build on this development? The honourable Member is going to tell me that if we are going into Mount Wilton, if we are going into Highland and Hopewell, that we can put a road into Hopewell and refuse to put almost half a mile of other road because the people in Hopewell would have the benefit? That is nonsense.

I want to make a document of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some pictures which were also taken by Willie Alleyne Associates. These pictures were taken on the 14th June, 1985, of Canefield Tenantry, and it is instructive that the honourable Members of the Opposition did not make a fuss about Canefield Tenantry. If you will notice, there is a long stretch of road where there are no houses whatsoever, longer than the total road area in the whole of Trents. But it was part of a proper development, a road constructed at a cost of \$1.5 million.

Why do the Opposition make a distinction? The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says he is not talking about Canefield, that this debate does not concern Canefield. It concerns every area in which there has been a development that has benefited the tenants and where you have gone through for a total

development. Why do you want to isolate Trents merely because a Member of this House happens to be the plantation owner there, and you cannot deal with a situation where other plantation owners have had a similar benefit, "if a benefit at all it is." I am using your words and putting it in quotes. The honourable Member does not understand how one speaks in quotations: That is the benefit you are alleging.

For the benefit of the honourable Member, there is no

(Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Two wrongs make a right?)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What wrong is the honourable Member talking about? The moment you take a road into any private land, automatically that road will enhance somebody's property, and there is not one road constructed, whether it is Thomas Tenantry in my area or somewhere else that as a result there is not an enhancement. The Speightstown By-pass Road passes through my mother's property, of which I happen to have a half share. That is a fact. You are not going to tell me that it has not been benefiting. I did not hear the honourable Members raise that in here. Why didn't you raise it? They do not raise that.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: We did not know).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well you know now, raise it. I will tell the honourable Member further that I have indicated to the Government that, in keeping with the social conscience of my deceased mother, I would like to give the land for a community centre from the estate. Ask the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), if you want to know.

This Resolution is what it says it is, pure political Resolution for political purposes, part of the Opposition's technique in order to run up to the next election. I will ask the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central how they are planning their campaign. I was telling them a few facts about the planning of the campaign. They want my colleagues to know that four seats in St. Michael are targeted. The Opposition believes that if they can stick mud on this Minister and pick him off, as they tried to do with the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) that then they would be home in St. Michael.

6.10 p.m.

They cannot stick anything on me. They will try to stick all sorts of darts on me. They can try as hard as they like to stick what they like on me. All they say about me is that I like white people. That is what they say.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Prime Minister says, "women, too." I love women, I have not hidden anything about that, and that is why I have fought for them so hard on the floor of the House and brought forth proper measures. They cannot bring anything on me.

One Member said that Trents cost \$400 000 plus the additional \$200 000. That is not true. Despite the tremendous work which was done, as it came off on to the St. Lucy Road, despite the fact that you saw in the Trents Development steps being carried right up to the houses, — you would know that the total cost of the Trents Development is \$335 000. That is the total cost of the whole Trents Development and, in that respect, it cost less than a similar area of land in my constituency, in Balsam's Tenantry, which was done by the Government — the honourable Member for St. Michael North would know that — near to Simmons Road. Is he going to tell me that Mrs. Balsam probably did not get some benefit in that respect? Who is he going to make the allegation against now that somebody is feathering their nest?

One of the easiest things to do is to throw mud and try to make it stick. I have seen the honourable Member for St. Michael South East and his family harrowed and pilloried on the basis that he had something to do with the Pele murder case. I came under the greatest amount of attack from the Opposition, personally and otherwise, and some other misguided people, whether there be on the other side or otherwise, on the Pele case. I hope the Minister not only has faith in God but has the courage to stick to his guns, once he has done nothing wrong, and always feel that he can get up and justify social development.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said he can bring a Resolution asking the Government to take over the land at ten cents. I am sure the Minister would not mind if the Government took over at ten cents, because I do not see where is the tremendous benefit. The honourable Member for St. Philip North said he is going to make over \$100 000, pure speculation.

Finally, I would like to say that this is a purely political Resolution, brought for purely political purposes, with the political intention of throwing mud on the Minister in the hope that the Government would be

brought down on the basis of the Resolution, not in this House, but with the public, but I think the public has the capacity to see through the Resolution and treat it for what it is worth.

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

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, may I enquire if other Members may speak....

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other Member rises in his place, then it is up to the honourable Member to make his final reply. Some other Minister is entitled to speak on behalf of the Government after you have spoken.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, we know it is critical of the Government and, therefore, we have the right to final reply. In the meantime, Sir, put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I said.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question is....

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I have heard some very remarkable presentations by honourable Members on the other side, particularly those of the honourable Member who last spoke, the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Hon. D. A. C. Simmons) and, to some extent, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John); not by any means the hardest, but the most diversionary of tactics which were used in this debate.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who last spoke on this Resolution, said it was one which was politically motivated for political purposes, and he said that we were trying to heap odium and calumny on the head of the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) because we want to create a problem for the Government in the St. Michael constituencies. The honourable Member for Christ Church West, in my submission, is seeking to divert attention from the real crux of this Resolution, and is seeking to make the public and the House believe that it is just pure politics in this Resolution and there is no substance in it.

What we have to be concerned about is the fact that the Government side has not really come to grips with the issue which we have raised. All we heard from honourable Members on the other side, and I speak now particularly of the honourable member for St. Thomas and the Member for Christ Church East Central, is that we have not presented the facts. They are treating this as if it were some criminal case in the law court, where they are defending the criminal and they are in the position to say the prosecution has not presented the

facts and proven the facts. But that is not the position in this Parliament. Apart from everything else, we are in the position where the facts in relation to this matter are within the peculiar knowledge of the Government, a lot of them. You are talking about the cost of the road. The Government has that figure. Why does not somebody on the Government side tell us the cost of the road....

(ASIDE: Barrow said that.)

Mr. M. A. KING: Do not tell me what Barrow said. The facts relating to the cost of the road are within the peculiar knowledge of the Government. You ever heard of the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*. You are talking about legal principles. All the knowledge relating to this matter you have, and yet you are adopting legal, technical positions by saying we have not proven our case.

We are saying that this matter raises issues of public concern, that the public must be concerned about what has happened, and if you are going to be fair to this House and to the public at large, you would bring all the facts that are within your knowledge to the public forum. Let the public and this House know how much road has been built approximately for the tenants, that is, the road which runs from the Mess House side right down to the Swampy Town side, tell the public how much is that extra triangular bit of which we complained. You have the knowledge. Tell the public how much it would have cost to build the tenantry section, and when I say "tenantry section," I am talking about the section from the St. Lucy School side right down to the Swampy Town side. Tell the public how much the extra bit which goes around in the triangular bit section would cost. You have the facts, so do not stand on legal technicalities and say, "you are presenting the case and therefore you have to prove it." We are in a public forum discussing the spending of public funds, and therefore you have an obligation to present to the public and to this Parliament how these public funds have been spent.

6.20 p.m.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You should have asked the questions first.)

Mr. M. A. KING: Ask questions first? Come and tell the House. There is a Resolution critical of the Government.

The honourable member for Christ Church West makes the remarkable statement that we should compliment the Government on its social development policy, and that we have not addressed the issue of what the Government has done in relation to the tenantry areas and so forth. Of what relevance is that? He goes to great lengths reciting what has been done and what has not been done by the Government, as if it were to say you have to look at the Government's overall policy, and if

they have done well in so many areas, it does not matter if they have committed a wrong in this one specific area. What we are quarrelling about is what we conceive to be the wrongdoings in relation to Trents, so it does not matter that the Government has done marvellously in other areas. That is not the issue we are concerned with. We are concerned about the wrongdoings in relation to Trents Plantation. As well as you have done in other areas, which is questionable anyhow, and which we take issue with, we are saying to you that that is not the problem, we are not concerned about social development policies in other areas, we are not now examining those issues, and the only issue we are concerned about is what you have done wrong in relation to the Trents issue. We wish you to confine your attention to that, and we say that you stand indicted and condemned because you have not addressed that specific issue.

I am dealing again with statements by the honourable Member for Christ Church West. He said that the Minister of Transport and Works has given to the people of Barbados the land on which the road was built and that he has not been compensated for that. He goes on to make the point that the road has no water and no slipper drains, and then there are ridiculous submissions being made about Town Planning permission and all that.

The fact is that nobody can deny that the roads have been properly paved, and the road we are complaining about has been properly paved right through. The fact that there is no water under a section of it is not a critical issue. If you have spent a substantial amount of public funds putting in a road and paving the road over your land but have not gone the final furlongs, so to speak, and put in water and other services, are you going to say that that excuses it, that because they have not gone the full hog and put in water and put in slipper drains you cannot apply for planning permission? The fact is that public funds have been used putting in this extra bit of road; the rest of it is irrelevant. Whether Town Planning permission has been sought and obtained is not the issue. Public funds have been spent putting in that extra bit of road which has nothing to do with the tenantry.

Asides

Mr. M. A. KING: How does it benefit? It benefits because it is improved. The fact that a paved road has been put in is a definite improvement to the Minister's land.

You talk about the fact that there are agricultural holdings in this area. That is one of the defences I heard being adverted to. It was raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, it was raised by the honourable Member for St. Thomas and others. But look at this point. You say that there was a cartroad

there before. One understands putting in proper roads and paved roads to provide access for tenants in dwellings. What are we going to put in paved roads at the type of expense, properly Barber-Greened and effectively paved roads for in relation to agricultural holdings? To haul canes out? For goats to travel over? For sheep? To bring out produce from the land? What are you putting in that type of road to serve agricultural holdings for? Can you explain that to me?

Our position is that there were no agricultural holdings and there are no agricultural holdings in that area. But even if there were agricultural holdings in that section of the land about which we are complaining, what do you need this type of expensive improvement in the road system for where you are putting in the best kind of paved roads? Just to haul canes out from agricultural holdings, if they were there, and for animals to travel over? It is absolutely ridiculous.

The further statement that you do not have the slipper drains and the water in again is a non-point, because the way how the road is constructed and the fact that you do not have slipper drains, you do not have to dig up the road to put in water. You can run the water mains at the side of the road, as the tendency is now these days. So those are non-points which are not the issue. The fact that the road is there is a definite improvement, and to get planning permission, which you are talking about, you would just have to go one step beyond and get your water in, your slipper drains and all the other ancillary services, so to get planning permission then you would have already saved yourself quite some considerable expense because you have got the road already. All you need now to do is to put in the water and the lights and the slipper drains. The point that Town Planning has not approved the matter and that no permission has been sought and gained is a non-point which does not address the issue, but which circumvents what we are talking about altogether.

What I find remarkable, as I said, about the speech of the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, which was the first Government speech in response to the presentation of the motion, was that the honourable Member did not deal with the issue at all. One knows that he is a good debater, one knows that he can come to grips with issues quite easily and quickly, so when the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central skirts the issue and does not come to grips with it, you immediately come to the conclusion that there is no defence, because we said that the Minister has built this road on his premises to improve his land for his benefit, and the Prime Minister's immediate response was that the Opposition has always been opposed to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Perfectly correct.)

Mr. M. A. KING: You see, perfectly correct you say, not correct I say, but in any case totally irrelevant. Whether one is opposed to the Tenants Freehold Purchase Act or not is not the issue, and the fact that you can spend nearly half your speech trying to develop this aspect of the argument shows that you have not got a defence to the substance of the argument.

You talk about the conflict of interest principle not being relevant. I do not quite understand what honourable Members over there were saying in that regard. While I am on the conflict of interest, let me get one thing out of the way early, that is, the statement made earlier today by the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw). The honourable Member for St. Michael South East made a quite untruthful statement. First of all, in the way he presented his argument, he clearly demonstrated that he knew nothing about the whole concept of conflict of interest, and then he made the ridiculous presentation about my being an adviser on severance payments, and that because I advised the Barbados Workers Union, which is a client, like anybody else, on severance payments, I should declare an interest in this House when I speak on severance payments. There are other lawyers in this House who advise people on severance payments, and if that is what declaration of interest is, or his concept of it, it is clear that he does not understand what he is talking about.

6.30 p.m.

He went on to make the charge against me that, in representing someone whom he said was a member of the Union, I charged the Union a fee for representing the person in that severance payments case, and then also charged the person a fee for the same case. I deny that categorically.

(Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: That does not mean it is not true.)

Mr. M. A. KING: It is an untruth. And it is a most diabolical untruth, Mr. Speaker, that can be told in this House!

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the point of order.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I made a statement in this Honourable Chamber. The honourable Member is now saying that I told an untruth. I take objection to that, because I can bring the evidence before this Chamber, I can call the names. If the honourable Member wants to challenge me, I could call not one, a lot of names. You had better not challenge me.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Call them!)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You had better not challenge me because I have always told you to keep quiet. You have charged the person in your capacity. You were representing the Barbados Workers Union, the person was a member of the Barbados Workers Union and you turned around and charged them. You have drawn two fees for the same case.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of explanation, not a point of order.

The honourable Member may continue.

Mr. M. A. KING: I maintain that the Honourable Member is diabolically misleading the House, even in the representation he has just made. You are talking about calling names? I would like you to come outside and make that sort of statement in public. Do it in public. Do not do it under any cover of privilege. Do it in public so that we can get the issue dealt with. I beg you, come.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. M. A. KING: Honourable Members on the other side made the point that we have not established that the Minister did not declare his interest to the Cabinet, if the matter came before Cabinet, and that there is no evidence that the Trents Plantation issue ever came before the House so that he could declare his interest before the House. Again, this is a purely legalistic technicality, because how are we in a position to tell what goes on in Cabinet. That is not the issue.

(Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is why you should ask questions.)

Mr. M. A. KING: You have a responsibility, being responsible for public funds, to be in full knowledge of all the facts and all the issues and to come clear and clean. You talk about open Government. You are the persons who, when you came into office, spoke so eloquently about the expenses of Government. But now in relation to this Trents issue, we are having a closed book and we are having you shelter behind the technicalities of not having proved this and not having proved that. If you believe so much in open Government, and if you hold so fast to the principles of open Government, come on the floor of this House and disclose fully, freely and thankfully all the facts and relevant materials in relation to this Trents issue.

The crux of this matter, and this is our position from which we do not divert, is that we say that the Minister of Transport and Works has abused his ministerial

office. We say that he has done this because he has unlawfully expended public funds in putting a road at Trents to serve his own purpose.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is your opinion.)

Mr. M. A. KING: It is not an opinion.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is your opinion. That is what you are saying.)

Mr. M. A. KING: A road has been put in for the tenants. We are not concerned about that. We are concerned about the additional bit of road which has been put in on lands which do not serve the tenants and thereby enhances the value of the lands of Trents Tenantry and improves the value of that land.

You adopt the further position that we do not show how the Minister has benefitted. How do you show that a Minister has benefitted from a road on lands, other than the fact itself? The fact itself that the road is there is indicative that the lands have been improved and that benefit accrues to the owners and all those persons who are interested in that land. If proof was needed, in the way in which honourable Members on the other side say that proof is required, all the elements of proof, all the facts to establish the guilt of the Minister, so to speak, in wrongfully using public funds for this purpose are clearly established and are there for all to see.

When we talk about the conflict of interest situation, honourable Members try to divert the argument by saying that because the Minister is a Minister, we are saying he cannot benefit from Government policy. That is not the issue. What we are saying is that because he is Minister of Transport and Works, because he is accountable for public funds, and because public funds are being spent on his own personal property, he has an obligation, first of all, to declare his interest in that regard.....

(Hon. L. R. TULL: To whom?)

Mr. M. A. KING: To this Parliament among others...

(Hon. L. R. TULL: It was not before Parliament.)

Mr. M. A. KING: At the Annual Estimates of the Ministry of Transport and Works. They come before this Parliament every year.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Nonsense!)

Mr. M. A. KING: Tenantry roads are part of the programme of the Ministry of Transport and Works.

This sort of thing calls and cries out for what we have been complaining about all the time, that we need

to provide some sort of programme and show this House and show the public what roads and what road works and programmes are being contemplated by the Ministry of Transport and Works. If you have that kind of programme laid before us in Parliament, we would know what is being discussed.

It is no point hiding behind the cover of whatever it is and say, that there has been no opportunity to disclose. There has been every opportunity to disclose a matter of this nature, because you know that if you are developing roads, if you are developing the tenantry at Trents which is in the ownership of a Minister, and, clearly, you intend to go beyond what is necessary for the tenants themselves, you know that that has to be a matter of public concern. What is wrong with presenting that issue up front in Parliament and saying what you propose to do, and because it concerns a Minister of Government and it is all the more important that you want it to appear to all and sundry that things are being properly and effectively done? If you do not do that, and if, in the final analysis, what turns out is a resultant improvement of your own property, in circumstances which clearly go beyond what is necessary for the proper, effective and necessary use of the tenants, we say that in that situation you have clearly gone wrong and that for that you should stand indicted. You have clearly covered up the situation because you have not been as free and frank in your disclosure as you ought to have been.

The honourable Members on this side of the House have fortunately been able to hone in on what is the essential issue in this debate. I want to compliment all honourable Members on this side for the way in which they have dealt with the debate, how they have stuck to the issue, how, despite all the provocation, they have not allowed themselves to be distracted from the main issue which is before this House in this debate. I hope that, in the final analysis, when all is said and done, the Government, despite the need that it feels it has to support its Minister and to close ranks on this issue, will recognize that it is in the interest of all of us, it is in the interest of the public of Barbados, that things must be done properly, that it is not good enough to say that because we benefit some of the community, it is all right if we benefit ourselves a bit — and quite outside the law.

6.40 p.m.

From that point of view, I say that where the Minister has gone outside of the law in providing a benefit for himself he stands condemned, and I am urging this House to support the Resolution which is now before it. We are expressing lack of confidence in the honourable Member as a Minister in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown and we are calling for his removal from office as a Minister.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The lame duck reply of the mover of this Resolution is of such a nature that it is hardly necessary for me to deal with anything that he has said. But there are a number of points that have been raised by a few honourable Members on the other side which I feel, in the interest of public knowledge, I should deal with.

The first point that I think is necessary for all to appreciate and understand, particularly because of the phrase in the Resolution which alleges that the Honourable Minister unlawfully spend public money, is that no Minister of Government spends any public money in Barbados. There is no authority, no law, which says that a Minister can draw a cheque on the Treasury in Barbados, absolutely none. The responsibility for accounting in any Ministry resides with the public officers in that Ministry. The Chief Accounting Officer is the Permanent Secretary of the particular Ministry and the general supervision of the total accounting procedure in Government is in the Director of Finance and Planning, subject to the Auditor General's audit and subject also to the scrutiny of the Public Accounts Committee, presided over by the Leader of the Opposition. All of that statement, therefore, about unlawfully spending Government money is a worthless and useless allegation made by people who do not understand the constitutional procedures in Barbados. It is no wonder that the Leader of the Opposition did not repeat it, because he knows fully well that any such statement has absolutely no legal validity. It is no wonder also that the Member for St. Michael South East can say about the honourable mover of the Resolution what he has said.

During the course of this debate, there was one over there from St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) who had certain observations to make. I am not going to deal with those observations, because the honourable Member is well known as being a person who occupied a position of public trust in this country and he caused the Treasury of this country considerable sums of money for total and absolute incompetence and bad-mindedness. Let us not forget that the honourable Member, sitting in his capacity as a magistrate, deprived a person of the person's liberty, found by the judges to be unlawful deprivation, and it cost the country money. Anything that emanates from his mouth must be coloured by the reputation he had when he held that capacity. And as the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O Bradshaw) said quite rightly, while he was a magistrate he expressed statements during the course of the time when he was sitting as a magistrate which indicated quite clearly that he was a biased and prejudiced magistrate in that particular proceeding. He should take the warning. He should also check his Estimates of Expenditure for the current year and see what is in the Estimates of Expenditure in relation to the matter about which he spoke.

We have disposed of, very effectively, the falsity of that part of the Resolution which deals with unlawfulness. Now let us deal with the question of interest. This is a very interesting point. I have tried to check the comparable position in Barbados in our rules and in our law in relation to the position in the United Kingdom in relation to declaration of interest and the Barbados law, as set out in the Parliamentary (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, Cap. 9, is considerably more restrictive than the one in England, and if the honourable Members feel that as Members of the House of Assembly that they wish an amendment of the rules and the law in Barbados in relation to the disclosure of interest, it is for them, in the usual manner and style, to put forward the recommendations for a wider ambit of regulation to the Rules Committee. In 1974, in the United Kingdom, Parliament passed a Resolution which provided for wider disclosure, and that disclosure is set out very clearly. It says "direct or indirect" and delineates also whether it is a debate, a proceeding in the House, Committee, a communication, an interest or contract. All of these things you will find in May's Parliamentary Procedure, 19th Edition, at page 1086.

The gravamen of the defence of the Government from the very beginning of this has been that the Minister, as a landowner, was in no different position from any other landowner in Barbados because of the fact that the public well knew, well understood, that it was the policy of the Barbados Labour Party Government to improve conditions in the rural areas of Barbados and to bring them up to par with urban areas. We campaigned upon that basis. We won an election on that basis. Two hundred-odd lots have been built on that basis. The fact that one of the landowners happens to be a Minister, does that mean that the honourable Member's tenants and the honourable Member's land are not to be treated in the same way as other landowners? That is a vital one. Just as there was a partnership between the Government and landowners whereby the landowners surrendered to Government, free of cost, that area of land over which roads went, in return Government put in roads, paid surveying fees, conveyancing fees and stipulated the purchase price.

7.00 p.m.

I want to deal now with this question of agricultural tenants, because the honourable Members on the other side fail to appreciate the point that we have been making on this side, and I mentioned this during the Budget Debate. We have come to an agreement with land owners who have agricultural tenants that, provided those land owners are willing to sell the people the agricultural tenancies at ten cents a square foot, the Government will do in relation to that land the same thing it does in relation to land where there are house spots. I mentioned that when I assumed duty as Minister of Finance, the first

person that came to see me in respect of this was the person who owned Drax Hall Plantation. I mentioned that, and I also mentioned that he was accompanied by his attorney, a Mr. Armstrong, and also that we had hammered out at Cabinet level the policy, and pursuant to that policy the Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act will be changed to include a wider schedule. I am telling you that. That is a fact of life. It has passed Cabinet. I have mentioned it on more than one occasion that Mr. Drax came to me in respect of Drax Hall and mentioned that some surveyors had refused to give up the plots of land that they had surveyed, and among the people who had refused to give up the plots were people working for the firm of Franklin and Franklin on the ground that they had not been paid, and a dispute arose between the Ministry of Housing and the surveyors as to who should be paid for surveying agricultural lands. All of that came to me long before, and I constantly mentioned it in here.

Mr. Drax, thank God, being a very careful man — and I had never seen the man before — as I understood it, when he went back to Dorset, or wherever he lives, wrote to the Permanent Secretary confirming what we had agreed at the meeting. Apparently that is his style, so I have that letter, and I can demonstrate at the appropriate time, with his permission, of course, and Mr. Armstrong's, the complaints he made about the surveyors.

Mr. Drax was one of those who said he wanted more money for the agricultural land. I said Government would pay for the surveying, but if the Government is going to put in the services, you are not getting a penny more for the agricultural land. That is the position. It is a well settled position of the Government of Barbados as elected.

I have in my constituency an area in Lodge Road where since 1974 I have been trying to get roads, water and light put in and "Peanuts" Morrison and his family have bluntly refused to allow us to put a road across their land. That is up to two weeks ago. That will show you how the Democratic Labour Party operates. Up to two weeks ago, when the Waterworks was putting in the road, he stopped the Waterworks people from going across his land, although there are tenants in there. That is your philosophy.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He is a member of the Democratic Labour Party. He typifies the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party. Your Resolution is only further evidence of that kind of attitude.

We have others, too. We are doing sidewalks in Maxwell and going down Two Mile Hill. Some people objected too, but the land owners have agreed with

Government that they will give up the area of land over which the roads go.

There is another thing. I have personally talked to tenants in this area of Trents. I have the list that was supplied by the original owners, and the material thing is that the original development of Trents did not start with the honourable Member. When the honourable Member bought Trents, it was a matter of public record that that was an area that was scheduled for development, so what disclosure are you talking about? Trents Plantation was scheduled for development prior to the ownership of the honourable Member. He bought it *cum honore*, so do not let us fool ourselves on this.

Just as the honourable Member of Franklin and Franklin can draw fees, just as the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) can go to the Community College and draw fees as a teacher in return for his services.....

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not see anything wrong with that).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: So what do you see wrong then in a Minister who happens coincidentally to own a piece of land, who has to give up the area of land over which the road comes? He has to sell the tenants the land at a stipulated price, something that you all objected to. This is where the Democratic Labour Party and us part company, for when the Bill came to be passed and we were restricting the constitutional right of the citizen to adequate compensation, the honourable Member voted against that. In short, you were saying that you should be paid full compensation, in which case the honourable Member would be sitting good and pretty tonight. You voted against it, Clause 36. Errol Walton Barrow voted against it, as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Errol Walton Barrow in here.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In the Minutes I see that name, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean the honourable Member for St. John.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member knows that the then Member for St. Lucy and I voted for the Bill in all its phases, but in Committee voted against that clause as not being the right way to alter the Constitution of Barbados. We never said anything about price at all. The honourable Member persists in this fallacy all the time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Clause 36. That altered the Constitution so that the Government could prevent the

owner from getting compensation under the Constitution. I have it clear. All of this we went through, and the then Speaker in the House of Assembly debates of 1980, page 4296, said:

"Clause 36. Do you really mean section 36?"

"Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Clause 36."

"Mr. SPEAKER: Do you really mean clause 36?"

"Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. I said section but I mean clause 36."

In short, that was the clause where the alteration of the Constitution was coming which permitted the Government to deprive the owners of the rightful value of the land, because we said it was a partnership. The owners gave up something and we also offered them something in return.

There will be an amendment to the Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act to include the agreement that we reached, and there will be a large number of tenancies included. Secondly, I want to make this point very clearly. I think it is important. In this particular case, like in other cases, some of the lots that were sold at ten cents per square foot as house spots are as much as half acre, so what are you telling the public? Let the public know that at Trents one of the tenants has as much as three quarters of an acre, another has half an acre. The lowest I see is an eighth of an acre.
7.00 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North should be ashamed of his contribution in here, because he should really have disclosed the fact that he drew \$106 000, along with the other partners at that time. He should also have investigated and found out, if he wanted to put a true presentation, not only the amount of land that this road potentially will open but also the amount of land that the road went through for which no compensation was paid, and, also, the totality of the amount of land that the tenants occupied and exercised their option to purchase at ten cents a square foot, and work out the cost of the deprivation that the honourable Member suffered in the reduction of the purchase price. In other words, you balance one side with the other side. Being fair — now that is a characteristic that a valuer should have. Let us get that straight; an essential characteristic of a valuer or anybody who gives an opinion is that he must be fair, he cannot praise people who only know one side. If the honourable Member is going to get up in here and say that 600 000 square feet of land has been made available for a potential benefit, he must get up and say that, on the other hand, he suffered a disability of having to convey, in accordance with this wicked and unjust law, all

of this land at ten cents per square foot and, therefore, has lost so much.

I think that we should have it clear. The Ministry of Housing carried out a social survey of this land. The cost of the road was \$334 542. There was a disagreement between the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Housing surveyors as to the alignment of the road long before the Honourable Minister got into it. The final alignment was only settled after the Deputy Technical Director went down there, after representations were made by the two old ladies who lived there. I do not know their names. I am only going by the files and this was compiled for me at my specific request.

All they have done over there is laboured long. They have made a lot of wild allegations, but that is popular now. From now on, make no mistake about it, Government and Barbadians are going to be suffering from a barage of lies and propaganda from the Democratic Labour Party. You have started already. The honourable Member for St. James South started it in here today. Last week the well know prince of liars in Barbados had his say.

They even now have people, who, I hope, will soon be exposed to legal ethics, writing matters in respect of the number of state cars in Barbados and concocting information. They say there are two. I invite the Leader of the Opposition to investigate when the second one was bought and who paid for it. That is your function as Leader of the Opposition. You know that is your duty. Why you do not tell your members, particularly the neophytes, that when they criticize any public expenditure of the Government, they are criticizing you for your indolence in not carrying out your duty as Leader of the Opposition. That is what they are doing. You are the Leader of the Opposition. You are the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The Rules say very clearly you can call for books and papers and everybody has to come before you. Why do you not use your powers? Use them! I want you to use them, and I promise you something, too. You are going to have a quorum. It is not going to be like during the time when we were in Opposition and we wanted to hold a Public Accounts Committee meeting. You have the powers, use them.

It is obvious to me that there is a serious difference of opinion between the other side and the technicians in the Ministry of Transport and the Minister in the Ministry of Transport. The other side feels that you should have stopped the road there, have a roundabout, make the two old ladies move and push them up to that corner. You must not make any provision for people like Mr. Elcock and you said that there is no such thing as Mr. Elcock.

I requested the Town Planner, through the Cabinet Secretary — when some of these neophytes become Cabinet Ministers they would know. The Leader of the Opposition should hold a school for some of them. Let them understand how public expenditure is done. There cannot be any hope for the honourable Member for St. James South, though. His inherent weaknesses would not allow him to appreciate or understand that he is only interested in devious ways.

No. 472/884, Stephen Rollock, applied for planning permission, the erection of a residence in stone and timber at Trents. Permission was granted on the 23/10/84. Mr. Rollock happens to be one of the agricultural tenants situated between the two old ladies at that corner and the other group of houses nearer to the St. Lucy Secondary School. If the honourable Member for St. Philip North says that is a bad development, that is his business. I know that I am going to be campaigning in St. Lucy and I am going to ask the people in St. Lucy to decide whether this is a good development or not.

This Resolution is a Resolution that was inspired by the St. Thomas by-election, and I am deeply grateful to the Leader of the Opposition, for today he mentioned the name of two people. One person happens to be either the brother-in-law or the potential father-in-law of Mr. Rock, the candidate in the by-election in St. Thomas. One of those names that you mentioned today. He is a superintendent in the Government, but he also happens to be —

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not mind what he is. He is a superintendent in the Government. He is obviously a person who has a good relationship with the other side because the honourable Member knows him — he mentioned his name, I did not mention his name. That is how the honourable Member got his information. He thought that it would have been a big political gimmick. He thought he had it. He wants to replace the drama that was created in here by the former Prime Minister when he disclosed the cheques in here. Today he was so anxious to do it that he nearly put his hand in a vase permanently.

This Resolution is deserving of no support. If the honourable Members on the other side wish to help parliamentary debate, let them join with an amendment to the Rules and widen the ambit so that people like the honourable Member for St. Philip North, when he comes in here and is working for the Government, people like the honourable Member for St. Michael South, when he comes in here and is drawing money from the Community College, they would have to disclose that, too. Let us have a register. The Barbados Labour Party

had a Bill dealing with this matter. We never got the co-operation of the Opposition and we never received any co-operation from the members of the Senate who were independently selected. So we have done our best to try to improve the standard of public administration.
7.10 p.m.

The honourable Member knows, and the public should know, that no Minister of Government spends Government money. The Civil Servants in Barbados should remember what the Hanschell Commission said. Anybody who tries to tell them to spend money when they do not have the money voted is wrong, and I know the Director of Finance and Planning is always telling them that nobody could make them spend money which has not been voted or make them spend money for the purposes for which it is not being voted. So once you have these rules in operation, nothing can happen with the public finances of Barbados.

The Government will not be supporting this Resolution.

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

Noes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. A. TRUSS; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS; Mr. O. S. ARTHUR; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. J. G. ODLE — 12.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN; Mr. N. K. SIMMONS; Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES — 8.

Abstention: Hon. V. L. JOHNSON — 1.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, before I go into Government Business, I would really like to salute Members on this side for the contribution which they have made. I must confess that if there is one thing that is of paramount importance, it is to see the distinguished, gallant and learned Member for St. John back to his exercise books. All he has to do now is to start with "Baa, baa black sheep, have you any wool," back to nursery rhymes. Once a man, twice a child. Look what you have come to. You are doing nothing else but impeding the progress of that party you gave birth to. Give up, old fellow, give up.

Sir, I now move that Government Business be the instant Order of the Day.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

TAX ON QUARRIABLE MINERALS ACT, 1985

Order No. 1 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of sale of minerals mined in a quarry.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, the Bill is pursuant to a budgetary proposal of the Government, which really is to collect for the public revenue some of the proceeds of the sale of quarriable materials in Barbados.

The Government has had some consultation with relevant interests. I am not suggesting that all the relevant interests have agreed, but the material point is that rather than rely on the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, the Government has decided to give this legislation a forward date so that it will come into force in respect of a date in the future.

I am attracted to such a scheme of legislation where legislation is entering in new areas which were not taxed before, and one wants to shape the legislation after consultation. In future I trust that it will be a practice that will be adhered to, because it allows Government, having announced the principles of the taxation, to enter into discussions with relevant interests on the impact of the legislation and then put a future date for the legislation to start having an impact. The date as set out in the Bill is 1st July.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 – 23 inclusive were called and passed.
7.20 p.m.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 3 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, Cap. 114.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas) This is a bit of amending legislation to put right one or two anomalies that have appeared in the parent Act, the District Auctioneers Act, Cap. 114.

The origin of the Auctioneers Act goes back to 1904, and there were subsequent amendments in the Fifties – 1954, 1956, 1958 – and then in 1973. The regime of penalties for breach of the Act reflected the going rate for offences in those years. But with the passage of time and the need to make penalties more reflective of contemporary requirement, there has been a demand that the principal Act be further amended.

The impetus for the present amendment was given by reason of an incident in 1981 involving the District Auctioneer, Mr. Darcy Scott, who was attacked by a man brandishing a cutlass whilst carrying out his duties and was obstructed. In checking the legislation, it was found that the penalty for obstructing the District Auctioneer was \$48, so opportunity is being taken now to modernize the legislation and to remove the anomalies and bring them more in line with other contemporary legislation. The Bill before the House was fully canvassed in its draft stage before the Registrar, who made some useful inputs, of which account has been taken.

Broadly, this Bill seeks to do the following things: we tidy up Section 12 (6) of the present Act and create an offence and a penalty of \$500 or a term of imprisonment of six months – that is Section 2 – and we provide the criminal procedure for prosecution.

Under the old Act, under the parent Act, there is a proceeding by way of complaint, which, as you would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, is better applicable to quasi-criminal proceedings than purely criminal. We have taken the opportunity where it is relevant and in the Bill, for example, in Section 24(2) and 26(2), to provide for institution of proceedings by information rather than by complaint.

Honourable Members will see that a number of offences have been created and a number of amendments made to the level of fines or punishment.

As a consequence of the amendment in procedure, it was necessary to amend the Fourth Schedule to the

Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act to allow proceedings to be done by complaint.

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

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.
7.30 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, earlier in the day I gave notice that I would do a supplementary of \$354 000 in all of its stages. It is a Resolution which relates to the enumeration exercise.

I now move that Order No. 4 be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any objections to this Resolution being made in all of its stages? There is no reply. The Resolution will be taken.

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$354 070 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985–86, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985–86, No. 3 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985–86 No. 3

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

HEAD 15 – PUBLIC OFFICE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): This Head relates to the expenditure of the funeral of the late Prime Minister, the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams. It is in the amount of \$60 507, of which \$1 083 was paid during the previous financial year. I do not believe that there will be any debate on this. I know it is not impossible for Members on the other side to debate this.

I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): He is as smart as a fox! This Head 15 deals with one sub-head which relates to the funeral, but Subhead 4 relates to the Electoral Office and Subhead 5 relates to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. I would like to address Subhead 5 – the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The honourable Member is an old trickster – that is what he was trying to do, to trick me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I do not believe that my colleague really means that I am a trickster in the Richie Haynes sense. I believe that I am a skillful House Leader, I think this is what he is trying to say. I think he could be a little more polite in his language. Do not call me a trickster. I am not a trickster. I may be a skillful individual. I called Head 15, and I spoke on what I thought would not cause a debate, that is the late Prime Minister's funeral. I know my colleagues would never debate that, and so I put it like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think the honourable Member's remarks were ill-intended.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir I thought it was one of his more delicate moments as Leader of the House.

Subhead 5 relates to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, to conduct a house-to-house survey of electors, to bring the register to electors up-to-date and to provide for the national registration I.D. card to all persons on the register, and the sum being provided is \$260 000.

As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, for many years we have laboured on this side and I have spoken again and again on the need to try to update the register, because it has implications, naturally, in relation to the fairness of elections, on the one hand, and, almost certainly, the fairness of the outcome of an election in a

given constituency. But I think that the success or otherwise of this exercise would depend on several factors. The first factor is that it is important that persons should be appointed to conduct this survey who live in the polling districts and who really know the people in the polling districts. This is absolutely important. Those of us who have some experience in going around examining lists would know that you have to be walking with someone with a very intimate knowledge of the people, someone known by a pen name, and sometimes you find members in the same family who should have the same name and yet one part of the name is left off or something like that. I will give you an example, — a family with the name Pierre, also Jean-Pierre, and one or two others having the name of Pierre. Unless that is known, this exercise is not going to be as successful as it can otherwise be.

The second important thing is that the people who are carrying out the registration or updating the lists should at least know the electoral boundaries and the boundaries within the constituencies. I will give you an example: In my polling district, if you leave Collymore Rock and walk along George Street on the left, that is an RC district. Then you come to a particular house where the whole thing shifts over to RB, that is the above side. The reason is simple; the person who was carrying out that registration, the first person, knew that side was an RC and the person who took over did not know that that side was an RC. This kind of thing causes endless confusion. We have had a situation where a whole road in Brittons Hill was registered in one constituency when we broke, but which is part of the constituency. We have a situation where another part of Brittons Hill is in another constituency, and it is difficult to get it corrected.

This kind of exercise can, therefore, only work and money worthwhile spent if we ensure that these built-in safeguards are here. It is in the interest of all of us. For years we have games going on where we know that certain people do not live in the constituency and you try and keep those names on the list, and probably get the names of other people who do not vote for you off the list. The net result of this is that it is a very confusing list with a lot of errors, a lot of dead people on the list, a lot of people who have gone away for longer than the statutory time, some as much as twenty years.

One of the reasons why the lists cannot be kept up-to-date and why the representatives cannot make a more important contribution to keeping these lists up-to-date arises from the legislative constraints in terms of the removal of names from the register. Let me explain what I mean. If I come across someone in my constituency who has recently moved into the constituency more than three months, I can get a transfer form signed and have that person transferred to my constituency. If I know that a person was living in that

house and had left the constituency, it is virtually impossible to get that person's name removed from the register, because you have to sign an objection form stating not only that the person has left but also informing the Electoral Office where the person now resides. Under the law, their names cannot be removed unless you can find an alternate address which can be certified by the Electoral Office. This paralyses the efforts of both candidate and the Electoral Office, and I would suggest that in due course it may be necessary to look at an amendment to the Representation of the People Act, or whatever Act covers this aspect of the electoral process, and probably make a provision by which, when it is found that someone has left a district, it may be possible for more than three or four months to advertise their names in the newspapers, and if there is no response then the Electoral Officer can deal with this.

7.40 p.m.

It is true, as I understand it, that the law places an obligation on individuals to inform the Electoral Officer if they have left one constituency and gone to another. At the same time, the law also imposes an obligation on the Electoral Officer not to remove that person's name from the register unless it can be placed in another constituency. As I understand it, the fundamental principle being that once your name is somewhere on the register of the island, you are enfranchised, and if it is not somewhere on the register of the island, you are disenfranchised. But in terms of the fact that we have to consider an election as being 27 elections taking place on that day, I submit that where seats are won by majorities of 50, 100 or 150, the outcome of those elections can be influenced by the fact that these lists are not pure. I do not expect to get 100 per cent purity of lists, but I believe that an effort can be made to try to get them at about 95 per cent pure. It would also reduce the work of conscientious campaigners like myself by about 75 per cent if this was done, and it would give everybody a fair chance of trying to get a majority of the votes of those living in the constituency and in the various polling districts at the time of the election.

I notice that this subhead also says to provide for a national registration ID card. Does this suggest that the old ID card would no longer be acceptable for the purpose of voting as from the next election? Is that the intention here? I do not know, but it would suggest to me that if you are going to provide for a national registration ID card to all persons on the register, it may mean that the purpose of this would be to make it mandatory in the future for people to vote only if they have the new registration number.

We have asked for scrutineers not so much because we distrust anybody in this exercise, but in order to reinforce the first point I made, that if you are going to

have an updating of the register, in my judgment it can be best done by the people who know the people in the area, particularly where populations are fairly mobile, as in the major parts of my constituency. I believe that scrutineers can help in this regard, because with scrutineers, then the person who is actually carrying out the house to house survey or the enumeration would not have to have as intimate a knowledge, because the scrutineers would have a fairly good knowledge. So it is not a question of disturbing the Electoral Office or anybody, it would seem to me to be a step further in the direction of making sure that these periodic checks are in fact effective and produce the results intended.

It would seem to me that this is not an enumeration as such, but it is an attempt to help to clean up the register. We on this side can only welcome it. It should be conducted in three months' time. It can be in time because there cannot be any general election in the next three months anyhow.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): There was a newspaper article that was written some weeks ago, and to which there has been no response officially or unofficially — indeed I do not understand how the Electoral Department has not responded to Mr. Cameron Tudor in the *Advocate* — a nasty and wicked article, because it imputed to the Returning Officer for St. Thomas that he was incompetent and was not carrying out his job properly. Clearly the implication was that that gentleman was less than satisfactory.

It is alleged in this article that they were trying to find 21 people whose names appeared on the register for a particular district but they could not find them, then at one stage they found 14, and that there were about 300 persons they could not find in St. Thomas, which is an adverse reflection on the Returning Officer. But hear this now. In the course of the campaign, we have found more than 400 objections to the inclusion on the list of persons who had not resided in St. Thomas for some considerable time. Owing to our inability to satisfy the Electoral Officer as to where all of those persons lived, the Electoral Office upheld only about 70 of our objections.

Where the honourable Member was just coming from was straight out of this article, because this goes on to deal with scrutineers.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: The honourable Member has suggested that I have brought to the House material coming out of an article which he has designated "wicked." Honourable Members who have been in here for the past four years would know that this is not the first time I have made that speech. I make it every year in the Estimates, for four years I have been making the same speech.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was not implying that the honourable Member is in this particular matter wicked. What I was implying was that he was using the arguments of this article for today's contribution.

As I understand the honourable Member, he has some difficulty with a situation in which you should object to somebody but you should not necessarily have on the objection form to state where the person is living. That is fraught with all kinds of dangers, as was exemplified in the St. Thomas by-election. A vagabond, a well known embezzler who was dismissed from the *Nation* newspaper, and let it go in the Record of this House, one Mike Walcott, submitted 400 objections, frivolous and vexatious, during the St. Thomas by-election. Luckily we had a good machinery set up to trace everyone. He objected to people who were living in the constituency. He would pick out a name, because he heard the person was a Labour Party supporter, and object to it in the hope of flooding the Electoral Department, in particular the Returning Officer, so that he could not get to all of these people and check them out and genuinely determine whether they should be on or off. That was the whole purpose.
7.50 p.m.

I am not saying you did it. I said Walcott did it. Do not charge me. I know what I am talking about, I am going to call names.

What was worse in that by-election was that attempts were made to take off the names of persons who were living in the constituency — and, indeed, they succeeded in one case. My circular went out on the basis of the penultimate list. A circular was sent to a man from Canefield called George Forde. On election day, at 3.30 p.m., he came to campaign headquarters and told the Prime Minister and myself that he had gone to vote and his name had been deleted. The man was living. We called the Electoral Department to be told that he was taken off because he was dead — but on May 23 this man was as large as life! That was one instance. Another case was a woman called Marvatta Hoyte.

I have made my representations to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission on a number of those infelicities, but the point is that it is not proper to remove somebody because they are not living in the particular constituency, when you do not know where they are, merely on whim. You must know the district to which the person has gone so that he can be checked out, so that the fear expressed is a real fear. You will disenfranchise people unless you can account for them in another constituency. I think it must remain.

I am all for seeing an amendment to the law which would demand that when people move into a particular constituency, the obligation is on them to go and register.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of explanation: My understanding is that is the current law now. It is not enforced, but the obligation is on the person who has moved. What I am suggesting is that that should probably be strengthened. Let us say that you have discovered that someone has left St. Thomas and you do not know where they are and the person probably have not reported that to the Electoral Office. It is not that there is an automatic removal of the name but there should be a process of advertising in the newspaper periodically or something like that so that the person has an opportunity to report to the Electoral Officer.

I really seriously suggest this, because it would help a lot of people over a five-year period in helping to keep the list relatively clean.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I understand the point made by the honourable Member. One other point that he made which I think was meritorious in that you should have people from the particular districts, not necessarily the electoral district; enumerators and so on should probably be from the districts, not necessarily the polling district. You need to have somebody doing Rock Hall and Porey Spring. You need to have two or three enumerators from that area who know the people, because the more you get into the country, the more you will find that a lot of people have nick-names and very seldom do a lot of people know their correct names. If you are from the district, you have a better chance of knowing who "Boga" is, rather than somebody coming from outside and not knowing the person's correct name.

I am against the scrutineer principle. I think it has inherent difficulties. You are going to send two people, one from the Labour Party and one from the Democratic Labour Party — God help us if you also want one from the Eric Sealy group — along with the enumerator to ensure that when you go to a house, you take down the correct information. You come to my house, a well known Labour Party yardfowl, but you have a Dem outside. I say, "Get off my premises," and race him. How are you going to control that if the house owner says he does not want anybody else around other than the gentleman who is recording the information?

I think there can be a lot of problems with the scrutineer principle because we all know as politicians what it is like canvassing. St. Thomas is the exception. St. Thomas is a beautiful parish to canvas. Members of the Opposition know. They went into Arch Hall — I see two sitting there who went into Arch Hall — and they had a good reception, but a reception that said, 'We are solid Labour Party, try your luck somewhere else,' but nobody was rude, offensive and insulting. But there are some constituencies where people can be nasty, curse you, run you out, threaten to do this and that, and while we might get away as politicians, the ordinary fellow

going as a scrutineer might be embarrassed, so I would encourage.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just a minute. I agree with the point of the scrutineer having problems, including co-ordination with the actual work. But he is speaking about the scrutineers being well known yardfowls, as he put it, and that they might be driven off and chased away, and I am wondering what would happen if the enumerator himself is a well known yardfowl. Would he be chased as well?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member can give way: When that happens in my constituency — and they have well known yardfowls, like the gentleman who ran against me last time, he was not chased away, he was just voted against.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I think we have to be careful on some of those things. Anyhow, it is out of our hands and it is a matter for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe we have to provide special feathers for these yardfowls.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I do not want to delay the House for any length of time. I just want to make a few points without developing them.

The first is to congratulate the Government on trying to bring up-to-date the Electoral Roll, having regard to statutory requirements of having a General Election anytime after September next year or before.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate the Democratic Labour Party on having been converted like Saul on the road to Damascus to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission and its efficacy in the electoral process. We fought with the Democratic Labour Party from 1965, when we were dealing with the Independence Constitution, to enshrine in the Constitution an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The debate on that occasion is now history, but it is history that we must never forget. We were told that it was unnecessary, that this House had all of the powers that were necessary and that the electoral process in Barbados was and had always been pure, to paraphrase the speech of the Right Honourable Member for St. John, which was repeated so often.

8.00 p.m.

Some of us were then Under-Forties, with all the idealism that was necessary to keep the purity of democracy within our area, and we believed beyond the point of conviction that an Electoral and Boundaries Commission was necessary. We can look around the House and see some of the Under-Forties in here now.

There was strong opposition on the part of the Democratic Labour Party, and one must never forget this.

When you find the hypocritical attitude of someone like the person referred to in the article in the *Advocate*, Mr. Cameron Tudor, one really has to say that these people have guts. The holier-than-thou attitude being adopted on electoral matters by the Democratic Labour Party must be exposed for what it is.

I fought the 1971 election with the Democratic Labour Party a week before the election altering the boundaries with people in Parish Land, not knowing where they were to go. That was particularly directed against the present Prime Minister in his present constituency. It was the worse gerrymandering that I have seen. We asked for scrutineers at that time. I do not know where the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was then. I know that he was a member of the Democratic Labour from school days, and I respect him for his political views, but his voice was silent. The Democratic Labour Party was dead against scrutineers, and I hate the hypocrisy that I see they are adopting in their political stance on the platform and getting columnists every day, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central preaching to Mr. Gladstone Holder, a good friend of mine, to try to give him a wrong attitude about these matters. Every day he is preaching to him on these matters without giving an objective view. He can go when he leaves here and quote correctly what I have said about him. The honourable Member is on a public relations trip that anybody he comes near to, he gives a one-sided and biased view, and refuses to let them focus on what has happened in the historical, political development in this country. The honourable Member can tell Gladstone Holder what he likes.

He gives the impression that we are against democracy every week, and one does not recall what happened in this country from the Sixties when a few of us had the guts to get up and fight for maintaining parliamentary democracy. The Opposition was then at the height of its glory, and it was very much against scrutineers at the time. They said that we wanted yardfowls to be going into decent people's houses. I have some of the tapes still of that period of our history. If the honourable Member has forgotten, I do not forget these matters, so when I hear the Democratic Labour Party being now converted, I say thank God we did not labour in vain, because it was always our aim to purify the electoral process.

The honourable Member may have a case for reducing the period of time that people who live overseas should remain on the electoral roll. But it is always a mistake to say to the electorate, in the heat of elections when partisan feelings are at their highest, that the electoral roll is packed, because you may find the names

of 200 or 300 people who are now living outside of Barbados, but have not been living outside for a five year period. It would be a dangerous precedent for us not to put safeguards in the legislation in order to facilitate the easy removal of people's names from the register without a proper process.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) has a lot of experience in this field, and I think when he gets up he will agree with me on this point. He may not agree with all the partisan political statements that I have made, but he will certainly agree with me on this point. I do not know of any election law in any proper democratic system that I know which could facilitate the easy removal of people's names, because the right to vote is too fundamental. What I would like to suggest to the House is now that we have got an Electoral and Boundaries Commission and we believe that there is a greater consensus between the political parties, we look at a sensible Representation of the People Act that has been updated and would take into consideration the legitimate concerns and criticisms, some of which I have heard from both sides of the House from time to time.

There is one solution that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission can take, and it is quite easy. On election day a master list should be available to the whole island, should be available at each polling district so that you can give information to people who can go to the wrong polling districts. Within my own constituency, whenever you get on the boundary you have a problem concerning where people are placed. In Observatory Road, you can find somebody voting in St. Michael South East and voting in Christ Church West. Normally our canvassers should pick up this as we go along, but you go to a house twice, sometimes three times, and you do not always find all seven people at home, at any time, and no matter how careful you are, you can get this problem occurring. I agree with the honourable Member that we can straighten out this. The honourable Member is quite right that the list does show some people who have died. I can show the same in Christ Church West constituency, but that is not a difficult problem. The Chief Electoral Officer can get the information from the Registry if he is following up, and he can easily rectify that.

What I do not like is the suggestion that somebody is deliberately setting out to pad the list, as is contained in that article. I read the article and it is a nauseating article. I think it is unfair to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission to have written an article of that nature, because, let us face it, the Democratic Labour Party got beaten in St. Thomas. They say they had a moral victory. All of a sudden we are hearing now that if they had had an electoral list and 500 had been removed, they would have won. I do not buy that.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North and me sat as lawyers dealing with the mistakes that were made in the by-election in St. Peter, and if we are honest and candid, the election was very close. The mistakes were not many. I felt a little satisfied in Barbados that the mistakes were not many, although in this case they were important and fundamental, and at the end of the day, if one forgot the fact that I was Barbados Labour Party and the other side was Democratic Labour Party and considered that we were Barbadian citizens looking for the best for Barbadians, I think we had to objectively recognise that the errors in St. Peter did not betray the democratic process, in the sense that there was no fraud.

I agree that in the elections in the last 25 years, if you like to put it so, on both sides of the political fence, you have seen people who have been in position at the electoral poll who may have some known political connection. In my own constituency, when I was running not against the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) but when I was running against Mrs. Frazier, the person in charge of one of the biggest polling districts was Mr. J. C. King, who was going to be a candidate against me. I do not believe he did anything wrong at all that day, but the fact is that, psychologically, it could have affected one or two of one's supporters. The present candidate against me, whom the Democratic Labour Party wants to get rid of shortly, Mr. John Daniel, — I have to send the message to him early; the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, is canvassing an alternative candidate to throw out Mr. Daniel from running against me, — in the years before he ran against me, when Mrs. Frazier was running, Mr. Daniel was in charge of ZA. I saw him canvassing for Mrs. Frazier, but on election day he was in charge of ZA.

I do not really want the Democratic Labour Party to get around here and give people the impression that the Barbados Labour Party has come in and has put their supporters here and you cannot do this and you cannot do that, whereas I know that this was a tradition. I know I can cite it in my own area, and yet on that day my polling clerks ensured that everything went right. I got the biggest majority despite the fact that well known and high-ranking members of the Democratic Labour Party were manning the post. I got the biggest majority, at that time a higher percentage of the votes than the honourable Member for St. John had got. Between the two of us, we have a little private competition as to who would get the highest percentage. I think the two of us have about the highest percentage, and then it was the former Member for St. Thomas.

8.10 p.m.

Despite the fact that manning the poll right through were members of the DLP — when it was not Mr. Gollop — not Mr. Clyde Gollop, his brother, as a well known member of the Democratic Labour Party — it was

Mr. John Daniel or Mr. J. C. King — and they had everything stacked in Christ Church West, yet, I won. I am not making any allegations that the gentlemen were in any way unfair at all. I think they tried to the best of their ability to carry out their task, despite their obvious political sympathies.

We can do the electoral process a lot of good if we put our minds together. We form the Electoral Act, keeping in mind the necessity to respect people's right to vote, and try and arrange a procedure between us so that we would stop making the electoral process and registration process issues of political division between us. We have come a long way since 1965. We are near the position where there may be a maximum political consensus between the two parties to maintain democracy, and there are two good parties.

The Democratic Labour Party and ourselves, we have not.....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, I have an objective view about politics, although I am partisan.

Luckily for Barbados, both political parties have at some stage, despite the fact that we may criticize each other, made it clear to the electorate that we want to maintain at least a two-party or multi-party system in this island, unlike Guyana and some other countries. I do not believe that when the chips are down in this island and you get us out of the immediate political impact of vieing for the electorate's favour, either political party would seriously want to tell you that they want to restrict or prevent people from voting.

I know the honourable Member is on his greatest public relations trip and he never misses an opportunity to placate people he thinks may give a vote. I watch his style well, and he is doing it reasonably well, but he might still lose to the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt).

What I want him to move to the stage of admitting is that there has not, as he sometimes implies on the political platform, been any fraud in either the General Election of 1981 or in any of the by-elections. You would have had mistakes. I suffered, you suffered, all twenty-seven Members who won and those who lost suffered from the fact that there were people going to wrong polling districts. Had we had a Master Roll — and I have heard the honourable Member for St. Michael North say that already — at each of those polling districts, a lot of the complaints resulting out of the 1981 General Election would never have been heard. But I am satisfied in my mind that there was no fraud and that

we have not had a fraudulent election in Barbados from the time I took an interest in politics, and I would say that that began somewhere in the 1950s.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I never knew that the Prime Minister intended to reply, but I have a very different approach.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the Honourable Member for St. James North and the honourable Member for St. Michael North were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The columnist of "Men and Mice".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. This Resolution.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In relation to speeches made by colleagues on the Floor of the House. I am referring to the columnist of "Men and Mice", who seems to have attracted the attention of some of my colleagues. I do not see why you are to be attracted by a man with a warped personality – warped in thought and warped in deed!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. This is not to be the subject of the debate. You may refer to these things. But let us deal with Head 15.

Aside

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is what has been raised before the Committee.

Order, please. Come, let us get on.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, tell me as soon as you are ready, so that I can speak. Tell as soon as you are ready for me to proceed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. James North may proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am referring to "Men and Mice". I think there is a columnist who much reference was made to by name, this evening. I did not hear any objection coming from the Chair; so I took it upon myself that I would have had the same latitude which you gave other Members. That is why I have made mention of the name.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will decide what latitude is extended.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You gave other Members latitude. I believe that I am entitled to such latitude. Since you have asked me not to make mention of the individual's name, I made mention of a columnist whose thoughts are warped. I am surprised to hear my colleagues taking up so much time with an individual of that nature.

The Resolution which is before the House, Mr. Chairman,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG:.....has brought a lot of attention to what has been done in the past and what we, as the Government, are prepared to do.

There is no doubt that in our manifesto, I think as far back as 1976, we made it very clear that we were in favour of an Electoral Boundaries Commission. All that the Resolution seeks to do on this occasion is to vote a sum of money so as to have enumerators going around to make sure that the list is brought up-to-date whenever the Prime Minister sees it fit to call an election.

As far as I am concerned, if a Government performs well, you can have names on the list or off the list and the Government will get home, and I believe that the Government is performing well. So there should not be any kind of suspicion as to whether you should have scrutineers or people to make sure that nothing goes wrong in one district as against another district.

I heard my colleague, the Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), refer to the then Prime Minister's gerrymandering, I think three weeks before the election of 1971, of his constituency. No one suffered more than I did, not even the present Prime Minister, because in three weeks' time the whole of Orange Hill with 975 votes, the bedrock of the Barbados Labour Party, was removed and carried to St. Andrew, and the closest house was two miles away. The Member for St. Michael North was part and parcel of that gerrymandering. When I say that you are politically anemic, that is what I am referring to. You are bloodless.
8.20 p.m.

I sincerely hope that persons chosen to carry out this exercise are people who understand the districts well, and know what they are all about, and that the exercise is one which we can be justly proud of. I remember Martin Tudor on one occasion, and I think you too, Mr. Chairman, had contested the seat in St. Michael at the time against Dr. Caddle, I think it was, and you had a man by the name of Martin Tudor who had registered people in Christ Church because he was under the impression that that part of Christ Church, somewhere in Gall Hill, was in St. Michael – so dumb! That was the sort of people you had. It was a patronage thing, eating a lot of food, drinking a lot of rum, begging for cigarettes and registering away.

We do not propose to have that and that is why this Resolution is before us, for the purpose of having an Electoral and Boundaries Commission, to pay it and to make sure that the office is so staffed that you can have a proper exercise. No longer will you hear the prophet of doom and gloom and pull-down of Barbados saying an election has been rigged. No longer will I be able to hear the Member for St. Michael South Central, the prophet of doom and gloom, saying that there are unfair elections in Barbados. I sincerely hope that, once and for all, once we go through this exercise this evening, it will make the cards clear and clean in the fair name of Barbados on the national and international scene, and for it to be seen as a country that is proud of its democratic institution. I do not want to hear ever again about unfair or rigged elections in Barbados, because you know there are none. There has been no rigged election in this country either when your party was in power or this party was in power; not even when the Conservatives were in power. There have been a few discrepancies over a couple of votes here and there, but absolutely no rigged election.

We have honoured our manifesto pledge in bringing an Electoral and Boundaries Commission, which we on this side decided should be the best thing in the interest of the party and of the country.

I, as Leader of the House, who introduced the Resolution, beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I really am trying to make a positive input without the political overtones of the speeches of the last two Members on the other side who spoke. The point I was trying to make is very simple, that, looking at the history of the errors on the list, I think those errors have come about more as a consequence of the inability to enforce the existing laws in relation to changing people from constituency to constituency. That is a weakness in the whole system which makes it very difficult for candidates and the Electoral Office to assist in the total process of keeping the list relatively updated.

The only reason why I talk about scrutineers is a very simple one, to assist in this process, because, in my experience, unless someone really lives in a place and knows the people, they would not get more than 70 per cent to 75 per cent right. It is almost impossible. When I go through Halls Road or Carringtons Village, it is a big problem. An area like Belleville is a big problem because that is an area which has gone through social changes, it has undergone certain alienation of the groups that live inside there from each other, and it is even very difficult to ask someone in one avenue if he knows another person down the road or in the same avenue. I am only suggesting that if you are going to spend this money as wisely and as efficiently as possible, then you should either have scrutineers or have someone in the polling

district who knows the people and to whom the person doing the enumeration can make easy reference. It is very important. Otherwise, you can end up with different errors, but as many errors as before. You watch it. You mark my words.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Give the Boundaries Commission an opportunity to work. I believe they are competent people and people of integrity. Both sides have agreed on the persons involved, so give them an opportunity. Leave them alone.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): The weakness as I see it in the system as referred to by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is the role and the functioning or non-functioning of the Registering Officer. I think that is the major weakness in the system in keeping the register pure, for the simple reason, that many of the Registering Officers are not functioning. They sit in their homes and they wait for persons to come and make presentations to them. They do not get around in the constituencies, and that is the main weakness in the system. If they are paid enough – and I believe they do get some travelling funds – and not just look at it to top up some other job that they already have and they are able to get out in the constituencies, I think then we will have a better register. A lot of the problems that exist now in terms of people moving from one constituency to another – because there is a lot of mobility in Barbados, and the Registering Officers must be able to pick this up – they are not going to pick them up if they stay where they are in some far removed area from some part of the constituency. If they live in one part of the constituency, they have not got a clue as to what is going on in another part of the constituency. This is one of the problems which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, which I know is already functioning – it has been functioning for the past few months, and I believe it is functioning well – will have to address their minds to.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one money Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolution was read a second and third time, and passed.

8.30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this brings us to the end of this evening's sitting. In moving

that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, July 2, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that most of the day has been spent on a Private Members' Resolution on which both sides aired their views. No doubt when one weighs the evidence on listening to the debate, one can only conclude that the evidence as produced by Members on the other side and their presentation were weak.

I believe that I have always given a relatively fair assessment to my colleagues when I report the business in Parliament at Cabinet as to whether we had a good day or a bad day. I would in fairness to all concerned say that Members on this side excelled in attacking, counter attacking and defending something which was not really necessary to bring for political advantage, and this is only a taste of what is going to happen outside when the game is called for election.

I am going to say goodbye to a few of you, not now, but very, very soon.

I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, July 9, 1985 at 12 o'clock

noon. The Member for St. Michael South Central will not be in here when they call the election, Sir.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): I rise to speak on the Adjournment, to claim victory for the Opposition in the debate that took place today. That should be on record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that is exactly how the Opposition is going to look, the Leader and the three satellites, when they call the election. They look very good. You as their leader and the three satellites.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th July, 1985 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.36 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, June 18, 1985. 2708

Mr. Craig, 2708; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2708.
(Confirmation postponed)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER 2709

Accounts and Statements for the month of
March, 1985 prepared by the Accountant
General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2709

The Defence (Rate of Pay and Allowances)
(Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling
Allowances Regulations, 1985.

The Report and Financial Statements of the
Barbados Port Authority for the year ended
31st December, 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2709

A Resolution to approve the compulsory
acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, Black
Rock, for providing recreational facilities.

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the
Minister of Finance of the repayment of the
sum of \$8 000 000 and interest thereon
borrowed by the Barbados Port Authority
from the European Investment Bank for the
purchase of one Container Handling wide
Gauge Gantry Crane.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$354 070
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current,
as shown in the Supplementary Estimates
1985-86, No. 3, which form the Schedule to
this Resolution.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION RE PRIVATE MEMBERS RE-
SOLUTION 2709

Mr. Craig, 2709; Mr. Sandiford, 2710 Mr.
Speaker, 2710.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 2710

Mr. Sandiford, 2710, 2711; Mr. Craig, 2710,
2711.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

CENSURE MOTION RE HON. V. L. JOHNSON
AND TRENTS (d.r.) 2711

Dr. Haynes, 2711; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons,
2714; Mr. N. K. Simmons, 2718; Mr. Craig,
2719, 2731; Mr. Bradshaw, 2721, 2732,
2747; Mr. Weekes, 2724; Mr. Truss, 2726; Mr.
Greaves, 2729; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2733;
Mr. Barrow, 2736; Mr. Forde, 2740; Mr. King,
2745; Mr. St. John, 2749.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

TAX ON QUARRIABLE MINERALS ACT,
1985. 2753

Mr. St. John, 2753.

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1985. 2753

Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2753.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86 No. 3 -
\$354 070. 2754

HEAD 15 - PUBLIC OFFICE 2754

Mr. Craig, 2754, 2760; Dr. Haynes, 2754,
2761; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2756; Mr.
Sandiford, 2757; Mr. Forde, 2757; Mr.
Greaves, 2761.

SUSPENSION. 2723

Mr. Craig, 2723; Mr. Barrow, 2723.

ADJOURNMENT 2761

Mr. Craig, 2761; Dr. Haynes, 2762.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)
TRUSS, Hon. A. (St. Michael Central)
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West)