

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

Tuesday, July 26, 1988.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P., (Edin.)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

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

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)

D. A. C. SIMMONS, Esq., Q.C., LL.M.

O. S. ARTHUR, Esq., M.Sc., (Econ.)

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)

L. L. BRATHWAITE, Esq., J.P.

E. BOURNE, Esq.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.

Hon. W. W. HALL, (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

C. A. NEBLETT, Esq., B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

R. L. MORRIS, Esq., B.A., Cert. Ed.

P. J. M. MILLER, Esq.

R. P. BYER, Esq., LL.B., L.E.C.

D. J. H. THOMPSON, Esq., LL.B.

Prayers were led by Fr. Ivan Harewood.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, July 5, 1988.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the meeting that took place on July 5, 1988 be taken as read, and be confirmed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no observations or amendments, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am to announce the receipt of:

The Accounts and Statements for the month of March 1988 prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following papers:

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1988.

The Airport Fuel Charges Order, 1988.

The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1988.

The Auditors' Report and Financial Statement of Accounts of the National Training Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1987.

Statements showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for 12 months ended 31st March, 1988.

The Consumption Tax Order, 1988.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Reports of the Registration Office and the Supreme Court Registry for the years 1985 and 1986.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the following Bill was read a first time:

A Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this point I move that the following Standing Orders be suspended: Numbers 6,16,18,20,42(5), 43 and 44.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS STAMP

DUTY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1988

Order No. 3 was called - To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance delivered his budgetary statement earlier this year, he said that in order to revitalise the local manufacturing sector and to make it more competitive both in the regional market and in the extra-regional market, he would make certain proposals, and these proposals are:

to remove 15 per cent *ad valorem* rate of stamp duty on raw materials and packaging materials imported from extra-regional sources by manufacturers who are registered with the Customs Department;

to remove the ten per cent *ad valorem* rate of stamp duty on imports from CARICOM countries whose laws provide for reciprocal treatment of Barbados', exports entering those countries.

It was felt at the time that this was necessary and would lead to increased job opportunities, a stronger balance of payments position and possibly the earning of foreign exchange.

The purpose of this Bill now before this Honourable House is to give effect to the proposals made at that time by the Honourable Prime Minister. The proposal to remove the 15 per cent rate of stamp duty on raw materials and packaging materials imported from extra-regional sources came into effect on April 28, 1988, immediately. This proposal will benefit all manufacturers, not only those who were registered with the Customs Department at the date that the proposals were made, all manufacturers who import raw materials from extra-regional sources. Manufacturers who were registered with the Customs Department at the time these proposals were made are those who received exemption on raw materials imports under the Consumption Tax Act, 1963, which allowed them to import their raw material without paying consumption tax at the point of entry. 12.25 p.m.

Sir, the proposal to remove the ten per cent duty on imports from CARICOM countries, as I stated, Sir, would take account of the reciprocal basis. A number of countries have removed the stamp duty from exports from Barbados into those countries, and those countries are, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent, Antigua and Barbuda, Montserrat, Dominica, Guyana and Jamaica. The proposal to remove the ten per cent stamp duty will come into effect in respect of those countries from June 1, 1988.

Sir, we were subsequently informed that St. Lucia has taken a similar step, and as from July 1, just gone, they have removed the stamp duty from imports into that country. For that reason, Sir, this Bill will also become effective as regards imports from St. Lucia into Barbados, as we stated, on a reciprocal basis.

Barbados has been allowing imports into Barbados and has been raising stamp duty with effect from June 1, this year in respect of the countries that I listed previously, the ones before St. Lucia, and St. Lucia only from July 1, this year. So this Bill, now, Sir, will give effect to those proposals. It will not be necessary to come back to this Honourable Chamber in respect of any other CARICOM

country that may observe the CARICOM treaty and remove the stamp duty from those particular countries. That will be done on a reciprocal basis as provided for in the Bill now under consideration.

Opportunity has been taken to amend the stamp duty in respect of another matter, in respect of goods on which we refund the stamp duty, on goods which are re-exported from Barbados under conditions similar to those from which a drawback from imports duty is granted under the Customs Regulations, 1963. So if any tourist, for example, comes to this country and makes a purchase, there will be a refund of that stamp duty. Up until now it has been the responsibility only of the Minister of Finance to grant that refund. By an amendment now before us, that refund can be authorised by the Comptroller of Customs, and it will no longer be necessary for the Minister of Finance to grant that.

It is also proposed to impose a stamp duty at a fixed rate of \$10 on international business companies on any document that requires the adjudication of the Registrar of the Supreme Court. This is already done in respect of offshore banks and exempt insurance companies, and it brings the international business companies into line with those other companies.

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

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. R. P. BYER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE CLAUSES 1,2

and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing, of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BORROWING OF 90 000 ECUs (BDS \$221 000 APPROX.) FROM THE EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK

Order No. 1 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of 90 000 ECUs (approximately \$221 000 Barbados) from the European Investment Bank for the purpose of conducting a study on the feasibility of establishing a new abattoir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, section 3 of the Special Loans Act makes it necessary for Parliamentary approval for any monies borrowed under the authority of that Act that are to be appropriated and charged from general revenues and access from Barbados.

The proposal is a proposal of the Ministry of Agriculture to construct a new abattoir. As I understand it, Sir, the old abattoir is no longer operational and there is dire need for a modern abattoir in this country, as, in fact, the country is now promoting and pressing on with its livestock production. 12.35p.m.

This new abattoir is one of the projects identified for funding by the European Investment Bank under the LOME II Agreement between the EEC countries, that is countries of the European Economic Community and the ACP - the African, Caribbean and Pacific - countries.

Sir, a report on this new abattoir was already carried out, by the Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture, and it was submitted to the funding bank, the European Development Bank. The bank did not find that it contained sufficient information on which it would make a final decision, and therefore the bank has requested, as a precondition for making the loan, that a feasibility study of the abattoir should be conducted.

Sir, the objectives of this study are to examine the feasibility of the abattoir, prepare final estimates, cost estimates and tender documents, and to analyse proposals for its implementation. So we will make an assessment of the economic and financial feasibility of establishing the abattoir, the packing house and by-product plant. The duration of the study is expected to be six months.

Sir, if this study meets with the approval both of the Government and of the European Investment Bank, and if it is decided that this project should be executed, the monies now being sought here by virtue of this Resolution will become part of the total loan for the construction of a new abattoir. On the other hand, if it is decided not to proceed with the abattoir, the monies being provided by the

European Investment Bank will become a grant and will not be repayable by the Government of the country.

Sir, the terms of the loan is interest at the rate of two per cent per annum, a negligible rate of two per cent per annum, repayable annually on the outstanding balance of the loan. The repayment will be in six annual instalments, the first instalment falling due on August 15, 1992, that, Sir, is four years hence.

The executing agency will be the Ministry of Agriculture, and we believe that this is a very worthwhile investment.

I move the passing, Sir, of the Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sums of money, that is 90 000 000 ECUs, which is equivalent to Bds\$221 400.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second this motion, and I should take the opportunity to give a quick background to this situation.

The need for the establishment of a new slaughtering facility was recognised as early as the late 1970s and as a result some 21 acres of land were acquired then for the construction of this and a new headquarters for the BMC. In 1985, the Government of Barbados and the Inter-American Institute for Co-operation signed a letter of understanding under which the institute prepared the integrated livestock project. This project was funded by the Inter-American Development Bank, and had envisaged the construction of a modern abattoir, meat packing facility and a rendering plant as essential components of any livestock programme. As a result of that, a slaughtering facility was designed with a throughput of approximately 2 100 cattle, about 17 000 sheep and 30 000 pigs, increasing at a rate of about 15 per cent to a maximum throughput of about 2 978 cattle annually, and so on.

Very recently, the Ministry of Health advised that in respect of the spot that was selected in the 1970s in just about Hothersal Turning, because of the recent increase in residential use in and around the area and the possible pollution to that area, permission would no longer be granted to have the abattoir sited at that spot. As a result, the Ministry is now seriously looking for an alternate spot in conjunction with Town Planning and the Ministry of Health. We have not made any decision on that alternate spot as yet.

Because of the importance of the livestock development programme, the new abattoir was submitted for funding by the European Investment Bank in the indicative programme under LOME II, and the bank has insisted, under EEC rules, that a feasibility study must be

done again. In other words, they want to give some European a piece of the action. As a result of that, we are now coming to Parliament for permission for this loan.

As I said earlier, the development of the livestock industry in Barbados is one that the Ministry has been focussing on for some time. It is critical that if this is to continue, we must have a new abattoir meat packing facility and rendering plant. Within recent times, the Ministry of Trade has been having discussions with some interesting persons about the rendering plant, because they are of the opinion that we now have enough offal from fish, the abattoir, et cetera, that we can do a possible rendering plant. The importance of this new facility to us, however, is that it is critical for the development and the expansion for the livestock industry.

Despite the fact that we are very large importers of animal protein in this country, led by beef, some of our small farmers have been having difficulty within the last couple of months in getting rid particularly of their cows. The reason for that is that they are more or less at the mercy of the speculators, as we call them, who move in and offer very little for these cows, and as a result the owners are forced to hold on to them much longer than they should, because obviously they do not want to part with the appraised animal at very little price.

Beef obviously is an item that we will continue to bring in for a very long time. But one of the areas that we have to contend with in the local development is that despite the 30 per cent on imported beef, it is still possible to land beef in Barbados and sell it at a price that most of our local farmers cannot compete with. We have to understand that this would continue to happen, because most of the beef is coming from New Zealand and Australia, and we know for a fact that it is very poor quality beef, most of it that comes here. And sometimes, like within recent months, we have had the beef coming in from Ireland that was convention beef, which was dumped on Barbados. So there is no way we can compete with that price of beef.

On the other hand, if we are to protect our local livestock farmers and to see a development of beef, we have to find some way of marketing the local meat that would allow them to get off it. The Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture have been having ongoing discussions, and they are meeting tomorrow again to look at a plan in which we believe we can solve the marketing problem of our livestock rearers in Barbados, and we are going to be proposing certain arrangements to the importers of beef into Barbados. 12.45p.m.

The present abattoir has its constraints, not only with its location but its capacity, enough cold storage facility for the proper aging, cutting, and packaging of meat. This is crucial if we are to expand the industry, because the importers of beef in Barbados like the situation where they can order a box of clod, or a box of round, or a box of loins, and I believe that in order for us to be able to provide that service, it is absolutely necessary for us to have this new facility. Therefore, the Ministry of Agriculture is looking forward very eagerly for the passage of this Resolution in Parliament, the completion of the feasibility study, and, hopefully, obtaining of the loan from the European Investment Bank so that we can get our livestock programme going, and this, as I say, will be our beef, pork, and lamb - all three of which we have slated for expansion under our agriculture plan for the next five years.

I take pleasure in seconding this Resolution. The establishment of the new abattoir is very important to the future development of the livestock industry in Barbados, and it is long overdue.

I beg to second this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has just driven quite a hole in the Government's case for asking us to agree to borrow the money from the EEC, through the European Investment Bank. As I understand it, he is of the view that really the reason and need for the study is to give a couple of people in Europe a piece of action.

(*Aside:* Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: In his words. Those were his words.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am using his words, Sir - a piece of the action.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Minister has said, and he has said quite rightly, that at least one study, in my information it is more than one study, had been done about this project for some time, the most recent of which was done by the IICA in co-operation with the Government of Barbados. Indeed, the abattoir project has been in a high state of planning for some years now, and all that was needed was really the necessity to get on with it and build the project.

Before I review the development under the Barbados Labour Party of this project, I wish to deal with the *sotto voce* remarks from honourable Members concerning the idea of why if you are getting money from a particular institution, you always have to accede to a study. That is a myth, Sir. If a well-recognised agency has already done a satisfactory study - and my information is that the study

done by IICA in conjunction with the Government of Barbados is a highly satisfactory study, highly satisfactory to IICA, other funding institutions, and to the Ministry of Agriculture - I think the Minister will agree with that - our experience is that you can have that study reviewed by any other agency without the need for a further feasibility study on the project. Perhaps the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has not been using its personnel properly, or indeed doing the job that it ought to do, in making sure that it convinces the Europeans, who are interested in funding this project, that the initial work has been done.

I make this statement as well against the background of knowing that within the Ministry of Agriculture as well there is a study done by Halcrow and Partners as long ago, I think, as 1981 which the Minister should have access to. So the Government has gone through a series of studies and had reached the planning stage, as the Minister said, where the land was earmarked and was purchased and set aside. The designs were well advanced and ready, the financing for the project had been identified, and the feasibility of the project had been established. As the Minister said, the feasibility was established for a throughput of 2100 heads of cattle, 17 00 sheep and, I am not sure what was the amount for the pigs, I think it was 30 000 pigs, increasing annually at a growth rate of 17 per cent.

It seems to me that if the Government must now have another study done without making a severe and serious attempt to convince the Europeans that what is already in the Ministry is adequate, what we are doing is really buying another two years before this project gets on the ground. And I am lending my support to the Minister to the extent that he characterises it as only another excuse for a few people to get a special consultancy fee. That ought to be made very clear to the delegate for the EEC here, as well to the persons in Europe about this, because it is totally unsatisfactory. It is one of the reasons, for the delay in using funds under the respective LOME conventions. I have not heard any proper case really advanced, and the Government has said nothing about what efforts it had made in this respect to ensure that at the highest level of diplomacy, the difficulty which has occurred has been got rid of. I think it must necessarily be done.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I want to trace the development of this project. I think we all agree that the abattoir is located in the wrong position now, very unsatisfactory from the point of view of its use, as well as from the point of view that the public health and the environmental implications of it have become very serious. There are problems of disposal of the waste. Usually it goes

through an underground facility in the drains and there is stench in the area. Sometimes it is not properly disposed of offshore, and for some time there have been complaints from the public health sector about the difficulties and the hazards being posed by the location of the abattoir.

In addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is the problem of carting animals from the country through Broad Street and leaving them down by Kirpalani's, or whatever the place is, and leaving them in the yard. It is very unsatisfactory. By the time some of the animals reach Bridgetown they are not in a proper state. People have really seen the spectacle of the attempt to kill them, failing, and then they run through and stand in the streets of Bridgetown.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Some people. In addition, we had the problem of waiting space. As the livestock industry has grown there has been a serious problem of the space. Also, we recognise that with the development of the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour and the future expansion of that particular project, it would be necessary to relocate the abattoir facilities.

In 1981, when Mr. Basil Springer was chairman of the BMC, a holding measure was started at that institution. A training programme was implemented for the abattoir personnel, and some attempts were made to repair and upgrade the facilities purely as a stop-gap measure. The Government, always recognising that we had to search for a new location, took a decision to locate the new multi-dimensional abattoir facilities at Lower Estate. 12.55 p.m.

There were various reasons for this decision. The Government considered that one had to have some halt to the expanding residential location right across the agricultural belt and the removal of the green belt in Barbados. We also had to take into account any damage to the water facility which may occur. This area was just outside of the Belle, Zone 1 area, and therefore it was made out by all of the experts that Lower Estate was an ideal location, because any problem to Zone 1 water would be minimised, in fact would be non-existent. Third, Sir, there was the important factor that with the new highway facility, the Tom Adams Highway, bringing improved communications in the area, that that facility would be available.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am not aware that there is such a highway in Barbados.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Neither am I.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Such a reference would be totally erroneous in this island.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, we cannot be responsible for my friend's lack of knowledge if he does not know what other persons know.

With the new expansion of the roadworks, it was ideal that Lower Estate would be chosen, because it would be easily accessible to the farming community from the Scotland Area and beyond, as well as from the north on the new highway facility. So that spot was chosen.

It was intended as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the modern facility would be multi-dimensional. In addition to the abattoir, there would be the facilities for dealing with poultry, not only cattle and pigs, but taking into account the growing industry in chicken and turkeys. We would also correct the limitations that I spoke of which exist with the facilities in town.

We also intended upgrading and providing facilities for the cutting of fresh meat, and you will note that in the last few years there has been a tremendous spurt within some of our supermarkets in providing ideal cuts for the community. In fact, I was present one morning, shopping at a supermarket, when the Minister of Agriculture came in on an inspection tour - he shops there, too, Sir - looking at the fresh meat facilities which would be available, and therefore the ability for making fresh cuts available. There has been an increase in this, and we forecast that that increase would have taken place, and we recognised that we had to put this well within the planning.

Part of the long-term planning that was developed in the Ministry before we left Government recognised that we would have to have perhaps a sub-abattoir in the Scotland District, since it was envisaged that the parishes of St. Thomas, St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and to some extent parts of St. John where it borders St. Joseph, would be the food and meat basket for the country for the future. The Minister will find within his Ministry plans being made for this development to take place in the future.

There were two schools of thought concerning the ownership and management of these facilities. There were those who felt that the Government should build a facility and run it as its contribution to livestock, while others felt that the Government should put up the land and the private sector should put up the capital. The argument here is that

one expected better services, efficiency and profitability from the latter.

Sir, the Government did look at the feasibility of sharing the facility with those persons in the productive sector, as happened, for instance, at the Pine Hill Dairy, and what happened is that the private sector said that they thought that Government should carry the full cost of this itself. What the public does not always recognise is that some private sector people went ahead on their own and put up facilities for blast freezing vegetables, etc. In fact, in the case of one private sector person, when Halcrow and Partners had done a study for the Government of Barbados, they used the same Halcrow and Company, and using the ideas ran ahead with their own limited facilities without proper planning. That one is at Groves. In any event, there was a committee within the Ministry looking at this problem, and then, as the Minister said, a combination of IICA and the Food and Agriculture Organisation assisted the Government with the final design of this project.

In a way, Sir, the thinking of the Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government, in this respect was well ahead and far advanced and much broader than one could expect in those days from the private sector. As I said, with the fishing harbour being developed in Bridgetown and the consequential implications of that, we recognised that we had to make other arrangements for moving the abattoir, and we also recognised the necessity to try to give an added push to the beef industry.

Those plans are well known, but let me repeat them. Mr. St. John, when he was Minister of Finance, included in his Budgetary Proposals \$1 million for the development of the livestock industry, and it was intended that this would be a revolving fund into which on an annual basis for three years the Government would contribute \$1 million, and that the fund would be used as a spur to livestock development and to the beef industry. My latest information is that disbursements have still not been made from that fund, and I would wish to know from the Minister what is the bureaucratic incompetence, what is the reason why a fund that has so much potential remains unused and not disbursed. What are the limitations? What are the snags? We have had no report on this at all. In addition, I am told, and it seems to be so, that no further annual amounts have been placed into the fund. 1.05p.m.

This is a great pity, because the Minister spoke a while ago of the development which he says is taking place in the beef industry, that although Barbadian beef, on the face of it, does not look to be as competitive as New Zealand beef that we still import, and in fact we are now getting Belizean beef, we have the potential for a beef industry. And, Sir, I want to tell the Minister that the beef

industry is not the cattle industry; it is not only developing at the level, as some people mistakenly think, of a few big people, although I am going to speak about them in a minute. If you look across the countryside of Barbados, from Lears even to where I live in the parish of St. John, you will see the number of small holders who have made use of land coming out of agriculture and lying fallow and have used their own private initiative to develop this industry.

In Coach Hill, just across the road in Society from where I live, I can speak, for instance, of one small farmer who began with a few cows, and today he has close to 40-odd from his own initiative, and there are several individuals making use of the unfarmed lands at Society, not Society Plantation, at Haynes Hill, for the development of the industry. The point is that the land is there. Too many people are allowing lands to lie fallow - if you go up there in Waterford, you will see unused lands, and I have no difficulty, if the lands are lying fallow, if people use them for these purposes.

The point is that this is developing once again in Barbados. When I was a child, I knew of this, particularly in the days of the Forties, that the small man would have at least a cow, if not two, in his back yard. Coming from the area of Water Street and Silver Hill, where my family has traditionally been in the small farming community, I know for a fact that this was always part and parcel of the culture of Barbados. So the cattle industry or the beef industry is an industry in which there can be a tremendous input from the small farmer. That is why we are very disturbed that the fund remains unused, and the Minister of Agriculture has sat down without giving us any word as to the reasons why this fund has not been developed and used much better.

In addition, Sir, there are some other subsidiary problems - major problems in a way, although subsidiary to this issue - that have arisen in the industry. The Minister spoke of the difficulty confronting the small producer in getting his pigs sold. You talked about beef and I will talk about pigs as well. I believe that the Barbados Agricultural Society now makes all the marketing arrangements for the selling of these pigs, but I am told that there are small producers who have pigs well beyond the period that they should normally go to market and they cannot get them sold, and that today the monopoly in the pork industry is going to two or three major producers.

Sir, I believe that this cannot be allowed to develop, and that one has to make sure that the Government gives the support facilities that are necessary to prevent this from developing in that way. I think that this, again, is a traditional area in which the Barbadian small farmer has been able to make a living, and to educate his children overseas from it. I am going back again to the places that I

know well and I grew up in: Silver Hill, Water Street, Lodge Road, Newton, Ballantyne, St. Davids, Forde's Road, Sargeants Village, Vauxhall and St. Patricks. Those are the areas where you will find the small farmer growing his garden, having his vegetables, raising his pigs and being able to support a family and educate his children, and I think that we must put, as we were indeed putting, emphasis, particularly in this area, and also in our Rural Development Scheme, and see that they are not squeezed out in this way.

Sir, there was also a revolving fund for livestock development outside of the million dollar fund which I spoke of, and this existed for over ten years within the Ministry of Agriculture. Assistance was given for fencing, the purchasing of equipment, putting in wells, developing pasturing, and so on. I would like to know from the Minister what has happened, whether or not grants are still being made in this area.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to cross the honourable Member, but you keep saying you want to hear from the Minister. Do you mean in this debate? He cannot speak again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Some time in the future. I will hear from whoever winds up on behalf of the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Because we cannot hear from the Minister of Agriculture again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is possible, Sir, that the Minister of Finance (Acting) could give his winding up functions to his brother Ministers if he has not got the information. There is a winding up speech which will be made on the Resolution on the part of one of the Ministers of Government, and from whoever does the winding up speech for the Government we should wish to hear from the Minister what has happened in those circumstances to the normal revolving fund for livestock within the Ministry.

Sir, there is also the problem of Lome 2 funds. All of the Lome 1 funds were committed and spent within a short period of time. A substantial part of the Lome 1 funds available for Barbados was used in agriculture, in the development of the Oistins Fishing complex. I should make it clear to the House that Barbados became entitled not only to its own grants, but also to share in those regional project grants under the Lome Conventions 1 and 2, and what we are witnessing now is a great delay in drawing down and using the funds on a country basis for Barbados under Lome 2, and a worse delay in the use of funds on a regional basis under Lome 2. As a matter of fact, additional funds were coming on stream which I am not sure the region has been able to use. We probably have not been able to participate in that surplus.

Barbados designated a substantial part of its funds, when we were in power, for agriculture. One of the projects, as I said, Sir, was the development of the beef industry, and we also spent it on this very abattoir, the * subject matter of this Resolution before the House. My understanding is that those were some of the projects.

But there was also the project of the Speightstown Fishing Harbour. When we went out, again that was a well-conceived and advanced project. The present Government put a hold on that, and as a result, the biggest location has remained unused there for some time. ♪"

1.15p.m.

We are getting into Lome 3.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Lome 4, if you like. Lome 4 ^ now. Lome 3 is coming to an end. We are in Lome 4. If we cannot use the funds, like some other countries have not used all of the Lome 1 funds, I understand, in the Caribbean we have not used all of Lome 2 funds. What we are saying to Europe is that we have not got the capacity or we have not developed with Europe the mechanism for ensuring that these funds are disbursed, and disbursed promptly, on well-conceived projects and used for the benefit of the countries ** as a whole. I feel that there is a strong obligation on the Government, wherever overseas fundings of this nature, at low rates of interest - two per cent is virtually grant-aided funds - are available for use in development, that we should be giving the highest priority to the development of those funds.

I am not satisfied that in agriculture, certainly for the projects we have identified these for, that they have been used in that way. There has been what I would characterise as bureaucratic bungling and inability to make up one's mind on matters,....

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Dithering!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: and a good deal of dithering

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Drifting!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: and as a result, we have substantial funds still available, unused either for livestock or for the development of other facilities that are much needed.

We have to realize that, a few weeks ago, people in the beef industry made some of the very points that I have

made in this debate. We now have to try and get the matter moving so that we do not get a further delay of three to four years. And that is why I began this debate expressing my considerable concern that we have not used our diplomatic skills and initiatives to work out a formula, as has been worked out on other projects done by acceptable agencies, agencies acceptable to all of the major funding agencies, in respect of the abattoir. I hope that the Government can move this project along much more rapidly.

I expect that the Acting Minister of Finance, having introduced the project, is now in a position to tell us what funds remain unused by Barbados under Lome 3....

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: and Lome 2.

Laughter.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. That is what you call a yorker.)

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to know, Sir, what regional funds - the Minister might be able to tell me - also remain unused under these heads, and what is being done to make sure that they have been used properly.

In so far as the new abattoir is to be established, you would recognise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from what I have said, that it is a project, as the Minister pointed out, which had its planning genesis in the latter part of the Seventies. We repeated it in our 1986 manifesto, which is already a document of this House, at page 9, that we would strengthen"technical and support systems in the agricultural sector, including the provision of a centrally located and modern abattoir and the reorganisation of the financial and credit system to the farmer."

So our commitment to such a project is known, the work that we have done on it is known, and the only question I ask now is, why has it not been done, since it was at the planning stage, and ready for implementation by the time that we demitted office two years ago, and I trust that we would not have to wait another two years before the feasibility study is completed, and probably another two years before the matter is implemented. I would hope not, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES (St. Lucy): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you continue, I have been hearing too many voices in the Chamber. Perhaps if we can keep the voice level a bit lower, we will be able to hear the honourable Member much more clearly.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I want to refer to what I would describe as the sanctimonious stand taken by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. One listening to him would not believe that he was part of an Administration which had an opportunity to deal with the European Economic Community, which had an opportunity to deal with Lome 2 and a substantial part of Lome 3, and an Administration which would therefore know the kind of difficulties and problems which are encountered in dealing with international agencies.

The honourable Member started out by actually condemning the Government for not using its diplomatic skills and offices overseas to convince the Europeans that studies have already been done, and therefore, there is no need for another study. But he also agreed with the Minister of Agriculture that, in fact, a lot of these international agencies have self-generating mechanisms within them where you do studies upon studies upon studies. That is a fact. It is of concern to me, it is of concern to this Administration, and obviously it was of concern to the Barbados Labour Party's Administration, because it happened in their time over and over again. So there is no point in getting up and trying to pretend that they do not know what goes on in dealing with these international agencies.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Especially the Leader of the Opposition!)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Especially the Leader of the Opposition, who would have had an opportunity to deal with them, and who knew, and up to now knows, ...

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: what went on, and who knows what goes on in dealing with these agencies.

Furthermore, he must know that during the period of their Administration, all of the Lome 2 funds were not utilised. Do not worry to get up and try to give the impression that the Democratic Labour Party is so incompetent that we have not used up the funds for Lome 2, and we have not used up the funds for Lome 3. As a matter of fact, these funds are funds which were voted during their Administration. They were not able to use all of the funds for Lome 2.

We have not used up the funds for Lome 3. But this is not peculiar to Barbados, it is not peculiar to the Caribbean.

This is one of the problems which developing countries have experienced in dealing with the Europeans. So I do not understand why the honourable Member would want to come in here and pretend that he does not know what is going on and would want to give the public an impression which can only be the kind of impression.....

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am serious, I am serious, Sir,.... that this Administration does not know what it is doing.
1.25p.m.

Having put that in its proper perspective, let me come to the abattoir. It is a fact that there is need for a new modern facility in Barbados. This is a valid point. This fact, Sir, was recognised by the Democratic Labour Party way back in 1975.

(Aside: Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That's right!)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Leader of the Opposition must know that in 1976 there was a plan put on board, an agreement with.... What is the man's name now?

(Aside: • Reg Packer, who owned Cane Garden Plantation.)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Yes, that is right, the man who owned Cane Garden Plantation, to site the abattoir in that particular area. When the Barbados Labour Party came into office, the then Prime Minister, the late representative for St. Thomas, jettisoned this particular proposal and attacked the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt), who was the Minister of Trade in those days. You see?

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to hear the honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: So one would therefore want to question why, if you had a plan as developed as the Democratic Labour Party had, the Barbados Labour Party would jettison that plan and switch and go over to Lower Estate. I do not know who owns Lower Estate Plantation. I do not know who is the real estate agent for Lower Estate Plantation. But what I know is that there was a shift from a plan which was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Do you want to rise on a point of order and tell the House who owns Lower Estate?

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I can sit down. Do you want to raise it on a point of order?

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are hearing too many voices. If honourable Members want to address the Chair, perhaps they can ask for the opportunity. We are hearing too many voices in the Chamber, and I think we want to hear at this time the Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I think that this matter has to be put in its proper perspective. There is no point in trying to suggest that the idea of a new abattoir had its genesis with the Barbados Labour Party. This was something which was ongoing. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot be satisfied at the fact that we have not up to this point got a new abattoir and a modern facility in Barbados. I am dissatisfied with that, and I believe that every effort should be made to ensure that we have a modern facility in this country as soon as possible.

Let me, in developing this point, refer to a comment which was made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. It had to do with the fact that the way in which the abattoir at present operates, and where it is sited, has very serious implications for public health and our environment.

Waste disposal is becoming a serious problem in Barbados. When one looks at what is taking place in the development of food and food-related enterprises in Barbados, one would see that something has to be done. Over the years, we have had the establishment of a number of poultry processing plants in this country. We have had the development of at least two pork processing plants. We have an expansion in the fishing industry and now we have an expansion in the beef industry. We have possibilities for an expansion in developing sheep and other animals. So, in my view, there is an opportunity which can be created for another linkage between agriculture and industry to develop quite apart from corned beef, I really do not want to get into that - with the utilisation of the waste which comes off the animals, poultry, fish and what have you. I am talking about the possibility of the establishment of a rendering plant in Barbados.

I am aware that some years ago a study was done by a company which showed that we did not have enough raw material on the island that would make a rendering plant an economic possibility. Recently, we have been in discussion

with at least three companies which have expressed an interest in developing a rendering plant. They feel that the offal and waste from the fish, poultry and all of the animals combined could very well create the situation for the development of a rendering plant. That would assist in solving part of the environmental problems, and from that they could produce tallow, and a kind of additive to go into animal feed. This is the kind of linkage which we want to see developed, and I would like to think that now that we are moving towards the establishment of a modern abattoir, we will see this kind of development developing hand in hand.

I think this points to how these linkages can take place. I therefore hope that we can get this particular project moving as swiftly as possible. I think that the Europeans have to be told this very clearly, and we must express our dissatisfaction to them about the number of studies which they require. But as I said, this is not something which is peculiar to Barbados. I have heard complaints levelled in many forums about this particular attitude which has been adopted by the Europeans.

I was a little concerned, Sir, about a statement made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I want to be very careful here, because I do not want anybody to misunderstand the point which I am making. He made reference to a resident of St. John whom he knows, who he claims started off with four cows and now has 40, and I asked him in a *sotto voce* remark if the land was his, that is the person owning the cows, and he said well it does not really matter - the land was lying fallow there and the people could now go in and use it.

I think this is a very dangerous position taken by the Leader of the Opposition, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition will reflect on what he said, because the signal which the Leader of the Opposition is sending out to people in Barbados is that if you see anybody's land lying fallow and you have cows or sheep, you can go and put your animals in people's land and graze it.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is what he is saying.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have never given any such advice to anybody. On a point of order! The honourable Member must not get up and talk that kind of nonsense.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order: I have never advised anybody to do that. But unlike the honourable Member, whatever grazing area I have, anybody is free to use it. 1.35p.m.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that he did not advise anybody to take that position, but the implication of what he said was very clear to me, and was very clear to those persons who heard what he said, because to follow on from that, we would have a justification from the Leader of the Opposition for praedial larceny in Barbados.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member cannot argue in a way that, in my view, does not do any sort of credit to himself or to the debate. How could the honourable Member get up and suggest to the House that I would recommend praedial larceny? That is what he is saying, that I am suggesting praedial larceny. That is like suggesting I would recommend to the Ministers of Government to be corrupt.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to get the Leader of the Opposition absolutely clear, so that we are very very clear about his position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think he has cleared it up for us.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am satisfied now that he has clarified that position, because he left a number of doubts in my mind by the statement which he made.

Sir, let me just make one other observation. He did refer to Belizean beef coming into Barbados. Under the CARICOM arrangement, this is something which was agreed to, to support the development of the beef industry in the CARICOM region, and I think there was a tax which was imposed across the region for this. The unfortunate thing about this now is that the abattoir in Belize has closed down and, therefore, there has not been any beef coming from Belize, and there will not be any beef coming from Belize for some time, which strengthens the point, that we have to do much more in trying to develop our beef industry here in this country. I am supportive of that, I think that all honourable Members are in support of that, but not only supportive of the development of the beef industry, but also supportive of the development of any other livestock industry which will go towards satisfying some of our needs here.

We have to recognise that, in some areas, we will not be able to satisfy the demand entirely. But one also has to recognise that there will be a price for this development, and if we are going to be supportive of this development, then the community must understand that there is a price attached to this development.

I support this Resolution, and I hope that we will be able to see the realisation of this particular objective as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Hon. B. M. TATTT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wish to advert to those aspects of the need for an abattoir that relate to the disposal of waste. As you have heard from this side, the concept of a modern abattoir goes back to the early 1970s. The need for the abattoir goes beyond the simple question of having somewhere to slaughter animals, it goes to the point of the requirement that the facility in which the animals are slaughtered will meet international standards for the inspection of the meat which would come out of the abattoir.

One of the problems which dogged the present abattoir, and all of the Governments that have had to work with it, is that meat that had been prepared in that abattoir has not been acceptable for purposes of export. Hence, you will find that we were unable to export meat to Trinidad and Tobago or to the United States, because whenever, as is required, an inspection is done of the facility in which the meat was prepared - that is to say, an abattoir - it has always fallen short of the international requirement. Hence, Sir, it is not only a question of having an abattoir, it is having an abattoir that will meet the international standards that have been established for the export of meat.

It is fair to say that if Barbados could have met those standards, for example, we would have had a bigger export market, we would have been able to utilise the export market in a much more fundamental way than we have been able to. Take, for example, even of the export of poultry. You will recall that when Barbados became self-sufficient in poultry back in the middle Seventies, we would have a surplus of poultry on some occasions, but we were unable to export the poultry even in the CARICOM countries to a point in Trinidad and Tobago, precisely because we could not stamp on the finished product that it had passed the required standard.

So this question of the abattoir has been going for a long time, and I can confirm that arrangements had been made to put a modern abattoir at lands in St. Thomas. We were in fact going to put the abattoir at lands in St. Thomas. Part of the lands had been given for a playing field, part had been near where confectionery is being produced. The idea was to have a ten-acre industrial park in that general area.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking of what I recall, personally having been involved in recommending. You will recall that there was a study in the Ministry of Agriculture which indicated that it was desirable to have the new Barbados Marketing Corporation, that is what we were going to put, a new Barbados Marketing Corporation, in the St. Thomas area, because from a point of view of

transportation, a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, this whole business of having the produce of the country coming from St. George, St. Thomas, St. Joseph and the northern parishes would coalesce or converge in an area in St. Thomas, and would remove the movement of this kind of traffic from the Bridgetown area. That was agreed upon, and it was on the verge of implementation when the Government was changed. Mine is not to discuss now that aspect of the development, it is, as I said, to deal with the disposal of waste.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in Barbados are on the verge ^ of a crisis with regard to the disposal of waste in Barbados.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You can put it in the headlines or the backlines. If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they think what I am saying has anything to do with headlines, that is their problem, but I am saying it is a crisis. There is a crisis of the disposal of fecal matter, there is a crisis regarding the disposal of sewage. But we have gone some way towards solving that problem, in that we have created a plant at Lakes Folly, and we are in the process now of creating plants for the south coast and the west coast to deal with the sewage. What we have not been able to deal with effectively is the disposal of solid waste and the disposal of - „». other matter, such as the fecal matter, such as that which will come out of the abattoir.

The honourable Member said earlier that he was concerned about the effluent going out to sea. The truth is that ever since the opening of the sewerage plant in Lakes Folly, there has been a cessation of the disposal of fecal matter and other similar matter at Cowell Street and the * surrounding areas.

The matter which comes out of the present abattoir now has to be transported to Mangrove Pond in St. Thomas. It is so done by truck, and, indeed, we have a specific problem which is being addressed. The honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) raised some ^ questions, and I am writing to him privately about them.

In relation to the disposal of waste oil in Barbados, we have recently had visits made to the area of Mangrove Pond, and these are some of the problems which we noticed. Solid waste deposited at the site is covered daily in order to reduce the problems usually associated with sanitary land fills. Oil which has been deposited on land adjacent to the land fill

1.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you making that a document of the House?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, it is not a document. It is a Minister reading from a file.

Oil which has been deposited

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order: is that the reply you intend to send to me to my letter?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The reply I intend to send to you will include what I am saying now. I will give you a full, detailed reply.

Oil which has been deposited

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If he continues to interrupt, Sir, I will have to delay the reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Address the Chair, please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this dialogue that is going on with the former Attorney-General, who must know better, especially as he is wearing his guard, which suggests a certain courtesy at the level of debate, is very surprising.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, oil which has been deposited on land adjacent to the land fill has settled in a depression near to the gully. Cow itch, which may be associated with problems involving the skin and upper respiratory tract, was found growing on the side of the ridge and in the sugar cane fields to the west of the sanitary land fill. The odour characteristics of sanitary land fills were detected in the Arch Hall area. The people in that area are having problems, and we propose to burn the oil, and I think it is important that this be noted, if the weather permits. With the assistance of the Fire Department, we propose to burn the oil on Thursday, 28, because we have to burn off that oil.

The cow itch vines will be destroyed in due course, but the agricultural experts have advised us against disturbance of the vine now because they have started to pod, and anyone who is familiar with the cow itch problem knows that if you touch them at this point, it will be quite chaotic.

(Aside: What about the stinking smells?)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The stinking smells that emanated from the ordinary

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not Question Time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The point the honourable Member will not allow me to make is that the land fill method of disposal of solid waste in Barbados is the cheapest method. However, the only land fill that is currently useful is the one to which the honourable Member has referred in his letter to me, the one at Mangrove, St. Thomas.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is asking how we have moved from the abattoir to the land fill, well, the effluent from the abattoir is taken to the land fill by truck.

To the honourable Member who is asking me to make the linkage with the cow itch, it is simple. When you go to dispose of the effluent from the abattoir, which goes to the land fill, you have to contend with cow itch, which is around the area that has been chosen for the land fill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am making is that in the southern part of Barbados, there is no area left now that can be used for land fill purposes. In the St. Thomas area, we have identified Mangrove Pond. The land fill next door to the pulverisation plant has now reached the point which the honourable Member for St. George South (Mr. R. P. Byer) and the honourable Member for St. George North (Hon. C. V. Walker) have been in the forefront of drawing to the attention of the Ministry of Health, that the land fill has now become offensive to persons who live in the general area, and so, Sir, we are at a point where we may not have any more areas to dispose of the kind of solid waste which will come out of the abattoir.

It becomes even more important, therefore, that in the construction of the abattoir, we look at the stages at which we are going to be allowing solid waste to emanate from the abattoir, in other words, the designs. I see here that among the things that the study will produce will be final designs for the abattoir and it will have to be a state of the art abattoir that will allow for processing of the offal and other waste material that will emanate from the through-put of the large number of animals which are expected over the next 25 years. Hence, although a study may have been done in the past, it is still perhaps desirable that, bearing in mind the state of the art over a five-year period, it may be desirable, and I think it is desirable, that the final designs for the abattoir be couched in the most modern terms.

I go further - I do not believe, as the officials in the Ministry of Health have indicated - the experts in the Ministry of Health have already indicated this to the Ministry of Agriculture - that the abattoir can be placed at Lower Estate. There is no ifs, buts and ands about that. If the technical people have indicated that because it is in a Zone 2 area, or surrounding a Zone 1 area, it is not

desirable to have an abattoir there, then we are going to have to find a new location for it.

I want to sound a warning, Sir. The people of Barbados who are involved in the disposal of commercial waste, and some of the other ordinary people, but in particular those who are responsible for the disposal of commercial waste, are demonstrating a selfishness with regard to the use of the environment. The problems associated with the land fill which the people of Arch Hall are complaining about can be traced to the indiscriminate dumping of oil next door to a point which the land fill is located, and the combination mix seems to be creating additional problems. We find that there are some commercial people who are going up to Spencers, next door to the airport where the sludge from the sewage project in Lakes Folly has been deposited from time to time, taking some of their solid waste and dumping it at Spencers. We find that in almost every gully in Barbados there is a substantial quantity, literally tonnes, it may turn out to be tens of tonnes of solid waste, has been deposited in the gullies and the water courses of Barbados. This has been going on for a substantially long time, and as a result, people have not been aware of it, because there is an attitude that if you cannot see it, it is not a problem. It is a tremendous problem, and if we are not careful, and if we do not now take stock of how we dispose of our waste, we are going to become inundated in the not too distant future.

The Government is moving with all deliberate speed to find solutions to these problems. This is not a debate in which one wishes to spend time examining and/or articulating what those solutions are likely to be. Suffice it to say, and I say this for the benefit of this Honourable House, that we are moving with all deliberate speed to find solutions. But I take this opportunity of the debate on the abattoir to ask Barbadians, especially those who are disposing solid waste in large quantities, to spare a thought for the use of the environment not only now, but for our children and our children's children, and try, to the extent that it is possible, to stay within the guidelines that have been laid down for disposal of solid waste. 1.55p.m.

It is unacceptable for a truck that is owned by someone whose business is moving solid waste to take that solid waste to the nearest gully in St. Peter, or the nearest gully in St. Thomas or the nearest gully - they do not get as far as St. Lucy - in St. Philip, dump it and turn around and go without any thought to what is going to happen, what is going to be the consequence of that.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well that indicates that they are even going further now, they are dumping in Bourbon. It is

a very serious matter. And when I say that we are at the point of crisis, I am saying that if it does nothing more than to excite people to start looking out for the trucks at night, the ones that have contaminated the Belle. One has only to pass through the Belle. That stuff has not been put there by tourists, it has not been put there by monkeys - it has been put there by Barbadians, Barbadians who walk around every day saying that we are brothers and sisters. I do not know who put it there, but I know it has been put there by people like us, Barbadians, and I take this opportunity to appeal to them.

We are going to prosecute whoever we can. But that is not the point. The point is that we have to appeal to persons and their consciences to stop contaminating the environment which all of us have to share. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that context, the abattoir would be a welcome addition to our economic life, to say nothing to the preservation of our health.

Thank you, Sir. .

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this point I move, Sir, the suspension of this sitting until 3.00 " p.m. today.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. today was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.58 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When we took the suspension, the honourable Member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair. I think he had concluded his speech.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to make a few points on this debate under this Resolution in respect of two matters of constituency concern. But, first, I must deal with the larger issue. I do not think that the Government has answered a couple of questions that are still outstanding in my mind, and I think that are worthy of solution.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What is in my mind is peculiarly within my own knowledge.

It is agreed that sometime in the 1970s, around 1975, 1976, the Government of Barbados was satisfied that a new abattoir was needed. It is also common ground that, by 1985, the need for an abattoir had become more firmly established, to the point where the then Government had done virtually all of the primary work that was necessary to have the abattoir built at a future date. The designing had been done, the feasibility had been done, there had been some external funding for the project and a site had been identified on lands belonging to Lower Estate Plantation, or near Lower Estate. The Minister of Agriculture in his presentation told us that plans had been so far advanced that the throughput of animals through the abattoir had been settled, and it had been so designed as to allow for future development, because there was a 15 per cent factor that had been built into the project. What I think prevented the first plans from going on stream as they say, was that the site at Cane Garden was deemed unsuitable because of its proximity to the Cane Garden Development.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is the point I am going to make.

I have talked in here before about the development at Cane Garden. The honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite) is familiar with it. When you come from Canewood, the road that takes you from Canewood over to the main road running from Sharon to Bridgefield.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. The Cane Garden Development is bounded by a road running from Canewood to whatever the other highway is called. I call it the road from Sharon to Bridgefield. It might be two. It is quite a built-up area. East of the development is land on Cane Garden Plantation, where it had been thought it would have been ideal for the abattoir. That land, I have recommended to Government recently by letter, should be acquired, between the quarry at Cane Garden Plantation and the eastern part of the existing development. That should be acquired for housing, sites and services, a fire station and a police station, if necessary.

(Aside: The school.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not there. The lands for the school are at the bottom of Shop Hill.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am sorry.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. The Minister of Housing and myself have discussed this matter. I think the Government did acquire some land a few weeks ago for some housing.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, the plantation is owned by CGM Barbados Limited.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now.

What I am saying, Sir, is that in 1975, or 1976, the residential character of the area precluded the siting of the abattoir at Cane Garden. 3.05 p.m.

I assume that these lands at Lower Estate are those when you turn right at Hothersal Turning, and as you make the first left hand bend, you come to lands on your left where there are houses presently being built.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, it is not Lears. It is known as Lower Estate Heights.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Okay. Is that not where the abattoir was to go? Well, nobody has identified exactly where it was to go. Those lands are being sold by Habitat Corporation as Lower Estate Heights.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All right. I understood that they were part of the heights.

But, again, one could see that there will be a problem around there, because again that is a built-up area, and for all the reasons that the Minister advanced, it could not be an ideal site. If it was further in passed Lears coming back to what we really know is Lower Estate, like where Roberts Manufacturing is now, in that area, that might be a more open area, but you are going to run into water problems, because you are very near to the Belle. So I do not know where the Government intends to site the abattoir.

We are doing a feasibility study again.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Who?

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are going to do it at Neils? Yes, you can come down at Neils, right down in the bottom by our poultry yard. At least we would get the road done. My MP would make sure, then, if it came up there, that we will get the road done.

I think we ought to know, Sir, if the plans have reached such an advanced state and we are now voting another \$200 000 or whatever for another feasibility, in the language of the Minister of Agriculture, just to give some Europeans a piece of the action. Government should be in a position to know where they are going to site this. Before you come in here and ask for the money, Government should have had its mind pretty well made up as to where it is going to site it. I do not believe you can site it. It is a design. You cannot site it on any old piece of ground. It might not fit. So Government should identify the area first and hold it. I do not know how they can do effective costing if they have not got a site in mind.

Let us look at it very simply, Sir. Do you mean I would give architects instructions to design a house for me worth \$300 000 without knowing where I am going to put it, when a particular design would not suit a particular piece of land? All we are saying over here is that the Government should know now, because of the history of this project, and all they have to say is they have identified "X" locality and are going to site the thing there. You have the drawings already - go ahead. That is why we accuse the Government of shoddy planning over the last two years. Having had a project well advanced, they are just coming for money now to have a feasibility, on top of two feasibilities, without knowing where the thing is going to go. That is the first point.

The second point I want to make, Sir, is to thank the Minister of Health for - I do not know if it is this, but I wrote him twice about the problem occasioned by the dump at Mangrove Pond in St. Thomas. It has nothing to do with Mangrove in St. Philip, as some people persist in deluding themselves, deluding the public and telling lies. It has nothing to do with Mangrove in St. Philip. Those who want to bend the truth must not persist in their childish absurdities. We are dealing with Mangrove Pond in St. Thomas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the Resolution is dealing with Mangrove Pond.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But, Sir, the Minister of Health was allowed by you to talk about the dump at Mangrove Pond in St. Thomas, and how the residents of

Arch Hall were affected, and so on. I claim the same liberty to thank him and to say more in relation to that. If you do not want me to speak on it, tell me now and I will sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am not telling you that you cannot speak on Mangrove Pond. I am saying that the Resolution is not dealing with Mangrove Pond. But you may continue to make your point.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Resolution is dealing with the abattoir, Sir, and the Minister of Health was able to explain the linkage between the disposal of waste, and that is all I am doing, Sir.

First of all, I thank the Minister of Health, if he has replied to my two letters, of May 10th and the more recent one. Yes, I think this is it. I have just got it, Sir, but he had promised to reply. I have not read it yet. There has been a serious problem affecting the residents of Arch Hall. It is not only the oil. There has been the seepage of raw sewage down the hill as far as St. Thomas Primary School. That was drawn to the Ministry's attention. That has been corrected.

There is the problem of malodorous effluvium, bad smelling effluvium, that makes life uncomfortable for the residents of Arch Hall and interfere with their enjoyment and use of their own properties. As recently as Sunday, I had complaints. But I am grateful that the Minister has responded. He had promised me three weeks ago, or whenever it was I gave him the second letter, that he would have an investigation, and I am very grateful and appreciative, on behalf of the residents of Arch Hall, of the speed with which the Minister has responded, and the manner in which he has responded. I hope that we can have permanent solutions to the problems.

The cow itch that was spoken of is under the bluff, where there is a fire look-out on the hill, on the rock face. I do not accept from the officials of the Ministry that there is any cow itch in the canes. The canes are all burnt down. There is no cane out there to be seen. All that was burned from there to Bennetts. But if the Ministry is aware that there is a cow itch problem, the Ministry, together with the Ministry of the Attorney-General has the solution in its hands, and I am sure that they will find a way of dealing with that.

I want to draw the Minister of Agriculture's attention to something that may seem very mundane, but which has reached very serious proportions. In regard to the establishment of the abattoir and facilities for collecting carcasses, disposing of them and so on, it is my knowledge this is no hearsay - they are going to write on Sunday that it is hearsay, so go and check in the courts and see the cases I filed - that there is a company in this country, headed by

non-residents with names which sound like German or Austrian, called Productions and Trading Company Limited. The Minister of Agriculture is aware.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Let me give you the name - Productions and Trading Company Limited with an address in Trents, St. James. 3.15p.m.

This company has been in the habit for many months of sending out to local pig growers, people who would have two and three - people in my constituency have suffered and that is why I will talk about it -

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not Hojeg.

They come and see your pigs and they say we will take the pigs, we will kill them, we will give you the head, belly, the trotters and the liver. The pigs, in some cases, are weighed and a price agreed at with the owners. Those owners lose their pigs and never receive any money. Cases have been filed by me in the Oistins court and in the St. Thomas court about these people. The man, the Austrian, whoever he is, spoke to me on the telephone on one occasion and promised to call back and to send a cheque for my client the following week. The next thing I know, the man is not in Barbados.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He did not send me one that bounced, but he sent two clients of mine cheques that bounced. Members on the other side seem familiar with this. If nothing has been done yet, I am asking the Ministry of Agriculture to investigate this and have something done about it, because these people are taking advantage of the poor people who raise a couple of pigs to help themselves.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He Wants locking up, but I am not the Government, you all can deal with it. I would be grateful to hear something about this, because as recently as about four weeks ago, somebody came to me about it and I told them I cannot find the people. The marshal went to serve and cannot find him.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have the name of the man on a file, but I am grateful that members of the Government are aware of this, what I consider a serious problem of

deception and fraud perpetrated against very poor people who keep three or four pigs to make an extra dollar, Sir, and then this man has been able to get away with that. If he is in Barbados, he does not deserve to remain in Barbados, because his practices are less than honourable, and we do not need people like him in Barbados.

Sir, to wind up, if the Minister or whoever replies could help us as to what is the position of the Chief Town Planning Officer in relation to lands that may be available for the abattoir. I gather that when they had Lower Estate in mind at first there was no objection from the Chief Town Planner, but something has happened in the interim and now he is in a position to say "I won't allow it."

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, the same problem as with Cane Garden. I understand it. There is no need to reply then.

I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: (St. Peter): Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the course of the Estimates Debate, very often, because of shortage of time, we do not have enough opportunity to go into detail as regards the nature of capital investment projects as conceived by Government and intended to be implemented by Government.

As regards this particular matter, Sir, we have heard from the other side a presentation by the Acting Minister of Finance, in which he read his speech well, and a presentation by the Minister of Agriculture, in which he served notice to the House that it was the Government's intention to proceed with the borrowing of \$221 000 from the European Development Bank for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study to establish a new abattoir merely for the purpose of giving the Europeans a piece of the action. I would have to say that one can hardly think of a more frivolous reason why a House of Parliament should be asked to commit itself to the borrowing of funds in the name of the people of this country. That, Sir, is by way of introduction.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable Member, but I think that to ground his premise in the honourable Member's statement, and interpret that statement as saying that the reason for borrowing the money is to give the Europeans a piece of the action, would be to mislead the House. I think that the phrase "piece of the action" was more skeptical and was grounded in skepticism when the honourable Member was making reference and outlining that the Europeans like to get a piece of the action. The fundamental reasons for

getting the loan and the feasibility study were outlined very clearly when this matter was introduced. I know the honourable Member knows that, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture can speak very well for himself, and I heard him saying that the purpose for which this loan was being entered into was to give the Europeans a piece of the action.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And the House may be able to understand when I elaborate my point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is on a point of order. Could we hear what is your point of order, please?

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Deputy Speaker: When I read, I particularly said that, according to the EEC rules, a feasibility study had to be done before the funds were advanced. I am certain I had a document reading from.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: If the honourable Member is uncomfortable with his own words, Sir, I have no difficulty with his discomfiture. I congratulate his other colleagues for trying to-rescue him from the discomfiture of his own manufacture.

My central point, Sir, is that we need, as the Prime Minister of this country has reminded us, to look carefully at what we are doing when we commit this country to increased expenditure, and when, through Parliament, we commit this country to new loans.

The Government is now purporting that it has to borrow funds to do a feasibility study for the construction of a new abattoir, and I need to direct a few specific questions at the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. If one were to go back to the Estimates of Expenditure for 1987-88, and I am referring to Head 74, Subhead 12, Livestock Development, under this subhead in last year's Estimates this House considered and approved an amount of \$1.134 million, and the notes to this subhead said that this amount was to provide for the construction of an abattoir and meat packing complex and housing for livestock. This is one financial year ago.

I, therefore, have to ask a specific question. If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that project proceeded without the benefit of a feasibility study or an evaluation, because the monies were approved by this House.... 3.25 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member would give way: You will recall that I pointed out that the feasibility study which is required now would relate to a state of the art abattoir. It is quite possible that the amount voted for that abattoir has been superseded by the need for an abattoir now. We do not have a problem with that. The honourable Member can discuss the monies and what happened to them. The only point that would be valid is if those monies were misused. He cannot be heard to be saying, Sir, that we cannot advance to a state of the art abattoir. The honourable Member himself was an exponent of using the very best for Barbados.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would want to believe that before the Government of Barbados would commit itself to putting in its Estimates of Expenditure an amount of more than \$1 million for the purpose of constructing an abattoir, or any other activity, in advance of that coming to this House of Assembly feasibility studies would have been done, and the question that I am raising and that falls to be considered is, what could have happened between the last financial year and this financial year to merit our having to come to this House again to borrow funds to conduct a feasibility study to construct an abattoir, when, in fact, Sir, a year ago, we were voting money to construct an abattoir? That is the concern of the Opposition, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir: In my presentation I stated that a study was already done, but it was to go to the European Investment Bank. I do not know if the honourable Member was not listening. Now they require another study.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lot of the confusion that surrounds these debates could be pre-empted if Members of the House would study the accounts that come to this House of Parliament. Last year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, BDF funds were voted for a large number of projects in agriculture, and, perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ought to make the major point that I want to make in this debate, that we have a Ministry of Agriculture in this country which is very strong in giving appearances of things that happened, or that are happening, but is very short on performance.

Last year, this House also voted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the grant funds under the BDF

(Aside: How can we vote those funds?)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing the honourable Member.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: As far as the, overall project which this House voted funds for last year,] an amount was provided as a grant element under livestock /development as part of that overall abattoir project. The Ministry of Agriculture has a way of announcing things in this country. Week by week we are hearing about rabbit projects, guinea bird projects, pigeon projects - and nothing happens. Even in his own constituency, this House last year voted \$200 000 for a feasibility study for an irrigation project at Three Houses, and nothing has happened.

My point is that we take agricultural diversification seriously. This House is called upon to vote more than \$1 million in agricultural diversification because they want to diversity the agricultural base in this country, we come to Parliament and we approve it in the Estimates, and then nothing happens. But the Minister of Agriculture gets the credit for going out to the public and making these grand announcements about agricultural diversification, about pigeons and rabbits and guinea birds and all the rest of it, and even about the irrigation at Three Houses in his own constituency.

We need to know more about this project and its implementation, because an essential point in the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the House already voted funds for the construction of an abattoir less than a financial year ago, and this same House, which was a year ago in a position to vote funds for the construction of an abattoir, is now today voting funds not for the construction of an abattoir, or to commit those funds, but to vote funds now, Sir, for a feasibility study that may eventually lead to the construction of an abattoir some time in the future.

Since 1982, we have seen steady development in this specific area of livestock development as a result of a multi-faceted approach to livestock development. I recall, Sir, that in 1982, when the late Minister of Finance, Tom Adams, brought a wide range of rebates to stimulate the development of the livestock sector in this country, he was scoffed at by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Hon. W. O. Franklin), who said at that time, and the honourable Member will remember very well, that the cost to the Treasury was going to be low, and the reason why the cost to the Treasury was going to be low, in 1982 was that the livestock sector at that time was at such a low stage of development that the rebates, which were dependent on people putting in fencing and irrigation and improving their pastures and putting in silos as was conceived by the Barbados Labour Party, were going to be limited, because we were starting from a low base in 1982. But we made that start in 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and then we went beyond that with the creation of a livestock development fund, which my colleague has asked the Minister to tell us what is the present status of it.

We went further, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 1985, we brought the livestock sector in this country into a competitive position by imposing a 33 per cent duty, in the face of much criticism from people in this country who should know better. We also, over the course of time, built up the Dairy Industry Revolving Fund, and the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the improvement of the infrastructural facilities at the disposal of the livestock section fell to be considered after one had laid the groundwork for improved facilities at the level of the field and at the level of financing being available for farmers.

In that context, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Labour Party studies done and completed by 1985 made sense, because by 1985 we were in a position not only to have a feasibility study, but final designs of an integrated, multi-dimensional project to address one of the last remaining constraints to expanding livestock production in this country, the abattoir and that whole range of things. And the question that we are asking from this side is, when one charts the development of public action in this field since 1982, why has it taken us two years now to have to come back to this House to borrow funds to do a feasibility study, when, in fact, this thing has been studied to death, and we were in a position, as the Estimates from last year will show, to begin construction as of last financial year? These are the issues we want to hear about.

Sir, it is not enough for the Minister to tell us that we are here to borrow funds merely because the Europeans need to get a piece of the action. In my view, if a responsible Government has had a feasibility study prepared by reputable consultants, appointed by a reputable lending institution, it is a simple matter, as far as I am concerned, for the Government to have a review of that feasibility study undertaken with a view to updating it and with a view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to accommodating any design changes that Government may want to embark on, given changes in circumstances. But we have yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to hear any serious rationale for why we now have to be borrowing money from the European Development Fund to do a feasibility study when, by the consent of the other side, this project has already been studied to death and we were in a position as of last year to go ahead with construction. That is our point, Sir. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult, Sir, to overestimate the importance of making steady, but serious progress in this area. The area of livestock development is an area that one has to approach with clear, long-term perspectives in view. The economic benefits that can accrue to this country are considerable. Meat importation is one of the largest components of our food import bill. And it is that area of our food imports, where substitution is perhaps easier by reason of climatic and other considerations, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, that we have to address. We have, however, to move on it on a planned systematic basis, using proper fiscal policy, utilising sensible relationships between the private sector and the Government, and one would have thought, Sir, that the Member for the City (Mr. P. J. M. Miller) would have wished to speak in this debate, given his experience as a potential private investor, to try to get the Ministry of Agriculture to get action going in a major way in this critical area.

The area is of such potential importance to the future of Barbados, at a time when the future of sugar is in so much doubt, that what the Minister of Agriculture does or does not do can have a tremendous bearing on the prosperity of agriculture in the years to come. Therefore, Sir, given the critical importance of livestock as a possible substitute for sugar on the present sugar lands, we have a vested interest today in making sure that our planning for it is proper and done in the best possible way. There is no evidence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to suggest that one can point to such a circumstance in this particular situation.

We therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, need to ask questions of the Minister of Agriculture. We need, for example, to ask, how long is this feasibility study supposed to take? I ask the question deliberately, Sir, because one of the first things that the Minister of Agriculture did on the assumption of office by the Democratic Labour Party was to announce plans for a study of diversification on ADC lands. And it took the Minister of Agriculture, and the ADC, Sir, one year, not to do the study, Sir, but to choose a consulting firm to undertake a study on what are the most practicable ways of diversifying the use of ADC lands. That study, which was supposed to have been in hand to guide Government's relationship to the ADC and ADC's relationship to diversification in this country, is yet to be presented to Government. So it becomes necessary for us, if we are talking about livestock development as a major area of diversification, to get a feel from the Minister of Agriculture how long this will take.

What kind of planning horizons does the Minister and the Government have for the undertaking of this feasibility study? Is the Government proposing to use any of the information contained in former studies, or will it be involved in a brand new study? To what extent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the present study draw upon the information at the disposal of certain potential private entrepreneurs as regards their own plans for the future? Is there any scope, since we are now going into the area of a new feasibility study, for this study to be broadened so that the specific concerns of the private sector in this most important area can be accommodated? And once we have gone past the stage of getting the study done, I need to know and ask if the Minister of Agriculture, what kind of implementation schedule are we talking about as regards the construction of

abattoir facilities in Barbados? And I must stress that point, Sir, because last year the Minister of Agriculture spoke in the Estimates Debate, and he got, and claimed, credit for the fact that in the course of that financial year, he was providing funds for the construction of an abattoir. How long must we now wait to have that abattoir, which ought to have been completed in the previous financial year? These are the specific issues that the Opposition wants to hear, addressed, rather than to have this matter brushed off in the cavalier fashion of the Member for St. Lucy (Hon. E. E. Greaves), or to have only the financial terms read out by the Acting Minister of Finance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to my mind, it is a matter of very great regret, given the systematic direction along which the livestock sector in this country has been developed since 1982, to see such carelessness creep into the planning of it. My regret stems from the fact that in constituencies like mine and that of my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons), livestock production might well have to be the activity we call upon in a major way to take the place of sugar cane. If we are going to go into it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us understand that today we are not just debating a \$90 000 loan or whatever, but that we are starting to lay in a systematic way the foundations of a properly diversified agricultural sector in this country. I am therefore very unhappy to have to reflect upon the manner in which the Minister of Agriculture spoke in this debate. He seemed not to know where the abattoir is going to be located, he seemed not to know critical things about timing, such that the farming community both public and private can take

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The Ministry of Agriculture received from the Ministry of Health only about ten days ago the notice that the site cannot be used for the abattoir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Honourable Minister wants to reopen the debate, because if he received it ten days ago, ten days ago falls within this financial year, and clearly that could not have affected the decision, if the decision to construct the abattoir last financial year was a serious decision. So I do not know what is the point the Minister of Agriculture was trying to make. He seems to me to be merely confusing the issue.

The point is that, last year, funds were asked for by the Minister of Agriculture to build an abattoir. The fact that the Minister of Health said ten days ago that the abattoir could not have been built where it was supposed to be built last year does not reflect on the fact that last year we did vote funds to construct an abattoir, not to do a feasibility study. So there has been, in some respects, a complete breakdown in planning - that is the point we are making here - and co-ordination in this critical area.

I wish, Sir, that the Member for the City, who understands so clearly what I am trying to say, would impress on his Cabinet colleagues the fact that this area is a critical area, and that the kind of sloppy planning that we have evidenced, implicit

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir.

Aside

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not a member of the Cabinet, as you yourself know, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: So I do not understand what the honourable Member is saying when he talks about my Cabinet colleagues. I am not a member of the Cabinet.

Laughter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very deeply regret that the Member for the City sees the need to put so much distance between himself and his Cabinet colleagues. I deeply regret it, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The point is that this is too vital to the future of Barbados for us not to plan it properly. Livestock is the future of agriculture in Barbados and we have to plan it properly. This Government is not planning it properly now. We need to hear more from the Government on this matter.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS (St. Michael South East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to support this Resolution and to make a few observations. Every time we come before this Honourable Chamber with a concrete proposal for the upliftment of this country, we hear the same tune from the Opposition, that they were planning it in 1985 and they were just about to do it. It is the same thing every time we come here.

But history has recorded that the talk of an abattoir goes back to 1975. The Barbados Labour Party was in a position for ten years to do something about an abattoir. They did absolutely nothing about it, except to say that they would change a site from one place to the other. 3.45 p.m.

The last speaker who spoke, the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), made a big song and dance about the fact that the present Minister of Agriculture, about

a year ago, promised to put irrigation in St. Philip and he did not. But I want to draw some basic facts to jolt the memories of the members of the Opposition about some of the things that they promised in their manifesto in 1976 with respect to agriculture. I think this is a document of the House. On page 7 of the manifesto they said that they would provide agro-industrial sites in St. Philip and St. Joseph for processing, freezing and canning, particularly to assist those who farm vegetables, peanuts and corn, whether on a small or large holding, and to eliminate the importation of these goods. They went on to say in the 1976 manifesto, that three fishing ports, in the St. Joseph-St. John area, the St. Philip-Christ Church area, and the St. Peter area, would have been constructed. Now they are questioning a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture last year!

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is not being fair to us. Oistins was built. Speightstown was going to be built. They stopped it. Bridgetown was built. Tent Bay was done. I am still waiting for the shoe factory that was going to produce shoes at six shillings a pair, and the sea coast houses for the workers that the Democratic Labour Party had in its manifesto in 1961. If he is going down that line, I am going to get up on points of order all day. I also remind them that they promised to come to the country every three years for general elections.

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

(*Aside:* Hon. P. M. GREAVES: He is making his speech. He is not on a point of order. Draw that to his attention.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been seeking to give as much latitude in this debate as possible. But I do not want Members to take this matter really outside the perimeters of the Resolution, and I would like us to continue on the path that we started on.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South East may continue.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Peter was in the vanguard of the agricultural development for his party in the last few years when they ran the affairs of this country. He was not in Barbados during the 1976 era when this manifesto was put out, so he might not have been aware of what went on. But I would suggest to him that he updates himself on some of the things that took place during that time, because then he would be less critical.

They also went on in that manifesto to say that they would provide inland fish farms, utilising the streams of St.

Andrew and St. Joseph, and it was hoped that dams and other bodies of inland water would be created in St. Andrew for a development scheme. So it is really unfair to get up, after having made these promises, and having been the Government for ten years, to chastise the Minister of Agriculture for not implementing a programme in a year.

Let me come back to the point as to why it is necessary to have a feasibility study done. Our Government is cognisant, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister said it, that the financial institutions were not satisfied with the last feasibility study. I am not surprised, because it was the Opposition Party which, during the last ten years, because of their financial manoeuvrings, took us to a point where Guyana could owe us \$128 million, which we are finding a lot a difficulty in now getting back. So I am not surprised that the financial institutions were dissatisfied with the feasibility study that they did, and so we have to do a new feasibility study.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said that he discovered that in St. John, his new home, there are people raising cows who have gone from four to 80, or something like that. All of a sudden, he has discovered that small farming was a big industry. But I want to remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that in his constituency there is a young farmer by the name of Haskell Williams who has the best Black Belly sheep in Barbados. He said that during their time they had appropriated \$1 million to help small farmers, and I wonder if he was aware of that small farmer in his own constituency, who should have benefitted from all of this money that they said they put on paper, but which none of the small farmers benefitted from. That is very important. It is not only necessary to identify the farmer who lives next to you, but sometimes it is important to identify the farmer who lives in your constituency, and who can do with the help that you say that the Government can provide.

The Minister of Health alluded to garbage disposal, which is a severe problem not only for Barbados, but particularly for Barbados, because Barbados is a small land mass. Throughout the world today the bigger countries, the United States, England and the other countries in Europe, are finding that the disposal of solid waste is a serious problem, and they have been trying to dump solid waste on developing countries, and some of this solid waste is contaminated by radiation. In one of the African countries, I think it is Uganda or Gambia, in the last few months one of the European countries has dumped tonnes of radioactive material along a river bank, to the extent that now some of the cans have rotted and it is affecting the fish in the river, and we in the Caribbean are aware of the fact that there have been ships floating around the Caribbean trying to dump their waste, and there have been even some Governments which seem receptive to accepting this stuff.

We have to be very, very serious about this, and the abattoir presents a very peculiar situation in which we may be able to convert some of our solid waste into usable material. That is very, very important.

What also is important, and I hope, and I know, that the Government will look after it, is that *if* we are going to put an up-to-date abattoir in place, it means that we will be, able to utilise a lot more of the animals for not only the production of meat, but for the production of animal feed, etc. And I hope that, I know that we are looking at making sure that not only the big farmer, but also the small farmer, will be well placed by that time to come on stream so that he will not suffer from the problem of being able to get rid of his animals.

But there is probably an even more significant point that we must look at. As the developing countries become industrialised, there is a problem of maintenance of plants. We have seen the Oistins fishing complex and the cement plant set up. While we are bringing in all of this modern technology, we have not been looking at the critical area of the maintenance of the plants, using technicians to maintain them. It is all right to go and buy a plant for \$100 million, but what we are finding is that having bought the plant for \$100 million, we are allowing a part that cost \$10 to destroy the whole plant. 3.55 p.m.

In Barbados, we have young people with the technical background, the technical know-how, and while we are setting up these plants, we should also set in place a technical division with trained Barbadians - that is a key, trained Barbadians - who can maintain these plants, and we should insist when we are going to buy these plants, that whoever we are going to buy the plants from also provide the technical know-how to this group of people to maintain the plants. As I said, the basic problem in the developing countries is maintenance, and already we have seen the destruction of places like the Oistins fishing complex, where the things are all broken down and the fishermen have to scramble to go one place or the other to find ice. It really does not make any sense to expend that kind of money and, because you are not maintaining the plants, allow them to deteriorate. I know that we have the technical people, the young people in Barbados, with the computerised brains, they have come up in the computerised age, and they understand the computer and they understand how to maintain these things, and I hope that we make sure that we have that sort of infrastructure in place to maintain these plants that we are putting down. I know that this Government will be cognisant of that.

I am quite sure that the abattoir, having set these things in motion, will be a benefit to Barbados, and it will reduce the amount of foreign currency that we have to

spend in bringing in food not only food for ourselves, but for animals. I know that our Government will be mindful of this. But it makes no sense getting up every time and saying, "We were going to do it in 1985, but the people changed their minds." The people changed their minds because you had it in the plan for ten years and you never did anything about it. We intend to do something about it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, a reflection on the history of debates on abattoirs in this country makes very interesting mentation. If my memory serves me right, it is perhaps over 20 years now that there has been a to and fro debate on the question of an abattoir in Barbados, and from time to time efforts have been made to try to implement various proposals to establish an abattoir. However, I believe that what has happened over the past 20 years is that there have been various emphases in the Barbados economy which have tended to cloud the importance of that critical agro-industrial sector.

As we have reached 1988, and there is patently a clear need for a precise vision as to what would be the main props of the development of this economy as would take the country into the 21st century, it has become more and more evident, and I think beyond the pale of debate, that as this economy evolves relentlessly, despite our weakest efforts, into a services economy, the only additional area which can generate the maximum value added in terms of forming another major prop in the economy is what we have available to us and what we do not have to import into this country. That boils down to one word, agriculture, in Barbados.

There has been much discussion over sugar, which has led, I believe since 1982, to rather more informed debates than in the past, and there is increasing discussion on agro-industrial development and agricultural diversification in Barbados. Many have been the words that have been said, but I believe that the time has come when, in the context of a precise vision as to where this economy will find itself in the year 2000, critical steps must be taken to ensure that we exploit to the maximum the land mass at our disposal. It is therefore not surprising that this debate has ranged tangentially on the oceans, on agro-industrial development and, equally, I think, on utilisation of a God-given resource, namely the lands in Barbados.

There can be no question that unless you have an efficient abattoir in Barbados, which represents a critical pre-marketing stage for livestock development, you are going to have all sorts of bottlenecks in the development of the livestock industry, and it is my suggestion that all steps should be taken to have an abattoir established in Barbados without delay, or with minimum delay.

We have seen, for example, the quick responsiveness of the farming sector under fiscal conditions which are conducive to livestock development. We have seen, for example, the fairly rapid expansion of the amount of cattle in Barbados for the production of local beef under fiscal stimulus. In a matter of 18 months one was able to report to this House in 1986 that there was a substantial increase in the amount of beef produced locally, consumed locally by both our visiting and by the local community. We have seen a very massive expansion in the area of poultry and in various other areas. What this means is that in Barbados, provided we have the appropriate infrastructure and a clear understanding of what we are doing in the overall frame of development, Barbados' second sector in 1992 is most likely to be an agricultural sector. The economy would be services propelled, and the second important sector would be agriculture, and if we are to link the two closely, we have to make sure that agriculture does not fall behind. 4.05 p.m.

Needless to say, if you have an abattoir, it will once again be a major stimulus for the small farmer, in Barbados, the small livestock producer. Time was when the majority of livestock in Barbados was, in fact, produced by people who owned no land in this country and who grew their livestock either at the side of the road or by utilising other people's property by general communal consent within the community. One of the problems that has frustrated this effort is that as the banking system in Barbados has become more sophisticated, there has been the absence of a credit sensitivity which recognises that an important asset in lending to the small landless livestock owner is his ability and his performance in the past and not the usual criteria of physical asset assessment as collateral for lending. I think that that has in some ways retarded the development of this area. Therefore, I think we need to revert to the old maxim that the best banker for agriculture is one who knows more about agriculture than banking, particularly when dealing with the small farmers in this country.

Small livestock producers are capable of rearing their families, and many families in Barbados have been reared by the small livestock producer who did not own any land, or probably owned only a quarter of an acre of land or less than that, or no more land than his house was on with a shed in the back. I rather suspect that that form of agricultural activity is one which will attract the attention of the young people in Barbados far more readily than the other traditional forms of agriculture. It offers the opportunity not only for self-employment, but for that sense of independence which seems to me to be an increasingly important factor in terms of people seeking work in the agricultural sector. But they must know, when they have reared their animals that opportunity exists for them to have

them slaughtered, that they can get a reasonable price and there is an appropriate market for their product.

I believe that it is quite correct that the debate on this Resolution should have ranged in the context of a second reading speech. The abattoir is just, in a sense, the end product, and the purpose of the abattoir has to be clearly understood in what we are trying to achieve for the Barbados economy, and then, at the more human level, for individuals within the country.

There is no reason why Barbados should not be producing even more beef than it is producing today, there is no reason why we should not be producing more pork, there is no reason why we should not be thinking of a much greater involvement in agro-industrial development with the major spin-offs of canning and packaging, all these things generating jobs for the people of Barbados. Indeed, we should be thinking of developing our agriculture with a level of sophistication that we get more involved in the export of the excess product which we do not need in Barbados. We should be producing enough of a variety of things in this country not only to satisfy the local market, but at least for export within GARICOM, and then maybe, beyond.

I do not want to stray into the area of fish, because I believe that something is being done in this area. I believe that there are some fish exports now out of Barbados. Nor do I want to get into the area of peppers. I believe that the pepper industry is an excellent example of utilising the land available, satisfying the local market and penetrating the export market and earning foreign exchange and generating jobs in Barbados. That could be multiplied a thousand times, but I think one of the problems we have is a lack of vision, a lack of a clear understanding of where the Barbados economy has headed and where it is going.

I believe that maximum financial resources in Barbados in 1988 should be placed behind agriculture and behind the services sectors of the economy, whilst we allow the substantial purchasing power within the society to continue to generate activity within the manufacturing sector, because, make no mistake, these things are all interlinked, and that is why it is so important that we see agriculture in relation to local manufacturing. When a pig is slaughtered, there is only so much you can eat or handle as fresh meat, and the question is the processing beyond that, and now you have the opportunity for developing a sophisticated manufacturing infrastructure, you must have at all times in Barbados sufficient purchasing power to ensure that you give a local stimulus to that kind of activity.

So I do not think that we should look at this debate purely in terms of a physical building with some equipment inside of it to kill animals. You have to look at it in terms of

what has taken place in the economy, and I believe that the fundamental reason we do not have an agro-manufacturing industry in Barbados today is because there has not really been at any time a very clear definition as to what will constitute the elements of the Barbados economy down the road so that we can allocate priorities in the particular areas.

I recall the late Errol Barrow once stating that he wants to see Barbados as another Singapore in terms of economic structure. I knew what he was talking about, an economy where all the elements in it, whether it be livestock, non-sugar agriculture, tourism, financial services, the whole lot, would sustain a sufficiency of resources to employ the hoards of young people that we are now producing in Barbados with higher levels of education, and have the capacity to absorb higher levels of skills in a shorter period and to put them to work. That is what the Singapore experiment has been about.

In 1979, before the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) lost his seat, there was also a debate in this House in which a Bahamian model was discussed, one of the more important debates that took place in terms of the future of the Barbados economy. But somewhere along the line, it would seem to me that we lose vision and get absorbed in day-to-day debates, and into the kind of exchanges for which one loses interest as one gets older and wants to spend more time in dealing with substantive matters on the floor of the House. 4.15 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is the possibility for substantial funding. There is a considerable amount of undrawn funds, as far as I am aware, under LOME 3 available for agriculture or for any other project in Barbados. I believe that that facility may well come to an end fairly soon. I think the negotiations for the next LOME Convention will soon start. Whilst most of the other Caribbean countries have been able to draw down their allocations and have been able to get additional funds more recently, for some peculiar reason we have not been able to draw down on what has been allocated to us. I believe that at the time, the priority given to those funds was in the area of agriculture, but as I understand it, they were not exclusively for agriculture and can be used in other areas. I do not know if there are any funds remaining in terms of the Industrial Credit Fund, because those funds could have been made available to agriculture for agro-industrial development, and so on.

I have tried to look at this thing in a current and futuristic way, and also to recognise that in respect of a lot of the debate in Barbados about joblessness and jobs, as to whether the private sector or Government is producing them, in terms of useful jobs which conform with the expectations, the education and the skills of our people, the

levels of remuneration and also with the strength of the Barbados dollar in relation to other currencies, I think that the two areas where appropriate linkages and development would make the big difference over the next ten or 15 years would be in that critical area of an expansion of the services sector and an expansion of the agricultural sector. Along with that will come, inevitably, further expansion of the manufacturing sector for the local market primarily, and, I think, in later years, with the strength and surpluses in that area, for the export market. I see this as a kind of future of Barbados.

I participate in this debate not to worry about who promised an abattoir and who did not do it, who did a feasibility study and who did not. The important thing is that it represents an important focus for the future development of this country in a direction which would, if you like, continue the growth of the middle class, continue the wage levels which one expects in this country, and offer the kind of standard of living to which we are accustomed. Because, mind you, that kind of standard of living that we have in Barbados, and which our people expect, is not experienced in any Third World country, unless that country's economy is primarily based on a services development economy. I think we have been fortunate in that, as I said earlier, despite what we did, and did not do, over the past 20 years, there appears to be a relentless evolution of the economy in a services direction. I think it needs to be pushed a bit further, and I think any financial resources put behind agriculture and the services sector would be properly allocated. Those are the two props that we have to look to in the future.

I should like to make it clear that my perception of agriculture in the future is one which must be so organised and structured as to generate the kind of jobs I am talking about. This has started to take place. Those people who are involved in the processing of hams and pork, should I say, in various directions in Barbados, are involved in agriculture, but they are not involved in agriculture at the kind of level which seems to have generated some social rejection over the years; they are involved with the multiplying aspects of agriculture, and this can go on and on in many areas.

I hope that by the time an abattoir is built the Ministry would have formulated a comprehensive plan of production which involves all sectors of the economy, and finds some method of financing the small livestock producer which recognises that the history of skills and success in that area constitute probably a more important asset, as I have said before, than a physical holding that is readily quantitative in dollar terms, in terms of access to credit.

Another important thing to remember about agriculture too is that much of the credit needs of that sector

will always be in Barbadian dollars. It will always provide an important substitute for the use of foreign currency, and it has an important potential not only for job generation and foreign currency savings, but, down the road, for foreign currency earnings.

I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have made some small minute contribution to this debate in the wider perspective.

Thank you very much.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER (City of Bridgetown): Mr. Deputy Speaker, agriculture, to my mind, is far too important for it to have been treated in the manner that it has been treated in past years by the political directorate. I would agree that what we are debating here goes beyond just the construction of an abattoir, and I would also agree that it has to go beyond any partisan bickering. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) took a line that clearly indicated to me that maybe because he was not around in 1976, he was not aware of some of the promises that were made by the Barbados Labour Party's Administration.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He was asleep before I started to speak.

It would be remiss of me if I did not do it to draw to this Honourable Chamber's attention some of the things that were said about livestock and abattoirs and processing plants, all of the lip service that was given between 1976 and now. Because when I read on, it appears to me as though we have been promised not one or two, but several abattoirs. I therefore think that, so it is not misleading to this Chamber and the broader public, we should look at some of the things that were promised, and I would ask you to bear with me, Sir.

The 1976-1981 *Promises and Performance*, a document that I believe is a document of this Honourable House, produced by the Barbados Labour Party, under "Agro-Industrial Sites", on page 11, it said:

"A BMC complex is to be built in St. George. The operations of the pork processing plant in St. Thomas are being extended to vegetable processing."

I am drawing these references because I believe that if we are to understand the tremendous task that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has on his hands, we have to understand what was promised before and what was not done, I do not even know how that could have been included in a document called *"Promises and*

Performance," because there is no vegetable processing plant in St. Thomas, unless the honourable Member for St. Thomas knows of one that I do not know of. 4.25 p.m.

Then came the 1981 manifesto. At page 8, under Livestock:

"To improve the facilities at the abattoir and the standards for slaughtering and dealing with animals."

I have never seen any improvements in the existing abattoir that were promised.

The 1981-1986 *Promises and Performance*, page 12:

"To improve the facilities at the abattoir and the standards for slaughtering of animals." That was the promise I just read from the Manifesto. This is what they said the performance was:

"A feasibility study has been carried out and this project has been included in Barbados' indicative programme for the LOME 3A Programme."

We come to 1986 and we get more lip-service and another promise:

"The strengthening of technical support systems within the agricultural sector, including the provision of a centrally located and modern abattoir and the re-organisation of the financial and credit system to the farmer."

From all that I have heard in the debate today, and from what I have read in these documents, we have been promised about five abattoirs by now. So I believe that it is important that people understand what has happened when we come here to talk about the abattoir.

I agree with other honourable Members that when we discuss or debate the abattoir, we are talking beyond just somewhere for the slaughtering of animals. We are talking about a total improvement in the whole area of livestock farming and the ability of particularly small livestock farmers to have these facilities available. But I believe that when we talk about agriculture and we look at diversification of agriculture, something that I believe will become more or less a catch phrase in Barbados these days, people just use it loosely. If you look at it in its purest sense, diversification of agriculture in Barbados, to my mind, could only mean that you are going to plant something or produce something in the lines of agriculture outside of sugar. But that has been going on for a long time. I think that when this Government speaks of diversification of agriculture, we are talking about total diversification and we are talking about providing infrastructure that will allow

for not only the production of other crops and the production of livestock, but to be able to do all the necessary things that come after you produce it.

There is a crying need, and I know it is being addressed by the Ministry of Agriculture, because the Minister of Agriculture has indicated this to me, for proper research and development in the whole area of marketing of agricultural products. I believe that the honourable Member who just took his seat who spoke of other facilities beyond the abattoir, of packaging and so, appreciates that in the area of beef production, for instance, we keep saying that we can never compete with the substandard beef that we import from some of these other countries, and we do not seem to recognise that modern technology now shows us ways of producing high quality beef in Barbados. Maybe we may not be able to compete with the large percentage of beef that is imported into Barbados, but certainly with the right technology we can compete with the high-priced beef that is imported mainly for the hotel industry and, to some extent, some of those Barbadians who can afford a high-priced beef.

When you look at certain statistics, we should be trying to do something about turning around agriculture. I heard other Members talk about foreign exchange savings, or the reduction of foreign exchange expenditure in this area. If you look at a situation now where you are importing beef that would be equivalent to 10 000 cows, you would understand the kind of quantity of beef we are importing into Barbados annually. You are talking about ten thousand cows and we are slaughtering in the vicinity of a thousand cows a year - ten per cent. The same things applies to mutton, and yet we boast of the best quality sheep. We say Black Belly sheep is the best. Other people from other parts of the world agree with us and even want to buy our Black Belly Sheep.

So I agree that when we debate these kinds of things we have to look more at debating the nuts and bolts of it, and not be so concerned about where we are going to put the abattoir. I am sure that wherever the abattoir is sited, it will be sited somewhere that is right. The reason it is not being sited where it is now is because it was discovered that that will be a bad place to site it, and that is good enough reason for me to appreciate that a serious look is being taken at what is happening with the abattoir. So I am not concerned about where it is going to be sited. I know that whenever it is done, it will be properly done. I believe we have to look more at this question, are we really serious about assisting those small livestock farmers?

It is all well and good for honourable Members on the other side to talk nonsense about any interest that any relative of mine may have in livestock farming. I do not have any relatives that have any livestock that I know

about, they may have an interest in assisting small livestock fanners. I think that is a laudible thing, so if they have a problem with that, it goes back to what I always believe about them, that they have a difficulty in dealing with small people anyhow. They may be large livestock farmers that they can deal with, and those large livestock farmers may be able to put up their own abattoir.

When we are talking about an abattoir like this, we are talking about something to assist in developing the livestock farmers. We are talking about an integrated system. We are talking about sheep, pigs and cows. We are not talking about cows alone. I hope the honourable Member for St. Peter understands that. Everytime I talk about cows you get a little nervous.

Only a few short years ago, one would not have thought that we would be in a position today where we have a processing plant that processes canned meats that are sold certainly in our neighbouring CARICOM territories, and it is a fact that they are chosen over products of a similar type that are made in those countries. I remember when there was talk of that processing plant. I heard people talk about we are going to have all kinds of problems with quality and the fellows are not going to know what they are doing and this sort of thing. Now we have high quality meats being processed. Of course, they are mostly poultry and pork products. So who is to say that we are not well placed now, with the kind of infrastructure being put in place by government and the kind of assistance coming from Government in that area, that we cannot envisaged that in a short time we could have a plant producing beef-processed products like corned beef? Barbados is a country that eats in the vicinity of \$5 million a year in corned beef, and it is alleged, Sir, that politicians, particularly from the other side, know a lot about corned beef. So who is to say that we cannot look beyond just the abattoir?

My whole point is that there is a lot more to it than just talking about an abattoir. The attitude that the Members on that side display whenever we come to deal with these kinds of matters, the same attitude that the Member in his seat now still continues to display, is that whenever we start to deal with these kinds of issues that have far reaching effects particularly for small people, they always have a difficulty. They do not seem to have the kind of vision that this party has in dealing with these kinds of things. The \$41 million the Member keeps shouting about, Sir, is the \$41 million which have to do with a 1 000 small farmers, not one large one. Let the Member deal with that. 4.35 p.m.

What I believe we must look at, too, if there are certain inherent problems in terms of producing livestock at a reasonable price, is the cost of producing the livestock, and certainly one does not have to be a farmer to know that

the cost has a lot to do with the feed. I remember speaking to those who are taking a very serious look at the production of feed for the animals here and learning that they are taking a look at things like sorghum, which we know as Indian Corn, and we have already heard today that there is a possibility of offal of animals from this same abattoir being used as feed for this livestock.

In closing, and in giving support to this Resolution, I must mention that I believe the time is either here, or quickly approaching, when we may have to look at providing a Director of Agriculture or someone of that nature to deal with the co-ordination of all the various parastatal agencies dealing with agriculture. This is something that I am sure at another time we can probably go into further, but I believe it is very important that we have that kind of co-ordination if the mammoth task that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has on his hands is going to start bearing fruit at the rapid rate that all of us would like to see.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is strange that all those persons who fervently shouted that they wanted certain responses, they wanted replies to certain questions, now the time has come to provide those answers, cannot be found. It only goes to show that they were not serious in their work and genuine in seeking information that they said they wanted answers to. Mr. Deputy Speaker, frankly I do not know what to say. I am glad, Sir, that what I have said has brought them back into the Chamber. I am very happy to see that.

Sir, much has been said in this debate, for which there is little response needed. The fact is there was nothing said. I expect the Leader of the Opposition to vote against this Resolution. I do not know if he has enough leadership qualities to carry the other two members with him, but the way in which he began his debate, it is clear to me that he was not supporting this Resolution.

He gave us a history of the abattoir which made one believe that an abattoir in Barbados began only with the Barbados Labour Party, which has been acknowledged now, even by those on the other side, not to be the case. I can go back, Sir. I remember that some time in 1963 or 1964, an abattoir was established in this country, and I recall, too that at that time, the then Premier of Barbados had had brought into this country, I think it was two butchers from the United States of America, to teach the butchers here in Barbados. None of this is known to Members on the other side. For all that they rant and rave about, they do not study the history of what goes on in relation to parliamentary matters. Two butchers were brought into this country in the early to middle 1960s to

train local butchers in the butchering of meat and making certain cuts.

In 1975, Sir, as we have heard here before, it was realised that the Barbados Marketing Corporation should be resiled, including the abattoir, which was an adjunct to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and a site had been located and plans were being prepared. That was in 1976. Elections came, we lost the elections, and now 12 years down the road all we have from the other side is talk about an abattoir. Nothing has been done to set up an abattoir in this country, which will have an effect not only of the butchering of meat and making cuts which we can dispose of to the hotels and other businesses, and Barbadians in this country, but will have the effect of stimulating the livestock industry in this country. The whole period of the Barbados Labour Party Government came and expired and we got no closer to establishing an abattoir. We are now at the point where we are back to where we left off in 1976.

I made it clear in my introduction to this Resolution that there was a preliminary study done by the Inter-American Institute for Co-operation in Agriculture (IICA). The honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) claims he did not hear that. A copy of that study was sent to the European Investment Bank. On the basis of that study that was done by the IICA, certain funds were included in the Estimates of Expenditure in the 1987-88 book of Estimates. Subsequent to including that in the Estimates, we were told by the European Investment Bank that that study was not adequate enough for them to disburse the funds and that we would have to carry out further studies. Hence, we are here at this point today.

I am reading, Sir, from a Minute Paper. The selection of a firm will be by restrictive invitation to tender, in which six European firms already submitted by EIB - that is the European Investment Bank - and six local firms will be invited to submit technical and free proposals, based on the terms of references to which I made reference when I introduced this Resolution. I want to repeat that the objects of the study include the preparation of final designs, cost estimates and tender documents for the facilities. In other words, we have gone beyond just bare talk, we have gone even as far as the question of the study. The study will review the livestock subsector and meet marketing strategies, and make an assessment of the economic and financial feasibility of establishing an abattoir, meat packing house and by-product plant. I have said all this before, if the honourable Member was listening. I did not say this when I started, but I said it just now, and I will repeat it, that the study will prepare detailed designs of the project, prepare tender documents required for the invitation of bids for construction works and equipment, and analyse bids and recommendations. 4.45 p.m.

Sir, I hope that the honourable Member for St. Peter understands now why we had in the 1987-88 Estimates a sum of money which was voted which would not have covered the construction of an abattoir, but could only have been either counterpart funds or funds reasonably expected that could have been spent in that financial year, or both.

On the dairy industry revolving fund, I am advised, that there were certain difficulties with farmers in providing suitable collateral for them to draw down on those funds. I understand that this has now been resolved, the applicants have been interviewed and disbursement of funds will commence quickly.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked some questions which he must know cannot be answered from the floor of the House. We are now, Sir, about to begin Lome 4. Lome 2 was exclusively during the period when they were in power, and part of Lome 3 as well, Sir. The funds we are discussing today are funds under Lome 2 that should have been spent by them. The funds under Lome 2, not even Lome 3, should have been spent by them, and these funds remained unspent.

Aside

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Well, if the honourable Member wants to seriously ask the questions he asked, let him put down a substantive question and he will get the answers to those questions.

Sir, I believe I have covered all the intelligent points made by the honourable Members on the other side. The rest will be left unanswered.

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

BORROWING OF US\$3 000 000, £900 000
AND 6 000 000 DEUTSCHE MARKS
FROM CROWN AGENTS SERVICES
LTD.

Order No. 2 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sums of US\$3 000 000, £900 000 and 6 000 000 deutsche marks from Crown Agents Services Ltd., for the purpose of assisting in the purchase and supply of capital goods and semi-capital goods during the fiscal year 1988-89.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the case of the Resolution which was just passed, it is necessary for Parliament to give approval for the borrowing of any funds from the Crown Agents Services Ltd. The Crown Agents, Sir, have been of service to this country for many, many years in helping to identify

certain services and goods for Barbados, and that is the case on this occasion.

In our approved Capital Estimates for this year, if one would aggregate the amount of money that has been provided for the purchase of equipment, etcetera, one would come to a figure approaching \$21 million. Of this amount, about \$13 million would have to be utilised in the purchase of equipment, etcetera, from external sources. The Crown Agents have identified certain sources from which we can acquire those goods - the United States, Great Britain and West Germany.

The amounts required are, in US dollars, \$3 million; in pounds sterling, 900 000; and in deutsche marks, 6 000 000. The loan has a maturity date of five years, commencing at the end of the month of shipment. Interest rates vary. On the US dollar portion, the rate is 10 % per cent or 10.25 per cent; on the pounds sterling, it is 8.85 per cent, and on the deutsche mark portion it is 6.80 per cent

Sir, the capital equipment and semi-capital equipment range over a wide area in respect of the Ministries, which are the Ministries of Education, Housing, Legal Affairs, Tourism, International Transport, Agriculture, Finance, Transport and Works and the Ministry of Health.

I regret, Sir, that I do not see anything, under the Ministry of Health - any piece of equipment - to deal with newspapers that carry inaccurate, misleading, lying stories, like what one carried, about a young boy with AIDS at a secondary school, which no secondary school knows anything about.

My belief is that any reporter who can report those facts which are untrue should be disciplined by that newspaper. I do not see anything here about it, but in the course of time, I believe those facts will all come out, because it was a total fabrication in the newspaper.

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

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Acting Minister of Finance has given us details as regards the specific circumstances surrounding this intended loan. We find the details interesting, Sir, but there is a broader point at issue that guides the Opposition in this particular matter, and which will, of necessity, have us vote against these particular borrowings by the Government. 4.55p.m.

On the last day of the Budget, the Opposition accommodated Government, at the very last minute, when Government brought to the House a Resolution asking the authority of Parliament to enable Government during the course of this fiscal year to borrow an amount up to Bds. \$160 million for the purposes of meeting shortfalls in Government finances.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was a very difficult decision for the Opposition to take even at that time, to even contemplate discussing the issue, since we had been bombarded during the course of the Budget Debate with statements from the Prime Minister to the effect that we had to be held accountable for a part of the overspending last year, because we voted for it, and that the debt was our debt because we voted for the loans that the Government borrowed. But since Government at the time said that it was a matter of public urgency, and also because Government at the time said it would borrow an amount equivalent to its full borrowing requirements for the entire year, this responsible Opposition decided to entertain the debate, and we also gave our support then for Parliament to authorise that the Government of Barbados borrow up to Bds. \$160 million to assist in financing Government capital expenditure, et cetera.

We left that debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the understanding that Government's external financing requirements for the year had been met, and that Parliament had fulfilled its obligations by providing Government with the necessary authority to borrow up to a particular ceiling of \$160 million this year. The Minister of Finance proceeded to Japan and came back with a loan of \$80 million. The Acting Minister of Finance will obviously say that we are asking questions, Sir, but we must ask the Government what are the circumstances surrounding that Japanese loan? We must ask the Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are the circumstances which explain the fact that the Government of Barbados had the intention, as represented in the Addendum to the Resolution, to borrow up to \$160 million on the Japanese market, but only ended up getting \$80 million?

We, therefore, Sir, against the background of all those circumstances, cannot now agree to this new set of borrowings by Government without a full account being given to the House as to why that initial borrowing strategy and that initial borrowing programme went off track. That is the essential point. This Opposition is not prepared to accommodate the Government in its borrowing programmes unless we get the fullest possible accounts from Government as to exactly where Barbados now stands in the eyes of the international community. We want to know what are the implications of this country seeking to put a bond issue of Bds. \$160 million on the market in

Japan, but having that bond issue being under-subscribed for the first time ever in this country's financial history, Sir.

I am not going to detain the House very much this evening in this particular matter. We on this side believe that when we were asked on the last day of the Budget to accommodate the Government, to agree in this Parliament that the Government could borrow up to \$160 million on the Japanese market to cover its financial requirements for the rest of the financial year, we thought then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we were providing Government with the comfort and the latitude to meet its external foreign requirements for the year, and we acted in good faith. We acted, with a view, as a responsible Opposition, to ensure that the functioning of this society and the operations of Government's capital programmes were not hamstrung for lack of financial resources, particularly in this case, external financial resources.

I think, Sir, that given the circumstances under which we debated that particular matter, the matter having been brought to this House on the day, and our agreeing, despite what the Prime Minister had said before, to entertain Government on it, that the Government has a responsibility to tell us what went wrong in Japan. We want to hear it, Sir. We will not entertain this particular support, on the principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we were led to believe in early May, when we supported Government coming to this House for \$160 million, that we were supporting Government in meeting its full borrowing requirements for the course of the financial year.

I will hear arguments from the other side that we supported up to \$160 million, but they only took \$80 million. The point that I want to make is that Government served its intention during the course of that debate to borrow the full \$160 million on the Japanese market That is incontrovertible. That was the clear intention as stated by the Government at that time, and the fact that we now have to be looking at alternatives, means that there was a slip between Government's intention and the result, and this House, which was called upon to approve that initial loan, now needs to be told why, having done our duty originally, we must now find it expedient to take Government out of its financial embarrassment.

The Opposition, Sir, on principle, will not be supporting this Resolution. And we call upon Government to give us a full account of what happened during the course of those arrangements that were put in place on the Japanese market.

I am obliged to you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to put the position more bluntly than

that After the Budget Debate, very late in the night, a Resolution under the External Loans Act was brought in here for Government to borrow up to \$160 million in Japan, at an interest rate of seven per cent, to assist in the financing of Government's capital programme and in meeting Government's foreign debt payments. We were given the assurance by the Prime Minister that that was all that would be needed in terms of Government's foreign borrowing for fiscal 1988-89.

I agree with the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) that we were reluctant to give support, even though it was very late in the night, but we were persuaded by Members on the other side to support it in the national interest. And one of the principal reasons we were hesitant about our support was that when Government last year brought a number of supplementaries in here,....

(Aside: At the last minute, too!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...on the same day of the respective debates, we accommodated Government, and we supported them, and we did not, except for one, I think, vote against them. But at the same time, we were complaining about the level of borrowing, and when in particular, the Member for St. Peter, week after week, was issuing warnings about the level of borrowing, issuing the warnings out of these accounts and statements about the level of Government expenditure, he was pilloried in and out of this House, and accused of making the same speech all the time.

The Prime Minister himself, one day in here, when we complained about the supplementaries, said, "But you all have been voting for them." In the light of that, we have determined to be more cautious in future with accommodating Government with last minute applications for matters of debate.

(Aside: Hon. H. deB. FORDE: David told some lies on you on Sunday.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He can tell whatever lies he likes about me on Sunday. Do you think I care about him?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He told one about Bree last week.

(Aside: Who is he?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Thompson.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On May Day, the Prime Minister of this country went to the Workers' Union Labour Day function and told this country that the economy was headed for the rocks, and that on April 28, he had had to take certain urgent, corrective and remedial action to save Barbados from economic and financial collapse. The Prime Minister, within a week after that, not in Barbados now, both in New York and Japan, was quoted as saying - and he has never denied it - that the economy and Government's finances were good. In fact, he was boasting of the first quarter growth at the time. 5.05 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Tom is dead. Why are you all obsessed with Tom? Tom and Barrow are dead. We are dealing with who is on the scene now.

It seems to us in the Opposition, and to several people in this country, that the Prime Minister was saying contradictory things through the same mouth. It did not speak well of the credit worthiness of Barbados, nor, indeed, of the credibility of the Prime Minister. We are in the position now that we have great difficulty in believing anything the Prime Minister says. I say that.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you say so, yes. I have great difficulty, and we on this side, in the light of those statements - I say it again - have great difficulty in believing him. We subjectively have difficulty in believing him, because he will tell Barbadians one thing and he will go overseas and say something else.

When we voted for Government to borrow up to \$160 million in early May - the last night of the Budget Debate, May 3 or whenever it was - we could not believe that by July Government would be coming back to raise additional money. I will hear the Deputy Prime Minister say - you authorised us to borrow up to \$160 million, but we only got \$80 million. What the Opposition wants answered, and what the country has a right to be told, is, how come you only got \$80 million of the \$160 million which you wanted? Were there questions about your sincerity? About your credit worthiness? You had a shortfall. Did any telexes or faxes go from Barbados to Japan after the Prime Minister spoke on Labour Day.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, we are too poor to have faxes. I do not have any, nor does the party have any. They know that

We want to know, Sir, how come the Government found it impossible to raise up to \$160 million at seven per cent in Japan? That is the first question. The second thing we want to ask is, is this the last, or if they are coming with more? You got \$80 million, we presume at seven per cent, as had been the original intent, for ten years from Japan. This money that the Crown agents have now found for you is 10.25 per cent on the U.S. dollar, 8.5 per cent on the pound, and 6.8 per cent on the deutsche mark, and I am told that the total being borrowed amounts to about \$16 million. Within the last three days, we have also heard that the Prime Minister is negotiating a loan in Venezuela of about \$54 million.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Certainly - something to do with road construction. You will still have leeway.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am showing them.

In May, you wanted \$160 million. You got \$80 million from Japan. Add this 16 million, which is 96 million, and 54 million - I presume you are getting the 54 million from Venezuela. We do not know at what rate, what maturity, anything about it.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Thomas is very good at his arithmetic. I do not think he needs too much assistance.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir, I have it understood. I am going to do like the little boy in school. Eighty from Japan, 16 in this - this is 96 and 54.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, if it is 64 from Venezuela.....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Minister of Agriculture is shouting 64.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, they are not with me. I thought I heard it announced on the television that the Prime Minister, in the course of his visit to Venezuela, would be seeking to borrow \$54 million. So \$54 million from Venezuela, \$16 million from these three sources, and

\$80 million from Japan would give you \$150 million. You would still have another \$10 million to come for later on.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right. The first Resolution that came in May authorised up to \$160 million. With these three loans being sponsored in various countries, you have \$150 million. You are within the range. But that is not the key thing in our view. The key factor in this is why was the country led to believe that all \$160 million would have been borrowed from Japan at seven per cent, as the Resolution had indicated, with a ten year maturity, and now you are getting shorter term money and higher cost money, certainly on these that are before us today. Unless the House is going to be treated with the utmost candour and told why the Government was unable to raise the \$160 million in Japan, as the Governor of the Central Bank, Director of Finance and Planning, and the Minister of Finance and Planning went on a trip to Japan to raise - unless you tell us why you did not get all, we do not feel that we are being treated openly and honestly. In those circumstances, the Opposition cannot support this attempt to borrow \$16 million. Although it may not appear to be a lot in the context of Barbados' capital expenditure, having regard to the levels of interest and the length of the money, and so on, Sir, this is borrowing at a substantial disadvantage as compared with what the Japanese money could have been obtained at in May this year if something did not happen, and we want to know what happened. Our suspicions are aroused. That is the Opposition's position on this. 5.15p.m.

We do not want to hold up Government's work, prevent departments from getting trucks or whatever kind of capital equipment they need. The Crown Agents do good work, the Crown Agents helped us to bring in that piece of equipment with the tall ladder that can go up to the Central Bank building. All right! The equipment is obviously necessary for the carrying out of Government's programmes. We are not questioning the necessity for the equipment, we are saying that there is something more fundamental in Government's borrowing strategy, apart from the promise in 1986 that we would not borrow again at the level to which we had become accustomed.

We are not going to use this occasion to complain about the level of Government's expenditure. We are not going to use this occasion to say that, all of a sudden, within the last two days, we find statements being made by people in Government and the Government party that nothing was wrong with the fiscal policies *per se*, but the problem was the method of implementation. When they were boasting about them, they did not say that they should be implemented one at a time or two at a time, they sold all as

a worthwhile package to be implemented. But do you know what happened? Three abstained, according to the calypso, and they are not well pleased with those three, and they want to go for the chief among the three, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). So it is a way of discrediting him to come and say

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not "want to interrupt the honourable Member, but you were going very well when you were speaking on the....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You do not want to hear the truth, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not really want to put you off track, because I know you really know what you want to say. All right, you continue.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir.

This money is to help with Government's capital. If Government had been earning, if this country had been earning enough money to allow for a contribution to be made to Capital Account, then there would not have been the need to borrow the same quantum of money externally. But we are not earning to make any contribution to Capital Account, and we have to borrow to supplement the lack of earning capacity.

The Member for St. Michael South Central is being blamed in a smart way for that, Sir, because they are saying that when he was Minister of Finance, he implemented the fiscal package all as one, too much too soon, and that is the problem. You were only hearing it Sunday, you were getting the admissions. But they say confession is good for the soul, and I am glad that some are now confessing that there were problems. But do not take it all out on the former Minister of Finance. We have one now, we have had him for a little time very well, and he was told and warned from this side to watch the level of expenditure.

Every month that these come, the Clerks can tell you we used to run them down - let us get these as soon as they are laid. There are three pages in this that we check every month to monitor what is going on. You all were not doing it. When we were warning you, you would not listen; now you seek to blame it internally on a member of your own side.

We are not supporting this, Sir, full stop.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say from the very beginning that it is the ultimate in amoral idiocy for anyone to say that a programme is good, but putting it in place is wrong. One of the main complaints that I heard from the Opposition when that programme was put

in place was that I fooled the public, and that instead of bringing it in place all at once in June 1986,¹ in fact, put some measures in place in June, some in January and postponed some to the next fiscal year. That is why I said that it is the ultimate in amoral idiocy for anyone to make that statement. That is the end of my story on that.

When I was in the Opposition, I felt free to examine and speak on Government's external position, because the financial community, as I know it, always takes with a pinch of salt what is said by a spokesman in the Opposition. It takes with a pinch of salt what is said by any Opposition groups, but it takes very seriously what is said by a Minister of Finance in relation to the state of the economy in any country.

When I was in Japan in 1986, I recall being shown faxes of certain statements made by a Minister of Finance in another Caribbean country relating to the state of the external affairs of that country when he took over. Suffice it to say that that country has not succeeded in raising money in Japan now for two years. We have to remember that we live in a world where communications are instant, where it is important to remember that, from whatever source we borrow money, those people have agents and representatives here in Barbados, whether it is in the form of a commercial bank, some agency that transmits immediately information to them on anything official said about the economy, whether it be from Government, which is most important, and equally important, perhaps even more important than the Ministry of Finance, what emanates from the Central Bank of Barbados. Because if it is a question of giving credence to the position of a Minister of Finance or a Governor of a Central Bank, the international community will always err with the Governor of the Central Bank. These are facts of life.

It does not take much to disturb the international community. When the Democratic Labour Party won the Government with an overwhelming majority in 1986, on just the fact of an overwhelming majority in 1986, one or two institutions which had short term lines with the Central Bank either raised questions or held up those lines for a while, because they felt that such a big majority indicated some kind of political instability. So once you are in the international markets, it is absolutely important that you do not lie, that your statements are accurate and signal to the lending community the correct information. 5.25 p.m.

I have seen the presentation made by the Central Bank of Barbados to the investing community in Japan. On the basis of that, my feeling was that provided there was appropriate liquidity in the Japanese system, which there is, particularly as the loan, with prior arrangements, would have been supported by a public sector organisation within

the Japanese system as part of the lead operation, that would have been an important factor in generating the \$160 million equivalent in Japanese Yen.

I have no doubt that all Barbadians clearly understand that the measures introduced in 1986 by the late Prime Minister and myself and my colleagues were an outstanding success. The last report of the first quarter statistics of the Central Bank certainly makes a liar of anyone who says this economy was heading for the rocks. Therefore, each and every quarter since those measures were introduced, the economy has grown and expanded, more and more jobs have been created, and each sector has generated more and more output, with the exception of export manufacturing. These are the facts of life.

I am glad that I was silent over the past two or three months in Barbados, because it gave me great satisfaction to see the overwhelming majority of people in this country, even the Opposition, recognising that there was some significant success in the measures introduced. There can be no question about it.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There was some success. I am not saying that they cured the ills of Barbados. I am not saying that we have solved all the problems of this country. I am not saying that the warnings of the Opposition in relation to the measures were not based on some merit, and indeed, contributed to the defensive measures taken in terms of the introduction, and other defensive measures taken all along by the rigid control of Government expenditure, and so on. You played your role and I have no difficulty with that.

The point is that all the objective data would indicate that if the appropriate signal had been sent to Japan - this would be the truthful signal, that the economy was heading for expansion and not heading for any rocks - we would have raised the money, and I am finished with that. There comes a time when the truth has to be told, and I rather suspect, as I have said before in this House, that a Minister of Finance would have made that statement based on information given to him by persons who have a vested interest in dislocating the Democratic Labour Party programme, because he would not have had the outturn figures, he would have been acting then on forecasts from certain organisations which would have resulted in misinformation. I have no doubt about that.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know who gave the information. All I am saying is that the information that a Minister of Finance would be acting on in May would be

information based on forecasts that, clearly, have turned out to be incorrect. I say further that with the late sugar crop, you will probably find a continuing effect of those measures until about the third quarter of this year.

Whatever happened in Japan needs to be corrected. I am not bound for any explanation. I have been Minister of Finance and I know what happened. It is important that when the Central Bank submits a proposal to the market-place, it presents a particular picture, and then, statements emanating from elsewhere in Government, no matter what the Opposition says, must be consistent with what is existing in the market at the particular time.

I believe that the Barbados economy is stronger than it was for some time. I believe that if those measures had remained in place, undiluted, it would continue to grow. I am not saying anything that is critical of anybody, but let it be clearly understood that when a Government changes, that Government has to start to build its own confidence in the market-place. When I had to go to Japan, I had to on my own try my best to build some confidence in that market-place and other market-places, so that combination of the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance is exceedingly critical in order to maintain confidence in the market-place.

Ask yourself, why bother about the market-place? Barbados is an independent country, you do what you like in it and to hell with the rest of the world. That is a view you can take. The only problem is that you have to trade with the rest of the world. If you are a market borrower, then you have to have the appropriate presentation, image and confidence generated in the market-place. You can do like Guyana, if you wish to, and forget the rest of the world. We can do our own thing down here, and then after ten years, go through an IMF programme, and eventually try to rebuild what you abandoned 10, 15 years before. Or you can avoid that kind of process. So long as you are in the market, you have to do certain things, and Barbados will be more and more in the market-place as it becomes excluded from concessionary loans on a GDP per capita basis from the World Bank. Barbados, like other middle income, developed countries, will become almost exclusively a market borrower, so you can decide whether or not you tailor your position, recognising that you need to finance your debt and capital programmes, or you just ignore them.

I could have said a lot more about the Barbados Labour Party, and a lot more about our external position, in June, 1986. But I would only be a fool to cut off my nose to spoil my face, because having made certain remarks on the floor of this House as Minister of Finance, how are you going to go next day to the same market and tell them all is well? It is important to remember that when you are dealing with Government's and the country's external position, it is a responsibility for all of us, even a responsibility for the

Opposition, to make sure that our domestic politics are seen in an appropriate role in that exercise.

It takes a long time to build confidence, and as you all know, it can be eroded in a very short space of time. I am not suggesting that the confidence position of the Government is eroded. All I am saying is, let us not in our mad desire to achieve particular political objectives locally, ever forget that anything you say locally can only cut off your nose to spoil your face.

It is a truism that if you have to go to the bank tomorrow to borrow money, you are not going to go inside there and start off by telling the banker how broke you are, how bad your position is. If you were going to do that, there is no point going. The least you could do is start to put some kind of honest gloss over the present situation and what your expectations are. That does not mean the banker is going to believe you, but if you have any sense at all, you are not going to go in there and tell him, "Well, you know, I want to borrow \$100 000, but I expect to lose my job next month." That is not the way you approach things like that. So that particular area is something I think we are not fully aware of.

Sometimes people express these notions in terms of national sovereignty, national independence national rights, and so on, just as you have individual rights, and so on. But the point I am trying to make is that once you take a decision that you need to be in a market-place, it is important to understand the ethos and the sensitivities of the market-place. This does not mean that you have to kowtow to anybody in the market-place, because, remember, the international bankers and those in the international lending community are hard-nosed people. They are in the business of making money, let that be clearly understood, and they will make their independent assessment of risks in relation to any particular country. They will go through their own detailed analysis, irrespective of what you say.

But one of the problems that you have in the Third World countries today is that most of the industrialised countries, whose inhabitants own the main deposits in the international commercial banks, tend to lump all Third World countries together. What Barbados has had to do, and will have to continue to do, is to try to find its own separate niche in that ocean of perception that you get, because what happens is that if an approach is made, say, to a bank in London, someone looks at the geography, the Caribbean and Latin America, and that is the end of the story. What you are dependant on are probably their branches and their firms in Barbados, and the people who do business with Barbados that know Barbados, and also the people in those institutions that know Barbados, who then have to put an independent case to their board of directors and say, look, you all are thinking of Latin

America and the Caribbean, we are talking of Barbados as a special case, with special requirements, with a special history and special performance. And that is what we have to try to maintain at all times.

I do not think that the Japanese thing need necessarily be a major setback. I think the important thing is to look forward and try to hold as much as those Japanese Yen as possible to try to offset the interest rate disabilities which one would have in terms of interest rate repayments this year, and interest on capital repayments next year, and to avoid or reduce the consequences of the unfavourable exchange rates, since we will now be repaying Yen at a completely different exchange rate from that which we borrowed in 1985, and to a lesser extent, in 1986, because the rate would have risen in 1986 and would have risen since then as well.

On balance, I think that so long as you maintain the right profile in the presentation of statements, and so long as the Opposition is responsible, there is no problem, although, as I say, it is a funny thing, people just do not take the Opposition that seriously in international markets. Sometimes I used to feel bad when I was in Opposition, when I attacked the Government on borrowing or something like this, that I may have interfered with their credit worthiness. But I discovered nobody was paying me any mind.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what happens when you are in Opposition. I am being very serious, and I think honourable Members would know what I am talking about. I am absolutely sure in my mind that the words of a central banker and the words of a Minister of Finance are taken extremely seriously in the international market, because when a loan is signed, in a sense, that loan is signed by the Minister of Finance, by the Director of Finance and Planning on behalf of the Barbados Government. So a Minister of Finance has very little leeway in terms of his statements when it comes to matters relating to the external economy. You can say what you like inside, but outside, you just have to be very, very careful in these matters.

I hope, Sir, that I have made some slight contribution in trying to resolve this particular problem.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES (St. Lucy): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to respond to some questions and comments which were made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons). In the first instance, he sought an assurance from the Deputy Prime Minister as to whether or not this is the end of our borrowing. I would like

him to know now that no Government could make a commitment to the extent to say that the Government will not be borrowing any more money.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Listen, the Government cannot make a commitment to say that it will not be borrowing any more money, particularly if one is going to take into consideration the quality of life which we enjoy in Barbados, the kind of demands which are made on the Government to provide proper roads, housing, a proper transport system, jobs, a proper educational system, and generally speaking, to improve the general welfare of this country, all of which were neglected by the Barbados Labour Party.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas made the point that the country is not earning enough money and, therefore, we have to borrow money. It is a fact, the country is not earning enough money. But even when the country was earning more money than it is earning now, under the Barbados Labour Party, they were still borrowing money, and borrowed more money in the ten years that they were in Government than for the entire history of Barbados up to that time.

It is very clear that money would have to be borrowed, whether the money is borrowed outside of Barbados or borrowed domestically, which would not have the same kind of pressures as if the money were borrowed on the international market. The fact of the matter is that if we are called on as a Government to provide the kinds of services which we have come to accept in this country, naturally, the money has to come from some where. The Democratic Labour Party does not manufacture it, money does not grow on trees, we do not print money, and therefore, we have to find the money from somewhere.

I do not want anybody to try to indicate to the country that we would be expected to perform in the way that we have been performing in providing the kinds of services which people are demanding and at the same time not borrow any money. I could not allow that just to go without a particular response. I think that it is important that it is put in the proper perspective, and I have sought to do that, Sir.

Thank you very much.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): It is very interesting that the longer this Government remains in power, the more they are in a position of reversal. I really do not believe that the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Hon. E. E. Greaves) would have spoken in the way he had if he had looked at some of his previous speeches both in the Senate and in this House.

Laughter.

5.45 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If there was a person who was the greatest castigator of the former Government for borrowing, it was this Member. In fact, in and out of this House, in public and out of public, he made the point that there was no need to borrow. That was part of his philosophy, that there was enough within Barbados. Today, he is borrowing not to pay off any debts or anything - he is borrowing to maintain the quality of life and that is his philosophy - a complete reversal of the position he and the Democratic Labour Party took in the last couple of years. That is one reason why the people have lost confidence in the Government. The reason given by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is the second reason. You have to be very careful if you are a Government how you speak, and in how many tongues you speak, whether you are forked tongue, or whatever. The honourable Member, realising that, Sir, is speaking in several tongues at one go, Sir.

There is another part of this Resolution that must not escape this House, no matter how much the honourable Member is now reacting. He must realise, Sir. I used to chastise him when he was at Coleridge and Parry by putting him into detention when he spoke out of turn, Sir. The trouble is that he does not learn, so I have to chastise him otherwise.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Hard ears - you won't hear!)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: No, no. I know that the honourable Member is trying to introduce some levity into this. I would want to let him know that I have a record at Coleridge and Parry. Having gone through Coleridge and Parry, I was never ever put into detention, not even by the honourable Member, for the few months he was a master there. He is telling lies. The record is there. You can check the record.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I will admit to having to write lines, but not for the honourable Member.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I expected him to deny that, Sir.

There is another aspect of this debate that I wish to focus on, because we must not lose sight of it either, although the points made by the honourable Members are

the major points in this debate, and they are points which I join.

The Acting Minister of Finance stated that the Government is spending this year \$21 million on purchasing capital and semi-capital goods for the Government's own use. The Government is now proposing that \$16 million of this will come through the services of, the Crown Agents. Five million can be provided internally from, obviously, our own suppliers. Am I to understand that the Crown Agents are now going to be the main importers for these capital goods? The Crown Agents, is no longer, or will soon will be no longer, a solely owned British Government institution, but is now, or soon to be, a private structure. Am I to understand that in those circumstances, what has been occurring will continue to occur, which is that the commission earned by persons in Barbados would be less than normally if they themselves were the importers of the goods and in direct correspondence with the manufacturers?

Sir, the Government ought to know that most countries, both Germany, from which the Minister has stated some of the goods will be imported, as well as the United Kingdom, have export credit guarantee schemes, in which they allow credit to be given to foreign importers, particularly where the Government is in the background, under the ECG Scheme, and where it would not interfere with the payment of commission direct to local suppliers.

I am very concerned if the role of the Crown Agents in this is to be to make sure that less commission is earned here in Barbados by local suppliers and importers who are providing direct employment and who then have to continue to give service to the Government as a whole. Take, for instance, the importation of equipment trucks for the Sanitation Service. Once the Crown Agents have done their part of the job, they do not look back with any responsibility at all for ensuring that equipment is well maintained or up to standard. Therefore, one must be very careful with these transactions, unless the alternative methods of financing them are explored, particularly where most exporting countries today in the developed world, and in some developing countries, like the newly-industrialised countries, have in place an elaborate system of suppliers' credits which will make it necessary to use the aegis of intermediaries, such as the Crown Agents, for this exercise. One must begin to look at mercantile policy in an upright and sensible manner, more to one's interest, and no matter what the historical relationship we have had in the past with the Crown Agents, there is now beginning to be the expertise within our own country to get a better deal, with some of the monies maintained here in Barbados rather than have another intermediary come into the position.

I know for a fact that when we were buying equipment overseas, we always looked for the export guarantee credit

facilities and made sure that the supplier or manufacturer overseas was put in direct contact with the agent here, because it was the agent here who was providing employment locally and not another financial intermediary. I must warn the Government of this, Sir. I am not satisfied that they have looked properly at this and I know that there are complaints within the market-place, among our commission agents and others, that this type of financial intermediary is going about making sure that there is less money coming into the country from which they can supply employment. I am concerned, because \$16 million out of \$21 million is a tremendous amount, and if the responsibility of the Crown Agents now go beyond merely providing a loan, but acting as the main purchaser through the manufacturer in circumstances where alternative sources of credit may be available, I do not see the benefit at all of the transaction which is being put to the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I join in the other remarks, made so forcibly by the honourable Members for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons), St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), and of course, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes).

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Members on the other side - the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), the honourable member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons), and now the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), the Leader of the Opposition - have linked the monies to be borrowed for the services of the Crown Agents under this Resolution with the loan sought to be borrowed from the Japanese market earlier this year. They went further and said that they will not be supporting this Resolution because they were led to believe that \$160 million was all that was required for the rest of this financial year. We got half of it, which is \$80 million, and now we are getting an extra \$16 million, which is \$96 million, and some mention was made of \$50-odd million dollars from Venezuela, aggregating to less than \$160 million, but they cannot now support it because all was not brought back from Japan. I have never heard anything more absurd in my life. This takes the cake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for absurdity. 5.55p.m.

They could support the \$160 million, but they cannot support \$96 million, because that is where we are at this point in time. I have not heard anything more illogical in all of my life.

I would like to ask them a question. Do they think that the finances in Japan, which include the private sector and the Government sector, are sitting down there in Tokyo

waiting to finance Barbados? Do they think that Barbados is the only country that goes to Japan to borrow money? Is \$160 million just a drop in the bucket and, therefore, any time a country goes to Japan to borrow money, Japan must fork out all the money that it says it is going to borrow?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Japan is the world's biggest creditor nation, and they know it, or should know it. Developed countries, not only developing countries, go to Japan to borrow money. Barbados is a small country, is infinitesimal in terms of borrowing money, and to talk nonsense about lack of creditworthiness, if there is lack of creditworthiness, Sir, how could we get \$80 million? If you are not creditworthy you cannot get \$80 million.

It is clear to me that the honourable Members on the other side have ceased to cerebrare. Long since they have stopped thinking. If they were thinking, they would not ask these silly questions, which kindergarten children would come and ask, at this time.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am not cursing anybody, I am stating the facts. Nobody sits down there and waits on Barbados. Barbados is just another country. Barbados is not the only country that is in the market for Japan's goods, the whole world is one big market for Japan, so they do not have to depend on Barbados. Quite frankly, Sir, I do not believe what I have been hearing from the other side.

I now turn my attention to the question posed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I believe that that is a valid question. I would only say that in our dealings with the Crown Agents we will not be dealing any differently from the way in which they dealt with the Crown Agents when they were in the Government.

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

Ayes: Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Mr. R. P. BYER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. R. L. MORRIS, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mr. E. BOURNE and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON - 15.

Noes: Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 3.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION
URGING THE ERECTION OF A
STATUE TO THE MEMORY
OF THE LATE CHARLES
DUNCAN O'NEAL

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, some time ago, this Resolution was introduced in this Honourable Chamber. We have had several speeches, all attesting to the value of the work of the late Charles Duncan O'Neal. I wish now to bring some closure to this Resolution in what is my winding up address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could the honourable Member just pause for one moment, please? I understand the honourable Member to be winding up on this Resolution. I just want to enquire if there are any other Members who wanted to make a contribution on this Resolution. Accordingly, the honourable Member may proceed.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Today happens to be July 26, and, therefore, I think it is a very symbolic occasion to be winding up this debate. I just want to cast my mind back to July 26, 1977, when there was a statement made in this Chamber by the late J. M. G. M. Adams. On that occasion, he sought to give, on behalf of his party, some idea of their perception of the meaning of July 26, what happened on that very important occasion some 51 years ago. 6.05 p.m.

In his address to the Chamber, which is on page 1517, He said:

"The peace and tranquility which the island had enjoyed since the Federation riot of 1876 was suddenly and rudely shattered. The reputation we had enjoyed as a law-abiding community for more than sixty years was put in doubt as the people rose in protest against the hardship and privation they suffered during the Hungry Thirties of the present century."

I will want in the course of my discussion to disprove that what he said there was correct. This peace and tranquility in the island between 1876 and 1937 was a figment of his imagination, or a statement that was guided by the limit of his knowledge of the particular period. This whole question about the reputation that we have enjoyed as a law-abiding community was again part of the perception of Barbados and Barbadians that is only a part of

certain persons' perception. But I should like to put that in context.

When he went on to describe what he called an honours list, he named people like Clement Osbourne Payne, Ulric Grant, Brian Alleyne, Menses Chase, Mortie Skeete, Israel Lovell, Cephus Mahon and Vernon Jordan. When you start making these kinds of closed lists, it is, extremely difficult, unless you have a wider perspective of what has happened at a particular period. Naming of heroes and selecting persons for special mention is a very difficult thing to do, and I would advise that before we go in this route of naming heroes and putting persons for special mention, we do a lot of wide research, because, otherwise, we can either leave out persons who should be put in or we put in persons who should be left out. We have to exercise a bit more care.

He also mentioned, of course, the role of W. A. Crawford and Reginald Pierrepont. But I want to come to the end of that address when he made this statement:

"It is because we are serenely confident of the maturity of our people, because we are profoundly convinced of their wisdom and common sense, that this Government resolved that the day when the poor and underprivileged rose in rebellion against intolerable living conditions should be recognised as a Day of National Significance."

Just listen to the thinking behind that type of person. We can consider July 26 a day of national significance because we are confident of the maturity of our people, profoundly convinced of their wisdom and commonsense! In other words, he is suggesting we can do that, because if we make July 26 a day of significance, the people out there would not rise up and do foolishness. It is a fact that you have to bring that in, but the fact that you have to bring that in suggests that you have a particular perception of the people, which I believe is still held by persons like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and himself. Therefore, when they make July 26 a day of national significance, and then every year thereafter when they were in Government they never showed any particular interest in that particular day, we know that this is only the kind of gestures that they are interested in.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The honourable Member may not have shown any interest....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. What is the point of order?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is winding up on a debate in which I have spoken, and in that debate I made my position clear on the recognition of the

contribution made by Dr. Duncan O'Neal. I would have thought the honourable Member was winding up on that subject, but he has come to be insulting to people about people, and dead people, having views. If the debate is to end on the high note on which it was begun, the honourable Member should really confine his remarks rather than be insulting to other persons.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you saying that to insult dead people is a breach of the Rules of the House?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think to insult anyone is a breach of the Rules of the House.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not insulted anyone, living or dead. Let him be more specific. To whom has the insult been offered?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the honourable Member continue.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: It is a simple interpretation of words. But he would be annoyed, because he knows that in winding up this debate, I would be dealing with matters of substance. I will have to lecture to persons like himself about the history of Charles Duncan O'Neal, because it is wider than Charles Duncan O'Neal. I use a historical personage to deal with issues of importance to persons like myself, and therefore I want to put Charles Duncan O'Neal in some perspective in winding up on him, because I consider history to be a continuum, and I have to bring the issue to the present.

When you are looking at the role of Charles Duncan O'Neal, you have to put that in perspective in the fact that the history of people like myself started, the real history, after 1838. With all this talk about the law-abiding nature of Barbadians, let me tell those who do not know, that in mid-August 1838, immediately after the emancipation of slavery, there were strikes on several estates in this country. In 1839 and in 1840 there were strikes on 30 estates. This is historical fact. So an Act was passed in 1840 providing for special constables, and immediately after that, the urban and then the rural police constabularies were established.

We are told that in 1840, 16 plantations had been abandoned by the labourers of this country because they were reacting against the conditions which had persisted after the emancipation of the slaves. In the 19th century, a few coloured persons were able to move away from that degradation that had been placed on the race. Persons like Thomas Cummins, Thomas Griffith, John Montifiore, London Bourne and Thomas Harris were a few coloured persons who were able to reach the books of history. Most of them would have been nameless and faceless persons. These were the ones who acquired a certain amount of

wealth. They had acquired certain property rights and therefore they were considered to be people of import in the society. And then, of course, there were persons like Samuel Jackman Prescod, who rose to a certain position of prominence.

There was no one really to speak out on behalf of the masses of black people who lived in this country. In the late 19th century there were a few coloureds, like Samuel Cowes Elcock, a wheelright, and Samuel Francis Hewitt, a coloured man of substance. He owned 1000 acres of land, including places like Bloomsbury, Warrens and Caledonia. Coloured in those days would be brown-skinned people, a little mixture of mulatto. He was a mulatto with a conscience. It is not only skin colour, it is attitude, too. We will come to that, too. If you read Fanon you would know what I am talking about. But he created an association of artisans and master mechanics, one of the first worker-oriented groups that were formed in Barbados.

Then there is the role of a man called Samuel Carrington, who got 12 months by the Court of Grand Sessions for attempting to raise wages, because he was against the Combination Acts at the time. Then we know of the Confederation Riot of 1876, which, because of the work of a prominent political scientist in Barbados, we now know was more than just an *ad hoc* rising up against an attempt to confederate territories in the Windwards Islands. They did have some strong worker class elements of getting together to improve rights, and so on.

Down to the end of the 19th century, it did not seem that black people could get anyone to fight for their rights, which still remained very near to what they were before emancipation. At the turn of the century, around 1905 to 1910, the Political Association was formed. It was led by men like Tom Roberts, P. N. Browne, Sammy Kirton and Jabez Dixon. When O'Neal first came back to the country after he was studying in England, and he met these people, he was convinced that they were only guided by a mild and intellectual liberalism which had *laissez-faire* for its sole article of faith, something like the philosophy of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He was not convinced that they were capable of projecting the needs of the masses of people in this country.

At that time, too, a group of three brothers, Reggie, Marcus and Harold Wilson, formed the Barbados Labour Union, long before there was anything like a Trade Union Act on the Statute Books of this country, and a man called Professor S. Arlington Newton formed the Ulotician Worldwide Union in Baxters Road. This is part of the history of the black people that I belong to, and the working class people, that would be foreign to some people, and I

have to tell them, and take this chance to put it in the records of this House.
6.15p.m.

When John Deckles started the UNI A in 1918, he was working on fertile ground that had been stirred up in the early part of this century, and his lieutenants were people like Edgar Marshall, who had been in Newton's union before, because there is a continuity in black struggle in this country. They were leaving one group and going to the next one. Do not think that they were new people all the time? I want you to understand that black struggle started a long time before. The sacrifices that were made by people before us have to be told to the people in this country, not just by political office seekers, but by people who are interested in the welfare of the masses of blacks in this country.

(*Aside:* That is the UNIA that had been started by Marcus Garvey.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: That is the UNIA that was started by Marcus Garvey, but it was brought here by John Beckles in 1918, just a few short years after it had been started by Garvey. It had fertile roots here in Barbados.

Let me tell you some of the names of some of these people who were associated with the UNIA. My research is not completed in terms of finding out who their sons and grandsons were, but these names that will go in the records of this House would have been left out by Mr. Adams and others, because they would not really have sought for them and because some historians think that only the leaders are the people to be recognised. They include Melville Inniss, who was a porter at the Government Railway, from Carrington's Village - he was one of the early founders of UNIA; George Belle, a hat cleaner from Bank Hall....

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Universal Negro Improvement Association.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: A lot of Barbadians do not even know what UNIA means.

Also there was Annie Hooper, a domestic from Westbury Road; Dorcas Bonnett, who sold some wood and some coals at her house in Halls Road; Edwin Miller, a ship's labourer from Westbury Road; and William Yarde, who sold aerated drinks from Church Village in the City. These people were the leading people in the UNIA in this country, talking about blackness and where black people

had to go in the early 1920s, or people who were conscious of themselves and their race in the 1930s, when the Forum Club was formed by people like Cham Hope, Hilton Vaughan and others, and they formed the Renaissance Book Club in order to introduce people to books about themselves, black people from Africa, and so on, so that they would know what was going on.

Put Duncan O'Neal in that context, moving from the early, from 1838, then those nameless people who led the strikes. I cannot give you a name of anybody who led the strikes in 1838, because then nobody identified them as persons, just as nobody identified Bussa. We cannot write any history about Bussa, because Bussa was not part of the tradition where anybody wrote against or about him. But it does not mean he was not a great man. If you knew two lines about Bussa, the only two lines you knew about Bussa Ranger, and that he was a leader of that massive uprising in 1816, that is enough to give Bussa credit and to name a statue after him.

The fact that we do not know about these people is because there was nothing written about them. Let any one of us go and write three sentences on our great, great, great grandfather, or great, great, great grandmother. You cannot write three sentences. But does that mean that they were not honourable people? They might have been great people, for that matter. They might have made significant contributions. But what can we say about them? The records are dim on them.

We have always heard history of governors, councillors, assemblymen, and so on, people who are far away from us as black people. But because we cannot write long histories on black people, does it mean that we cannot consider them to be great? I am totally against that.

You have to understand a man like O'Neal coming back to Barbados within that context, knowing what was going on, and deciding that he had to go further than others had gone before him, people with privilege like himself. O'Neal was not a dogmatic socialist, he was a socialist by instinct. He knew what he had to do on behalf of the people of this country. Nobody can call him, as they called him then, Marxist, Bolshevik, or any such thing. He was not that! He would have been a democratic socialist like any of us here,....

(*Aside:* On this side.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: on this side.... a person who understood where the mass of the people had to go and who wanted to throw in his lot. He said he saw socialism "not as a plaything of politicians, but as a grand philosophy for the regeneration of the world." That is what O'Neal said!

He formed the Democratic League, and I want to put in the records the names of the people who walked with him from 1924. I will have to put in the record a man called Grantley Adams, who was the biggest peer in his sight. Those who walked with him were people like Katie Greene, who became the Secretary of the League; the same Tom Wilson from the Barbados Labour Union, Martineau, T. D. O'Neal, Chrissie Brathwaite, J. T. C. Ramsay - I understand he is going to get a circle named after him, belated, but you have to correct your mistakes, or give credit, at some time - Clement Inniss, Clennell Wickham, E. R. L. Ward, Dr. Storey, Dr. Payne, Dr. Cummins and Herman Griffith. These were founder members of the Democratic League.

Let us understand what the Democratic League meant. It was not a figment of history, something that we could forget. That was the start of mass politics in this country. Unless these fellows had ventured forth, there would not have been any Barbados Labour Party or Democratic Labour Party. These fellows went out in the Twenties on platforms in the hustings throughout the country. These are important people. These are people that we have to look to with reverence and respect. We have to know their names. We have to know who these people were, and we have to tell our children who they were and the kind of work that they did in the 1920s.

O'Neal ran in St. Lucy in 1926, in the City in 1927, in St. Michael in 1928, and then he ran in the City in 1929, 1930 and 1931 before he gained a seat in 1932, setting a standard for us to follow. The late Cummins, who was a Premier of Barbados, ran for this Assembly from 1925 to 1935 straight, before he got a seat in 1935. He lost it and did not get back in again until 1940. These are men that we have to admire.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Adams ran five times in St. Philip and lost.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Not five.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How many?)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He ran in St. Philip in 1926. He ran twice in St. Philip rat election. That is a fact. He did not come back after that, because he got too many lashes.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He was told by Clennell Wickham that he was sent up there by his employer, Hawkins, to cut voles.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: So he did not go back. He went back when he found a safe seat, when the planters, some over here, told him they had a seat for him. That is when he came back. That was in St. Joseph.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You were making a good speech, but you spoilt it.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: But I am just dealing with the facts. When the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) asks me to divulge the facts, I will.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Let me continue. The late E. R. L. Ward ran in St. Joseph in 1926. He came back in the City in 1930 and he won the seat there. When O'Neal ran in St. Lucy, which was his native parish, he felt that he had a good chance. He sent out a circular, which he signed: "Yours for the bottom dog", telling you straight where he was coming from. He was castigated by everybody, including some of his major supporters - what are you writing on a circular that you are for the bottom dog? Of course, you know how he lost the election. He lost the election by "dachy", people giving out - you know what it was in St. Lucy in those days.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You would have heard about the tradition in those days.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I would like to register the kind of political work that was done by O'Neal. As modern politicians we have to understand the tradition that those fellows laid for us - hard work. For the first time, there were political meetings in this country. For the first time, there were contests.

Let us go back to the late Sir Grantley Adams' experience in 1926. When he went up in St. Philip to run, the fellows told him that he could not be running up there. They told him, 'You do not even own a rat up here. You do not even have enough land to put on a handkerchief. How can you come up here running against the big planters?' That was Sir Grantley's experience. In those days rats were a problem, and every time you killed a rat you used to get a penny if you brought the head. So an enterprising businessman would get a rat and breed it.

Laughter.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The whole idea of those who controlled the system was that all of us black people were fools. You could not represent anybody, no matter you were a Barbados Scholar, no matter that you came back with all your honours, no matter that you were a brilliant advocate. That is over 50 years ago we are talking about. I do not know why people are defending this particular element in our society so vociferously.

They told Adams "What are you doing up here? You do not belong up here." But these people persevered, in spite of all of that - not only the words, but the action that they would have brought against them, and out there in front of that was the acknowledged leader of modern politics in this country. He was the man who was co-ordinating black action, making sure that Percy Brathwaite could get in in 1924, that by 1937 we had about six black faces in this Parliament. Let us understand these things. Do not let us start getting on foolish defending people who need no defence at all, but try to defend those who need defence. Why have our fore-parents trained us and spent money on us if now we are going to turn against the others who are coming after us by telling them lies and being deceitful about our history? History is in the making all the time. You cannot fool people all the time. You do not understand. Let us understand the pivotal role that O'Neal and that group played in this country. Do not let us ever forget it.

(Aside: Dump the Uncle Tom's:)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: There is no point worrying about that. Even when he was making those comments he was so apologetic about the masses of this country.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am reading from the records. He was not apologetic? Do you understand what Mr. Adams said? "It is because we are serenely confident of the maturity of our people, because we are profoundly convinced of their wisdom and common sense, that this Government is resolved that the day should be recognised as a Day of National Significance." That is an insult to the masses of the people of this country. If you can make it a day of national significance you do not have to make those kind of apologies, that you know they got sense and all sorts of foolishness. Because what you are saying, basically, is that I know, and a lot of people think that if we make this a day of significance, these people are going to rise up and get on foolish. But I know they have matured, so I will call it a day of national significance. That is what I am telling you. You have to read behind what people are saying to understand what the real thinking is about people.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: All that is part of that whole psyche. I want you to understand what is happening. Bajan people are not foolish people. They are not wild, rampant and stupid. You are getting the same thing today about a 2A Highway, that discussion about race and blackness, that it might lead to people picking up money and going away, that it will lead to enough social dislocation. You cannot talk about these things in this country- with civilised,[^] intelligent people. You want to hide them all the time and fool people. Bajans are not that foolish. You can discuss these things in this country now and it will not cause any stir by black people against anybody. Black people are not going to rise up against anybody, because they are discussing their history, and because you are discussing matters of concern to them. That is an Anglo-Saxon view of my people, the people that I represent, intelligent, sensible people. They are not wild, they are not vandalistic, they are not going to destroy anything. The destruction will come from a completely different strata of people not the masses of people out here in the country. They are not going to rise up and throw down everything. We keep libelling the masses of people in this country - decent men and women who aspire to the same things that we aspire to. There are not any wild people out there who want to break down any white people's things or anything like that. We suffer from this paranoia about ourselves. That is very dangerous. It takes me off my discussion, because I want to continue on the role that O'Neal and these people performed in those days.

When O'Neal was running the Democratic League, he had all the supporters he wanted. All the middle class people would come with him and go on platforms. But the trouble started when O'Neal decided that he was going to form a Working Men's Association, a bird of a different feather altogether, because it was dealing with the masses. This was not just going on platforms and looking for political positions. A lot of those persons who walked with him before, especially after the strike in 1927, started to run away and hide because he was then moving into the trade union ring. So who were his supporters? The same George Belle from UNIA remained with him; a man called Joseph Garner from Carrington Village; Louis Sebro, who died a few years ago, from Hindsbury Road; James Chase, a lighterman; Edwin Turpin, a carpenter; Moses Small, a tinsmith; Joseph Simmons, a ship labourer; John Catwell, a letter carrier; Gerald Daniel, a shopkeeper. These were artisans, the heart of Barbados, not the so-called middle class with doctors and lawyers, and so on. They were waiting to benefit from the work of these people who are the soul of this country.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was given to understand that my time would only have been five minutes, Sir. But

he is taking a chance to be rather subjective and selective in his speech. He does not try to balance what he is saying, that when Grantley Adams came along and was leading the Progressive League, Dr. Arleigh Winston Scott, who was the Governor-General, refused to identify or contribute and Henderson Clarke. Men of money and ability, refused. Adams had to go for Lloyd Smith, Mencea Cox, and those kinds of people. Let us be fair or bring the debate to an end.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Let me continue to make the point. Very few people came out of the professional strata in those days. Mr. Adams at one time was at one level. He changed and became involved. I do not challenge historical truth. That is a fact. What I will challenge is anybody who is giving the impression that he was there from the beginning. That would not be true. But he did come around, and he worked hard on behalf of the philosophy that he supported.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member must not try to give the impression that Charles Duncan O'Neal was not given his due and his rightful place in history by this party. When the late Prime Minister Adams spoke in here on July 26, 1977, this is what he said, Sir:

"The social revolution that is still taking place in Barbados today began with the career of Charles Duncan O'Neal who set out the programme that was designed to change Barbados from a rigid, class-bound society to the healthy democratic state that it is today."

He gave him his place, and he gave that party between 1961 and 1976 its place, and he said this:

"We hold the view that the cause of progress and reform was vigorously promoted by the leaders of the Barbados Progressive League, the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers Union, and it was advanced with no less conviction by our immediate predecessors in Government."

That is the DLP. Can you want anything more charitable, fair, and balanced than that?

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is only recent history; the boys want to rewrite history.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Adams made those comments, that is true. He was wiser than some others, who were suggesting that really the social revolution started with his father. He went further and showed where it really started. He was being fair. I have no difficulty with that.

My difficulty is the suggestion that only the leaders need to be recognised. I am citing the people like Miss

Manning, Helen Alleyne, J. B. Grant, James Merrick, Mike Griffith, Norman Grannum and Walter Goodridge. These are the persons who really helped to form the Working Men's Association. I am making this point in relation to how you end up talking about heroes. When you start listing, whom do you put in, or whom do you leave out? We have to be very selective, because all of these persons will stand up to recognition, because they were there. People like Menzies Chase, Sobers, Brian Alleyne, Mortimer Skeete and Elrick Grant were latecomers; therefore, to give them all of the recognition, to me, is not understanding what history is all about. They were only recognised because they were in the last battle, but when the skirmishes were being formed they were not around. Nicey Belgrave would have been part of that action, also. 6.35 p.m.

Unfortunately, as I said, Mr. Adams gave the impression that there was this peace of 1876 down to 1937. That is not true. There were significant riots in St. Andrew in 1932, in 1934 there was a strike at Walkers Spring in St. Andrew, in 1936 cane fires all over the island. There were smatterings of concern in Barbados throughout the period that we know led to the actual disturbances, which came a year after Charles Duncan O'Neal died. I just want to put Charles Duncan O'Neal in a framework. It just so happens that just before he was born there was the Confederation Riot. He was born in 1879, those were in 1876. He died in 1936, and in the following year there were the 1937 disturbances, so his life was almost surrounded.

I want to put into the record, in tying up, the names of people. I have identified seven persons who were killed out of those 14. I have not been able to get the names of all 14 from my researches in the Archives, but I want these names to be known, because again the impression is given that the persons who were killed in the riots were a lot of lawless people.

My research shows a man called St. Clair Gittens, a lighterman, 19 years old; Elsie Payne, an agricultural labourer - this is what the death certificate is saying - 19 years old; Frank Springer, a baker, 15 years old; Nathaniel Bourne, a labourer, 55 years old; Ralph Hamblin, a labourer, 20 years old; Adriana Rock, a domestic, 38 years old; Aubrey Evelyn, a labourer, 45 years old.

These persons probably have grandchildren or whatever somewhere in our community who might not even have known that these were among the persons when they talk about 14 dead in the riots. These seven, and the other seven, if we can find out the information about them, are important people to me. These 14 who died so that we can be where we are, are extremely important to me, and should be important to all of us. They should not be nameless and faceless people. Those who died at 19, one person died at

IS, a baker, started to work at that time - they died so that we could be where we are, and we have to understand that. We have to understand that black history needs to be researched, written and promulgated in this country.

We do not know enough about ourselves. We know all the English History in the world. I only started learning this thing when I went to university, and there are so many people out there who are ignorant of what we were and where we have come, and that is why you get debates like the Highway 2A debate, debates that are based on ignorance. When you are ignorant of things, you are frightened of them. We have nothing to be afraid of. Where we have gone as a collective race - forget all this partisan politics nonsense now - where we have gone as black people in the last 150 years, if we did not come out of slavery, where would we be?

The quality of Barbadian people, of Caribbean people, the quality of our intellect, to me, is so massive, when I look through the Caribbean at the Demases and the McIntyres, whatever field you want to go into, whether it is Maths, Physics, Economics or the Arts. Our potential as black people and what we have done in the last 150 years tells me that we have so much further to go if we can but understand who we are, and if we can get together as a people. Do not let us be afraid of anybody on both sides of these parties. Do not be afraid of blackness, but be proud of blackness. We are an example to the world, and when you can carry a society forward after such a short span of time, because 150 years is no time, we are a fantastic people.

Do not let us be afraid of blackness. I am a child of the 60s and 70s, and then it was felt good to be black, and it is coming back into the country again. You can see that people are again identifying with black culture and that sort of thing. I understand that, because you have these periods when you identify, and then it fades out again and you are afraid and you are again looking to whiteness, and then it fades back in. A lot comes from leadership, it comes from what the leaders project about themselves and their understanding of their own blackness.

The black people of this country have to take over the economy of Barbados at some time. That is a statement that I make unequivocally. It will be taken over by our grandsons and so on, we will not be able to do it, because I believe in gradualism. They can call me what they like, I do not believe in ripping down anything that white people have, and so on, I believe in pulling up black people, taking over the boardrooms.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am going to address the Leader of the Opposition now. The Leader of the Opposition's

generation is a turning point generation, a very difficult one to exist in, because according to my philosophy, if you are going to take over as black people in this country, you have to get in there to white people's business and learn it from inside and take over gradually. In those days only a few could get in, and because the numbers were few, it was hard to accommodate the position of being a black man in white business - I am being very fair, and I am looking at the_ thing historically - so you would always appear to be a spade or something like that. It has been one black man on this board, one black man on the other board, and so on. It therefore meant that the only way - and this is a fact - that «, persons could identify their *bona fides* was in their whole living, by identifying with the masses, letting them know, "I am here, but here for a purpose," because people are bound to create images of you.

It is going to be less clear as more of us get educated and go on into white businesses, and so on, or start our own black businesses, .because you cannot take over by ""* remaining aloof, you have to get into those businesses, you have to get into the boards, you have to get into the management positions, and so on. That transitional generation, to which we all belong in a way, is very difficult, but you have to be sending messages to the young people coming - that, eventually, all of you have to prepare yourselves for those boardrooms, they are not going to give - ^» them up, you have to get in there.

That has nothing to do with being against white people, that has to do with being for black people, a completely different thing. Nobody could call Marcus Garvey a racist. He had so much love for his own black people that he did not have any left over for anybody else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member has three more minutes.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I will get home before then, Sir.

Black people in this country have to be very very careful that they do not get so frightened for themselves that ^ they send the wrong messages to their children. White people in this country need no defence by any black person. There is racism in Barbados, basic racism in Barbados, but Barbadians do not have hatred for one another. You do not find whites hating blacks and that sort of thing. We do not carry it to those kinds of extremes, it is just that you live in little cubicles. The black people turn the hatred on themselves. You have to read Fanon to understand these little phenomena. Black people do not hate white people, they turn the hatred on themselves. As a matter of fact, they might show more love for whites than is justified by any circumstances. It is a very funny situation. You have to put psychiatrists to unravel this one, so they have no real fear. You might create a situation where blacks turn around and

hate blacks more, and start saying that he is an upper class black now, or a middle class black now, and so on, and we turn against ourselves because we are afraid to confront the real historical problem that has been there.

We should not be getting into any foolish debates about Highway 2A. The Honourable Minister of Transport and Works has been cruelly misrepresented in this country for purely partisan reasons. He has never given the impression that "Cow" Williams and his company of white people will never win any road contracts. He said that he came out of a system where we were unfaired, so he could be unfair himself. But people report what they want to report, and they develop what they want to report, and now I am hearing a lot of shameful people in this country -1 do not want to call names in this debate in this House, because they would not have the privilege of coming in here and saying the things, but some of them write in newspapers, some of them call themselves priests 6.45 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I see you writing in *Henry Christopher* about how these people are the ideal type Dems. I could tell anybody those are swingers; they swing left, right and centre. In your party and in mine, you would have people like those who have no basic philosophy, and they would swing all about.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: That is the meaning of a political party. Anybody can come in, you cannot stop them.

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

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Let me wind up now, Sir.

You cannot be happy in the Barbados Labour Party that the leading ideologues, the major writers, for the Barbados Labour Party today are Philip Goddard, David Seale and Hoyos. You must be ashamed sometimes, and I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is ashamed that he cannot stop it when Philip Goddard is writing. He cannot stop it because this is a free country, but he cannot subscribe totally to the view of David Seale and Philip

Goddard coming out as the leading ideologues of the Barbados Labour Party in 1988.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I noted that in the Estimates we have made provision of \$225 000 for the erection of statues. I believe part of that was mooted for a statue for Dr. Charles Duncan O'Neal. I hope, Sir, that these administrators will come together and understand the need to recognise our heroes as a separate breed of people, people to whom we can look up, that we can use as role models for our children, and so on, to follow. I am sure that when the honourable Member for St. John (Mr. D. J. H. Thompson) enjoins the debate, he will have to contribute in wideness to the setting up of a committee to determine who these heroes will be, a non-partisan or bi-partisan or multi-partisan committee, but I would like to think that these names will be recognised in some way or another. I would like to see some kind of a plaque somewhere with the names of those who died in 1937 because of their will to follow the lead set by people like Charles Duncan O'Neal and to set a path for us all to follow.

I thank you, Sir.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the last meeting of the House, I announced prematurely, as it turned out, that this would have been the final meeting before we go into recess. It is not. It has become necessary for us to have, it appears, the final meeting next Tuesday.

I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, August 2, 1988, at 12 noon.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, August 2, 1988 at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7.00 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of

Tuesday, July 5, 1988..... 2656

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER..... 2656

The Accounts and Statements for the month of March 1988 prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 2656

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1988.

The Airport (Fuel Charges) Order, 1988.

The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1988.

The Auditor's Report and Financial Statements-of Accounts of the National Training Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1987.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 12 months ended 31st March, 1988.

The Consumption Tax Order, 1988.

Hon. M. A. KING.....2657

The Annual Reports of the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for the years 1985 and 1986.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 2657

A Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 2657

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1988..... 2657

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2657.

BORROWING OF 90 000 ECUs (APPROX. BDS \$221 000) FROM THE EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK 2658

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2658, 2682; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 2659; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 2660; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 2664; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 2667; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2669; Mr. Arthur, 2672; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 2676, Dr. Haynes, 2678; Mr. Miller, 2680.

BORROWING OF US\$3 MILLION, £900 000 AND 6000000 DEUTSCHE MARKS FROM CROWN AGENTS SERVICES LTD..... 2683

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2683, 2692; Mr. Arthur, 2684; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2685; Dr. Haynes, 2687; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 2690; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 2690.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION URGING ERECTION OF STATUE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE CHARLES DUNCAN O'NEAL (d.r) 2693

Mr. Morris, 2693; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 2693; Mr. Simmons, 2697.

SUSPENSION..... 2669

ADJOURNMENT..... 2700

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central) PAYNE, His Honour. J. J. (St. James North) SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas) SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael South East) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)