

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 18, 1989.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., (Econ.), J.P.,
(Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)

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

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. E. BOURNE

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

• Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of the Civil Service)

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

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

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

Prayers were led by Fr. Ivan Harewood.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 11th July, 1989.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the meeting that took place on Tuesday, 11th July, 1989 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or corrections, let these Minutes stand confirmed.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 105 asked by the Honourable Member for St. George South is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to move that the following Standing Orders be suspended - Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 - for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I wish to address the problem of the motion and raise a matter in relation to another Standing Order. I can raise it now or later, if you prefer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you objecting to the suspension of those Standing Orders?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is not the question, it is a question, subject to the Leader of the House. . . . If you wish me to do it at a later stage I will do it at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what we are dealing with, the suspension of Standing Orders.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant order of the day.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING OF A BILL TO AMEND THE JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS ACT, CAP. 115A

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for SC Thomas wish to continue?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Just to wind up, Sir. Mr. Speaker, last week when you were not here I was dealing with the prospect for the development of a new Supreme Court complex somewhere near Whitepark, and I was moved to warn Government that we should know at an early date the estimated cost of this complex for the Judges, because on the evidence of the Sherbourne project it is clear that where Government rushes into a Capital project without proper planning there is great wastage of funds.

We heard only last year, Sir, that the decision to erect Sherbourne was a hurried one, and it is going to involve the expenditure of \$25 million. It was hoped to have that opened for October 4 when the CPA Conference starts this year. It cannot be opened for October 4 and I was only

advising Government last time not to make the same kinds of errors in relation to the Supreme Court complex.

I advised then, Sir, that during my time as Attorney General I had had proposals from at least two foreign firms, English firms who had done work in Barbados, in relation to a Supreme Court complex and the figure then quoted was \$22 million on a scaled down version of what had been originally drawn by the Architects at MTW. Having regard to the inflationary trends, normal and abnormal, since 1986, it is clear that the cost of such a project would have escalated, and I would be grateful to hear from someone on the Government side what is the estimated cost of this Judicial Centre that we have heard about as recently as June 1, 1989, and what does Government envisage as the terms of the brief for the Architects. In other words, what are the parameters given to the Architects for designing this new complex? Is it just a complex of five or six courts? Or is it going to be a complex plus, for example, Registration Department? The public has had no information about this and I think they deserve to have it.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the remuneration for Judges and their pension rights, the Barbados Labour Party Opposition has no difficulty in supporting the Bill before the House, but we would wish Government to take into account a couple of the deficiencies which presently attend Judicial Officers, particularly the Supreme Court Judges.

I would like to suggest to Government, Sir, that it would aid in the speedier administration of justice if at least two appointments could be made to the secretarial staff of the Registry for assignment to the Judges to assist them with the dissemination of their judgments, typing the judgments and getting them out quickly. In fact, there is another aspect to it, Sir. They could also assist in the preparation of records of appeal. We are short on secretarial assistance for the Judiciary, and particularly the Judges, and I know it will have an impact on Government's expenditure and one is concerned that Government should hold down expenditure but I think to appoint two Secretaries to assist the Judges in getting their judgments out in a timely fashion would not be a burden that the country could not afford. This is a plea that has been going on for a long time, Sir.

I agree with what the Minister of Health has been saying. Do not forget that we increased the number of Judges in April 1986. We now have five, and the one or two persons who have to do the work for all five Judges in terms of typing the judgments find that it presses unnecessarily harshly on their human resources and capabilities. 10.30 a.m.

So that I would ask, Sir, for some additional assistance in that area of typing or stenography to assist the Supreme Court judges.

Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken for an hour and I think I covered last week all the main areas that I wished to address then.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not consider this particular Bill to be a tremendously significant piece of legislation that requires any serious debate about the terms and conditions of Judges. But I believe, Sir, that there are some points that have been raised about the administration of justice in Barbados which are critical. I should like to start by joining with the Honourable Member for SL Thomas in expressing my concern which is a concern that did not start yesterday and which is a concern that persons who have practised at the Bar prior to me have had about the conditions of the courts, the need for upgrading of the courts, the need for upgrading of the police stations and the general administration of justice and to point out to him, if he practised in the Magistrates' Courts as often as I do that there have been some attempts at improvement to the conditions at all of the Magistrates' Courts and the police stations. Work as I understand it is to be done on Hometown and other of the critical situations and Magistrates' Courts.

The question, Sir, of the manner in which justice is administered, the conditions and service that attach to the administration of justice in Barbados is one, Sir, that must relate to a person's conception of justice. So that if people do not conceive justice as being one of the important elements of the search by a people for their own development and improvement, then the manner in which justice is administered will be accorded a very low priority. All politicians, particularly those who are accorded the responsibility of sitting in the Attorney-General's Office or influencing policy in relation to the administration of justice should have a conception of justice (whether they are utilitarians or they follow other forms of legal theory) in terms of the relationship of justice to the development of people.

So we have said in this political party that our aim is to create a Barbados that is socially just. And therefore all of the institutions in our country have to contribute to the development of this social justice including the manner in which 'justice itself, the seat of justice administers its decisions and carries out its business in favour of the people.

Sir, the law courts therefore just represent one of the many institutions in our society that has to contribute to the concept of social justice that the people search for. And those persons who work in all of these institutions have to be accountable, just like politicians are accountable, church

leaders are accountable. Well, the persons who administer justice, the Judges, the Magistrates, the lawyers and all of the judicial officers have to be accountable. And they do not have to be accountable to any driver's licence toting tourist who comes into the airport.

The view expressed by some that if people from outside are not comfortable with the manner in which we dispense justice in Barbados then we could suffer irreparable damage is a very dangerous view to hold. The only people that have to be satisfied with the manner in which justice is administered in Barbados is the people of Barbados, not anybody from outside of Barbados, not anybody visiting Barbados. And that is my view of the manner in which justice should be viewed by us as politicians. So that the officers must all be accountable. And if there is cause for complaint about the administration of justice in Barbados, then that complaint must be placed in the context of its blame being squarely to be placed at the feet of the lawyers. All of the Attorneys-General have been lawyers. Well it would be an anomaly if there were an Attorney-General who was not a lawyer but all of them have been lawyers. Four out of six Prime Ministers in this country have been Attorneys who have practised actively at the Bar. Sixty per cent of the policy-makers in here have some professional training in law or acquaintance with it over time. Ninety per cent of the political aspirants in at least one of the traditional parties are lawyers. And yet, the administration of justice is accorded such low priority in terms of the development of our society.

So that only the policy-makers can take the blame at the end of the day. You can call any of the political aspirants, those who will be successful and those who will not.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, that is unprofessional. I will leave that to the Honourable Member for St. Peter to do. All of the aspirants that the Labour Party has basically who have met with any success so far in becoming candidates have been lawyers. The Honourable Member for St. Peter will tell you that. He knows it as well as I do.

But they do not accord any priority to the administration of justice. And I do not think that we as a country have accorded any tremendous priority to the concept of providing for a sound system relating to the administration of justice that the people of Barbados can feel entirely satisfied with.

Now, Sir, the only way that the administration of justice can be without these problems is if those persons who have seen it for themselves will accord it some form of priority, and that we recognize that some of the myths about law that are propagated for the maintenance of the status quo by lawyers, many of whom were not even trained in

this region, should be exploded. The first, Sir, being that any system of justice in a country has to be an expression of the people's will and the only people that have to be happy with it are the people who live in that country. And I know that is how the Democratic Labour Party views it and I know that is how the Attorney-General views the administration of justice, that Barbadians must come first. And once they are satisfied then the system of justice is one that is sound and solid. And the principal beneficiaries therefore of that sound system of justice have to be Barbadians, so long as we are satisfied that we have achieved or that we want to achieve something, we have to make the resources available to those who have the responsibility of carrying out justice in Barbados.

The question of the Court of Appeal allowance is a trifling matter when you compare that against the many other problems that exist in this society. And that would bring me to the other point. Rather than increase any Court of Appeal allowance, I believe that the second myth that has to be exploded is that you cannot have a sound system of justice where the poor and rich do not stand equally before the law. Now I am not saying that the seat of justice will not administer fairly in favour of the poor or the rich if the two parties appear before them, but I am saying that because of the absence of a widespread system of legal aid to give persons who cannot afford to go before the courts the opportunity to do so where their rights are being infringed and where, in particular, many of the matters that are of great moment to us are not part of the terms of reference of the Community Legal Services Commission. 10.40 a.m.

Unless we broaden the base of legal aid, it means that many people will still be denied access to the courts and that Barbados is one of those many countries in the Commonwealth which has inherited a system where legal aid for the poor runs a very poor second, and that the only people in this country who provide regular and ongoing legal aid are politicians because we have to. The country as a whole has not recognized legal aid as being an important corollary to the sound administration of justice. Instead of that, if somebody in St. Thomas has a problem, well they know where the legal aid might come from. That is how it goes. You have no choice and, unfortunately, for the few of us

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Man, you know how it is done. I cannot tell you that. I am a young practitioner. You want the Bar Association to call me in now and summon me to account for remarks I have made somewhere. I cannot tell you how it is done. You know and there are many in here who know to whom they have to send people when they simply cannot approach the courts. They do not have the money. So we are the legal aid in Barbados.

We, therefore, have to consider legal aid as an important corollary to provide for a sound system of justice. In the absence of widespread legal aid to those who need it, you will find that many injustices will be wrought. There are some persons who will never come to justice and there are others who when they appear may find that justice is not meted out because they are unrepresented.

I believe, Sir, that critics of the system of justice in this country should not be silenced simply because they are critics or because it will look bad for Barbados. The point is that it is Lord Atkin who said "that justice is not a cloister'd virtue." It must stand up to the scrutiny. It is a Trinidadian case - 1932 Appeal Cases *Ambard v. the Trinidad and Tobago Attorney General*. Once the criticism is respectful even if it is vocal, outspoken, and rambunctious, then it is acceptable to the courts and that those institutions can only grow and be strengthened when they are criticized just as Parliament and any of the major institutions of this country. They can only grow and be strengthened and enhanced if the people who reside in that country feel that they can honestly criticize the persons who operate within the framework of a system of justice or a system of government or whatever, and that is social justice. If you do not have that conception of justice, then you are wasting time. Do not go outside and expect people to tell you that justice is great in Barbados and then when you come back here people will tell you that we are not happy in how things are going. The only people that must be the beneficiaries of a sound system of justice must be Barbadians.

A lot of people outside would view Barbados as being a draconian society because we still have the death penalty and we still execute juveniles. That is maybe not how Barbadians feel about their society. I am one of the big opponents of the death penalty as a member of Amnesty International for years. It is not an issue that the Barbadian public seems to feel the same way as I do. It seems as though we are satisfied that the death penalty still exists and that juveniles can attract the death penalty in this country. We are one of the few countries in the world, perhaps 2 or 3, where that is the case. People outside would look at it and say, "but that is wrong". Once we are satisfied that that is the way we are going to deal with the problems in this country and the people are satisfied that those are the methods they wish to employ and that the system of justice is to their satisfaction even though it might be draconian, then I have to go along with it no matter what my small comments from time to time might be about the existence of the death penalty.

Sir, the third truth - the third myth that must be exploded is that the public must understand that the concept of legal procedure and jargon, and technicality and complexity is not a means of denying them justice. In fact, procedure is the very basis of justice in that every citizen knows no matter rich, poor, or indifferent that if they want

to approach the court they must use the following steps and that these steps will be enforced. So that, Sir, when you may hear the criticism by a lot of people that legal procedures are too complex and that it is too ritualistic, that criticism cannot always stand the test. The very existence of those procedures means that no matter who you are, no matter your station in life, if you want to sue somebody, in simple terms, you file a writ of summons. There is a defence, and a procedure that must be followed by every citizen, corporation, or other entity capable of being litigated against in this country. That is the myth that must be exploded, and we as lawyers must not make people believe that there is any big "to do" about legal procedure. Legal procedure is one of the safeguards that exist in democratic societies in allowing people to appear before the courts equally. That legal procedure must be given effect to in the case of persons who cannot afford it by well-trained lawyers and efficient legal aid systems where the persons who will effect that legal procedure for them are available to do so. Public education on this, in my view, is a must.

Now Sir, there was another criticism of this Administration that the legislative programme is weak not because of the content of it, but because of the volume. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas used the reference of his finger which is a bit shorter than mine to demonstrate that the size of the volume has decreased over time. Now Sir, he would know that that criticism is not valid. You can legislate any number of things in this country. The Attorney General is not necessarily the most important man simply because he legislates, because he can legislate what he wants. There are other factors that must come into play in the running of government and you should only, in my view, legislate when the society understands the need for the legislation and when there has been sufficient discussion of the pros and cons.

So that, Sir, we have only had this administration for 2 years and there is a legislative programme there. It does not make sense legislating and then criticizing it after. You are criticizing the Family Law Act in the most virulent way on the front page of a newspaper and you said that it has brought significant damage to the marriage relationships in this country and that men are reeling under the pressure of the Family Law Act - the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: So do not just legislate and then attack it after. The Family Law Act, like any other piece of legislation, should go through a process of public education. 10.50 a.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I did not criticise the Family Law Act as an Act, I wrote a letter to the Press in January 1986 where I tried to explain

that the application of certain aspects of the Act in my view was wrong. I had to draw to everybody's attention the case of *Malik v. Malik* which lays it down that you do not start with an assumption that when husband and wife break up they are each entitled to 50%. You do not start there at all, you start from nought and go up, but other people have been doing it the wrong way for too long.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You must not be afraid to criticise the application of legislation. If you find that the Judges are applying it wrongly, then obviously the legislation must be amended, because you cannot amend them.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Lord Denning in England had to leave the Bench at the end of the day after a brilliant legal career because of an indiscretion in a description I believe of black people on juries. He later said he did not mean it. If you read his book you will discover that. The newspapers described him in terms that I could not repeat, because no Speaker would allow me, least of all this Speaker, to repeat them, but terms that were objectionable to the extreme and Denning felt hurt, but he had no choice but to resign, so after he resigned there was no need for contempt to arise. That was the end of Denning.

Judges are not to legislate, and you know that. It is only in the United States in interpreting the Constitution that Judges have taken it upon themselves to legislate. That is a fortunate thing, because they have always legislated because of liberal courts in favour of black people and disadvantaged people, but in Barbados if it is true that the Labour Party had such a comprehensive legislative programme, then there would never be an opportunity for the Judges to legislate. The law would be so crystal clear that they could not be accused, by their interpretation, of legislating.

If you felt it was wrong, you, as Attorney General, had the means at your disposal at that time to change it. What is important in a legislative programme is not the number of Bills you bring in here, because passing those Bills does not resolve the social problems overnight.

Aside

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He was Attorney General then. His point is a wise point. I do not dispute the point at all. In fact, I am saying that the point he made is a useful point, but I am saying that if you turn the criticism on him you will find that he does not stand up well to it, he then moves on a little technicality. What is important in a legislative programme is the priorities of a Government. Your record as Attorney General on legislation is no better than that of your immediate predecessor. It is no better, the laws were not any thicker. I can hold them on the end of my

finger too, but you would still wish to come in here and lead us to believe that other things were happening in Government, that you took up office late, you did not have time to push through these massive reforms.

Aside

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I never complained. I know you were going to come with that. Get up and tell this House where and when I complained and to whom I complained. We have a legislative programme. It might be true that our legislative programme has not met the Statute Book yet, and that is the whole point, and the A.G. understands what I mean by that because he and I have spoken about it. I keep asking the Attorney General about the extension of the limitation period in respect of Crown proceedings, because I know that that is a vexed point in the profession, and he has explained to me where the difficulties lie. You know where they lie too, because you have had the opportunity to assess those same difficulties, with disastrous results for you, and I hope with positive results for the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

Now, Sir, you have a situation where he talks about the police in relation to the administration of justice. You can have two scenarios, Sir, one where police can be viewed to be carrying out their duties a little too zealously, and perhaps overdoing it, and the other where the police say their hands are tied. We know when it was said that the Solicitor General said that their hands were tied in this country, and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas can attest to that. It is being made, and how people felt at that time about the administration of justice when a Commissioner - he himself did not say his hands were tied, as far as I know - but the impression was there that the police felt their hands were tied. That was during your period, so do not wax too warm about the police. You all then said the man should be removed from office subsequently. Do not wax on that, we have gone past to the other extreme and the police now are functioning at a level where they are able to criticise this administration, the police administration, the public and any agency with which they come into contact with the utmost freedom.

Asides

•.,. Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! I cannot hear the Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You can either have a situation, Sir, where the police feel that they are completely denied of all power to fight on behalf of the people of this country, to fight crime, to fight drugs, to fight anything, or you can have the scenario which we now have where the police feel that their credibility in the community is being restored and that they once again have the opportunity to

carry out their duties without any semblance of interference, apparent or real.

The other criticism which surprised me most of all, Sir, and it is to the eternal credit of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, who is not in his seat today, that he has consistently supported the establishment of the Caribbean Court of Appeal. He has gone all over the place, he went in the newspapers and said the CARICOM leaders are too slow, this thing should be in place ever since, and yet during this debate the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, the spokesman on legal affairs, said that his preference is for a Caribbean Division of the Privy Council.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I began last week when I spoke about the final court in the Caribbean by saying I support it in principle. I made that point early. What I said was that when we are groping towards the establishment of this final court, what we should be doing is negotiating with the Privy Council authorities and the British Government to have a Caribbean Division with two or three Judges of eminence from the region sitting up there or down here, it does not matter, because there was a time as recently as when Douglas was last Chief Justice that he used to go, and Wooding used to go. What I am saying, add to that one, two or three more. We have a precedent, it is an area for negotiation, look at it.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: If I did not understand the Honourable Member correctly, Sir, I must apologise as a gentleman. He knows that I will apologise to him, but my understanding - and I know that the understanding of some of my colleagues - was that the Barbados Labour Party had suddenly back-pedalled on the question of the establishment of the Caribbean Court of Appeal when only a week before the Leader of the Opposition had said this thing should have been established a long time ago.

The only thing I have to say about his suggestion, if that is the suggestion he made, about a Caribbean Division of the Privy Council, I understand it now and I would only say that - you said groping, so I will use the groping - knowing our ability to grope on these issues, if we set up a temporary arrangement you can mark my word it will become final and that we will for ever be burdened with a Caribbean Division of the Privy Council. Therefore that is my only criticism of the suggestion you have made, and I now understand it in the context in which you have put it.

Therefore we have a progressive position on the Caribbean Court of Appeal, as I understand it. I do not know the position of all the parties in this House, I know the position of two so far, and basically in the region it seems as though there is agreement that the Caribbean Court of Appeal should be established as a matter of priority and that if we continue with the arrangement —

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member should wind up.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ____ of the Privy Council, people will only feel that we do not have confidence in our own system of justice. In that regard I would like to give support to the Bill which stands before the House.

Thank you.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I want to rise and at the outset support the measure that is presently being considered by this Honourable House. 11.00a.m.

And in doing that, I want to quote from some of the comments made by the Member for St. Thomas and also by the Member who has just taken his seat. I want, Sir, to begin where the last speaker ended in relation to the Caribbean Court of Appeal. Speaking for myself, I should like to say that I am in favour of the court. I think it is a good idea and it is one that I would urge the party that I belong to, the National Democratic Party to support the efforts of the Prime Minister in pursuing this objective because I believe that if we are to establish our Caribbean nationhood that the efforts that we are making on the Caribbean front have got to be supported and this is one way that I feel we could support it. We would recall that there was a previous effort to establish the court and I believe it was at the time of the Federation. But at the dissolution of the Federation, that court was also dissolved. But nevertheless the efforts made by that court are still sometimes cited by courts in this jurisdiction.

Our apprehensions about a Caribbean Court of Appeal have been based more in politics than for any other reasons. Our apprehensions have always been politically based. It has nothing to do with the Judges that would preside at this Court of Appeal because we have produced some of the best lawyers and judges in common law jurisdiction.

I would urge the Prime Minister to pursue this initiative with all the vigour and gusto he can muster to make it a reality. I know he has the support of several of the other Caribbean countries, and I would lend my own personal support to his effort in this regard. I think it is something that we should have.

I would stop short of the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas in terms of having what was referred to by the Member for St. John as a Caribbean Privy Council which he explained is not what he meant. But in practise we do have something like that where a judge or judges from the West Indies from time to time go to sit on matters that pertain to legal issues raised in the Caribbean. Chief Justice Douglas sat on matters of appeal from Trinidad which had to do with Trinidad tax law. He dealt with the matters very, very efficiently and the

opinions that he rendered to Her Majesty were accepted and that was the end of that.

So I would urge the Prime Minister and the Government of the day to pursue this matter with all haste to make it a reality. Because, as I said, it would give some support to our quest for Caribbean nationhood.

Now in terms, Sir, of the accommodation at Magistrates' Courts - I know this is a matter that deals with judges remuneration and so on, I am grateful for the latitude that Your Honour has offered in the debate because it is not often that we get a chance to debate matters of this kind in here. I was surprised when I heard that this probably is the first time or the first in a long time that a bill having to do with judges remuneration has been debated in this Honourable Chamber. I do not know if that is accurate. But I refer, Sir, to an aside from the other side - but something must be done about the accommodation at the Magistrates' Courts. As a lawyer myself I should like to see more 'tasteful and more comfortable accommodation at the Magistrates' Courts.

We have one Magistrates' court that is very comfortable but that in itself, Sir, has a drawback, the Oistin Court, the one at Oistin. And the drawback in the design of that court is that the air-conditioning unit is directly above the head of the Magistrate and his hearing has to compete with the noise given off by that unit and from time to time he also has to compete with the noise of the aeroplanes passing overhead.

I would suggest that if that is the model along which other courts are going to be built then it should be adjusted. Apart from that, it is a nice little court and it is very comfortable. Maybe something could be done about the seating accommodation because when one person has to move from the middle of the Bar table then everybody to the left or the right depending on which direction you want to go in, they also have to move to allow you to get out. So I think that in those two areas something should be done to adjust the design of the building.

Now in relation to the Judges, Sir, Judges in our jurisdiction work relatively free of societal pressure unlike Judges in military dictatorships or for example Judges in Colombia. Judges in Colombia have to work under constant threat of execution from the drug cartel. But at the same time I believe that the remuneration given to Judges and the accommodation that they have to use from day to day must be constantly reviewed and upgraded for the reason given by the Member for St. Thomas that Judges should be free of - they should not be open to bribes and things that might lead them to corrupt justice. This is why it is always important that the level of remuneration that they are given, the accommodation in which they have to work should from time to time be reviewed.

And also, Sir, for another reason, that it is about time that Members of the private Bar in Barbados be given not the opportunity but be given some incentive to want to sit as judges. A lot of our better legal brains sit at the private Bar. But I do not think any private practitioner in Barbados of standing would want to give up his private practice to sit as a judge. I believe he or she would suffer a considerable loss in revenue. Because I do not think that sitting as a judge in Barbados holds that kind of prestige and esteem to members of the private Bar as it would do to members who work in the Government legal service. 11.10a.m.

For them it is a question of promotion. You move from being a senior lawyer in the Attorney General's chambers to sitting on the Bench. That system has served us well. It has served us remarkably well for sometime now. At the same time I believe that we could avail ourselves of the better legal brains if the remuneration was of such and the incentives given to become a judge or accept a judgeship were of the kind that lawyers from the private Bar would be attracted. I believe that if for no other reason we must keep under constant review the remuneration and the pensions awarded to judges. We have got to do something about that if we are to get the members of the private Bar being attracted to work as judges.

Those are the very few comments that I would want to make on this measure and, as I said Sir, I give my wholehearted support to it and also would urge the Prime Minister and his Government to move with haste to make the establishment of the Caribbean Court of Appeal a reality.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make two brief comments during this debate which is in my name but which is being piloted by the Attorney General. The first is to correct any misimpression which may inadvertently be given that there is something wrong going on at Shcrbourne. All that is happening there is that a multi-purpose cultural centre is being erected.

Asides

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Do you wish me to give you the long title or the short title? You can call it an examination and cultural centre.

Asides

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, no. It is a cultural centre which will be used for a variety of purposes including examinations and that is an important aspect of the life of this country. I do not think anyone would deny that we need to increase the number of facilities which we have in the country for these particular functions.

Asides

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have been trying to put words in my mouth, but you cannot succeed in that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow Honourable Members to sit down and make a speech. What have you risen on?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: To apologise to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh yes, because I am going to ask that all of that be struck from the record as well.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: What we were trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to see if we could get the structure completed in time to host the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting which is scheduled to take place in this country later this year under your distinguished leadership, Mr. Speaker. It would have been and it still would be a remarkable testimony to the efficiency of Barbadian workmanship if the centre could have been completed or part of it completed for that particular purpose. I think, that the workers have made a very significant attempt and they are still working in order to get the structure completed. But from the very start we knew that it would have been a very close run against the dates for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting. Let us not

Asides

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is already in place. For everything we do, we try to make contingency plans. I am satisfied that a major effort is being made there. There is no wastage of funds and I am satisfied that this particular facility will increase the availability of places where Barbadians can participate in cultural and other activities, meetings, conferences, and so on to the benefit of the growth and development of this country.

Now as far as the accommodation for the Judicial Officers is concerned, let me now say, as is well known, that I am not a member of the legal profession and I do not claim to be a member of that profession. I have always had a very high regard for the law and my Government is committed to the independence of the Judiciary and is further committed to the objective of ensuring that facilities adequate for the administration of justice wherever possible. I have always had a high regard for the phrase "the majesty of the law". For a long time I was not sure exactly what it meant and, when I paid a visit to the offices at Coleridge Street and to the Law Courts, my concept of the majesty of the law as reflected in the accommodations provided for the administration of justice was not in any way enhanced.

Let me say that I am committed and my Government is committed to the provision of a Barbados Judicial Centre which will be part of the programme for the upgrading of

facilities in relation to the administration of justice. We are not only talking about this. It has been talked about. I do not know what it was called. What was it called at that time? - A Hall of Justice.

You see I believe that one of the problems with my Government is that we do not keep repeating and repeating things. We believe in action

Asides

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:....and I have indicated - I do not know if the Member for St. Thomas is annoyed because we said that we are going to put up a Judicial centre and that we are actually taking steps to put up that centre and you will be very closely associated with it. You know everything about it because I went to the Law Courts and I was accompanied by the Attorney General and Officers from his Ministry and some Officers also from the Registrar's Office.

Asides

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Registrar, Sir.

Laughter

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I was most impressed because I was given every opportunity to see all aspects of the buildings and all of the deficiencies of the building barely and fearlessly. Just as you speak in here, I was given that kind of privilege. I believe you know a lot of what is going on in Government even before we make it public. I believe that you are privy to all of these matters relating to the Law Courts. 11.20a.m.

You practise in those courts, so you would know. I would only like to assure this Honourable Chamber, Sir, that we are working on these proposals, they will be coming, and I expect that the building will be such as all of us in this country would be able to say that they measure up to the phrase "the majesty of the law."

Thank you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long because much of what I agree with has been said and I am sure that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central* will respond in due course to some of the things which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has said.

I myself was a little disappointed that in making the case for the Judges he found it necessary to articulate the allowance of the Appeal Judges in terms of day's pay, because the suggestion that they meet every day for 365 days a year belies the fact that they get in essence a sum of money - I think it is \$5,400 - as an allowance, and I do

not think that anyone attempts, in giving these allowances, to equate it to \$12 a day. Unfortunately some of the people out in the community who read that the Appeal Court Judges get \$12 a day took it literally, and wondered how the Barbados Labour Party for ten years could have kept it below that.

What I really wish to touch on is the fact that both administrations in Barbados - and there have been two - have tried to do two things to ensure that our Judges within the resources of this country have had decent emoluments. I do not think that anyone anywhere, taking account of the total infrastructure of Barbados can quarrel with the pension arrangements which the Judges in Barbados enjoy. I do not think anyone either will quarrel with the independence which the Judges in Barbados have enjoyed over a considerable amount of time.

The history of Judges in Barbados, if I may allude to a point made by the Honourable Member for St. John, is not one that has always been excellent. The initial Judges that came out to the old Barbados 350 years ago could not be described and must not be thought of in the terms which the Judges we now know can be thought of and now perform. In fact, a recent Chief Justice tells a story about a man who was being sent out to Barbados as a Judge in the early days and who was told by one of the great law lords something like this - "now I know you are a man of high integrity and you will be called upon to make judgments, and invariably the judgments you will make will be correct because of your integrity. Do not try to base it on the law, of which you are totally ignorant, for then you will make mistakes." That is the basis on which many of the Judges in the early days in Barbados operated, but I think to the everlasting credit of the Governments of Barbados, especially in the last 50 years, those who have adorned the Benches, in whatever conditions they have sat, have operated to the credit of a community that was emerging, and I think generally speaking that is so for the jurisdictions throughout the Caribbean. That is why I have always found it difficult to accept a thesis which suggests that we must not move away from the judgments of the Privy Council in London.

I have said in this Honourable Chamber before, and I will continue to say, that especially in the last 25 years there is hardly a judgment that has left these shores and gone to the Privy Council that has been reversed on substantive law. There is hardly a judgment that has come back from the Privy Council that has not been steeped in the scholarship of some West Indian Judge. Most of the great cases in the Caribbean that have been decided by the Privy Council have had their genesis in the work, invariably, of the Judge of first instance.

I do not wish, Sir, to take the time of this Honourable House to repeat things that are in the record that I have said before, but I would make bold to say that one of the Judges

who now is regarded by some persons as the expert, or who created for himself a reputation as the expert, in constitutional law on the Privy Council has demonstrably been a student of West Indian Judges who have researched, thought, and where necessary become innovative in the interpretation of West Indian Constitutions.

I have always found it difficult, therefore, to accept that we should not have a Caribbean Court of Appeal, and I would say I do not think that he intended - the Honourable Member for St. George South made reference to the West Indian Court of Appeal and said a court of similar jurisdiction - but I think what we are moving to is a court of final jurisdiction in the Caribbean, because the old Caribbean Court of Appeal still had the upper requirement of a Privy Council.

The point is, Sir, that we in the Caribbean have been reluctant to assume our full manhood and womanhood, if you will, Sir. We have been properly reluctant to do that because it is human. We have been spawned out of a system that is well nigh 800 years old and all of the lawyers in the Caribbean, up until very recently, were trained in the bowels of some of the old dungeons in London that are called law offices, and many of them feel a deep reluctance to pull themselves away from their experiences, some of them very pleasant, which they had in London. Indeed, that has sometimes manifested itself in a prejudice which sought to suggest, and sometimes still seeks to suggest, that those persons who did not study law in London are not in fact as graced in the law as those who did.

It is a myth, if I may talk of the myths to be exploded, which has been successfully exploded in the literature over the past 20 years or so. It is a myth which will be finally completed when the Caribbean Court of Appeal is established in the Caribbean. 11.30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, those young people who will become the Judges of the Twenty-first Century for the Caribbean were wisely put through a process in which they were Caribbeanized. That process arose out of the decision almost a quarter of a century ago to establish the Law Faculty in Barbados and the two Law Schools in Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, there is an affinity among the young Caribbean lawyers which allows them to feel stronger about a Caribbean Court of Appeal, I think, than the older ones. And hence some of the resistance which Governments still have to the establishment of a Caribbean Court of Appeal is cited in, resting in their own domestic situations where the older members of the fraternity are in fact unwilling to part company with their tradition.

But there can be no question that it is a matter of whose time has come. There can be no question that a Caribbean Court of Appeal will be established in Barbados.

What one hopes will happen however is that the young lawyers will stop engaging in superficialities and will set out to lay the foundation, the intellectual foundation that is necessary for a great tradition to be built

It is my judgment that not enough people are writing in the Caribbean about the law. There are too many people who are prepared to talk but who do not have either the will or the discipline to publish. They criticize those few who have manfully over the years toiled to produce what literature there is in the field of law in the Caribbean, but they themselves will not put their shoulders to the plough.

It is unfortunate, I have said before, that one of those persons who has been the most prolific producer of Caribbean legal literature has been lost to the field of politics. I do not know how he will fare finally but I know that there is a void which has not been filled since he departed from Cave Hill and moved into areas of politics in his country.

But it is necessary for us to establish that we are a full blooded community. It is necessary for us. I recall in 1974 when the Democratic Labour Party Government of the day attempted to begin the process of growing up into nationhood, when they attempted, by what was described as they were, as Constitutional Amendments, when they attempted to provide the basis for the community to make its own decisions, I recall that there was much pain and much anguish at that time. And now as the years have gone and there have been no changes in the methodology or indeed the quality of the Judges that have been appointed, I think people have come to realize that those Constitutional Amendments, even though they are referred to from time to time with a certain degree of negativity, those Constitutional Amendments were fundamental in the changes which they brought about and which they are bringing about in the thinking of our people.

But we have not yet reached the level that we should be at as we come to the Twenty-first Century. There are still many people who believe that only if something comes from outside of the Caribbean it can be good. There are still too many people even though they recognize with their own eyes and their own intellect that quality exists within the Caribbean who are prepared to say that if it does not come from overseas, it cannot be good. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we have difficulties and we continue to have difficulties about a Caribbean Court of Appeal.

I hope that the Attorney-General and the Prime Minister will feel able to stand firm and strong in the movement towards a Caribbean Court of Appeal. But I go further and say that I hope that in setting up such an institution we do not fall prey to the methodology by which we then create structures that make the system unworkable.

The appointment of judges will be one of the major stumbling blocks to the creation of a Caribbean Court of Appeal. But, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis the political process is the only process that will allow for a democratic appointment of judges. The United States had no difficulty 200 years ago in cutting themselves off from an old system. And in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court became the sole interpreter of the Constitution of the United States. And it has redounded to their everlasting credit. It is one of the reasons why that country, whatever their problems is considered to be the strongest country in the world. Because the Judges of the Supreme Court whether they are strict constructionists, whether they are liberal interpreters, they are Judges that have been appointed by the political process. The chief executive elected by all of the people appoints the Judges by and with the consent of some other people elected by the people.

And in the final analysis, whether it is this Honourable House or some other Honourable House, this House and the Houses in the Caribbean represent the aspirations of the people in a particular time frame. And therefore the political process is the only democratic methodology available to a country and it should be the one that should be brought to the fore in the appointment of Caribbean Judges.

If you have corruption, you are going to have it no matter what the system. There are some people so steeped in the art of corruption that it did not matter if you put them in a perfect system, they would find a way and they would find a means. On the other hand, there are the vast majority of people who are interested in process who are interested in system and who would have no difficulty whatsoever in accepting the will of the majority and the protection of the minority.

I hope that we do not have many more debates in which we are still discussing the Caribbean Court of Appeal as a thing of the future. I hope that it will not be long before we see the framework for the creation of the first Caribbean Court of Appeal.

I will end with one other point concerning the Judges in Barbados. I have been in this Chamber for a fairly long time now, Sir, and almost from the time I came into this Chamber I have been asking that we give consideration to the appointment of clerks to the Judges. It seems to me so simple, Mr. Speaker, that I have come to the conclusion that there is something, some flaw in the thinking, although I have been unable to find it. Put very simply, it goes like this, Sir.

There are a number of young people coming out of the Law Faculty and the Law School every year. Many of them are bright. There are one or two who write for one or two political parties who would seek to belie that, Sir. But

generally speaking, they are bright. All of the law students are bright. And they are coming into the system for the first time. They are fresh mentally, they are filled with knowledge about the new cases. They have some experience with the nuances of the new interpretations and they have the capacity to write. One of the things which one can always be certain of is that anyone who goes through the Law Faculty and the Law School in the Caribbean is likely to be able to write in the English language. That person is likely to be able to think.

And it seems to me that for a year or two or three that the Judges, if not each one of them, that collectively they ought to have the benefit of choosing one or other of these persons to work for them, as they say in other jurisdictions to clerk for them for a period. 11.40a.m.

It is an experience which the young person who manages to get that position would consider to be a plum, 'because apart from the emoluments it would be an opportunity to witness first hand the thinking of the great minds that sit on our Benches. It would provide the judges much needed respite from having to slog through the libraries and spend the tremendous amount of time sometimes with routine trivia and it would make certain that the quality of judgments which come out of our courts would be even higher than it now is,

Mr. Speaker, one of the criticisms that one can make of the Law Courts in the Caribbean and in Barbados, in particular, is that until recently the number of written judgments was too small. You could never find until recently, when there was a project where we were attempting to have the Law Courts, judgments in Barbados that could assist young lawyers and others to arrive at a better position on a particular statute or a particular point of law. I think that has changed or is changing and many of the judges are writing more. I am saying that if they had Law Clerks they would be in a position to produce a higher quality and, therefore, the ends of justice would be better served. I have been asking for that for so long, Mr. Speaker, that I now only ask for it for the record. I believe that the Attorney General is attending to it, Sir. I am not attempting to force his hands because, as you know, his hands are not easily forced. I believe before this term is ended the Government will give consideration to this matter. I am saying for the record...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am now being told that I can say with authority that it will be done, Sir.

Asides.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that this is a matter that will be considered, but I think it is important. It has to form part of the whole ethos of the Judicial Centre. The concept of a Judicial Centre envisages 21st century technique in the dispensation of justice and that is what one anticipates and that is where one will be going. I, myself, look forward to it. There is a time in one's life as one gets older when one can look at intellectual pursuits with a certain amount of joy, Sir. I look forward to the Judicial Centre if for no other reason to see the quality of material that will come out of it. I am mortified when I think of some of the cases where the Judges have worked over the years and one who does not go there often, when one does go one is a little surprised at the quality of the physical environment.

As for the Police Stations, the Honourable Member spoke with some feeling about the Police Stations. I think that he was being a little unfair to the Attorney General when he discussed it in terms which might have suggested that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central was doing nothing about the business of...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I spoke on that last week, so it is clear that the Honourable Minister has forgotten what I said. I did not attack the Attorney General in relation to the Police Stations. I lamented the fact that they were in a certain state and I did talk about the prioritising of the new station that we had planned for in Hometown and I understood that it was this Government's decision. Whereas we were going to start with the station at Glebe Land, St. George as a new district, the Government as a matter of their own priority decided to start with the one at Hometown instead. There is nothing wrong with that. That is a matter for the Government to decide. That is a matter of priority, but I did not attack him, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I did not accuse him of attacking, Sir. I have no difficulty with my words, Sir. I said that he spoke in such a manner as to leave the impression and, even if he did not leave the impression, it was reported in such a manner as to leave the impression...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I cannot be responsible for what was reported. If the public has an impression that the Attorney General has done nothing for the police, who am I to say that they are wrong? That may well be so, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it is the manner in which he speaks and he now provides ample evidence of precisely what I mean. The impression has gone abroad and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is notorious, Sir, for that kind of approach where he says one thing. I think it runs with all Honourable Members who represent St. Thomas, where they say one thing and leave the impression of the opposite. It is a St. Thomas trait.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is a St. Thomas trait that has manifested itself in those who have represented St. Thomas since the Barbados Labour Party Government.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I hope he is including Senator Boxill and Mr. George Batson in that gang.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I had no evidence of Senator Boxill, Sir. Are you speaking as you know? I have to speak about what I know when I am speaking in here, Sir. I only experienced two Honourable Members from SL Thomas - only two, Sir, and both of them demonstrated the same trait. I will go no further. I will go no further than that, Sir. I wanted to make the point that anyone who remembers or wishes to remember will recall that the Attorney General, in fact, started with the station at the airport and it has been announced that it is the Government's intention to systematically bring the level of the Police Stations up to the required level for the 21st century. He has said it often enough that I think that it bears repetition if anyone is going to get the impression that the Attorney General has not been paying attention to the Police and Fire Stations.

Sir, one of the things that is happening in Barbados is that because people are freer than they used to be to speak their minds as they see fit, because there is an over abundance of freedom in Barbados the likes of which there has not been in the last 15 years, because of all those reasons every Sunday evening every week you can have somebody making some statement which, if one does not correct it, gives the impression of untruth almost everyday, Sir. The Attorney General has been relentless in his attempts and in his quest to have the accommodation for the Police and Fire Stations improved. I think therefore, Sir, it is incumbent on us to let the public know that it is only a matter of time before all of them are completed. I have no doubt that he will spell out the details. You see what was said last week might be forgotten this week.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member, Sir, has not drawn my attention...

Mr. SPEAKER: You had better not use the one minute.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Use it to the best intention of the debate.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. I was merely going to make the point that that Honourable Member I have not seen him for the day and he is very upset. I will now acknowledge that he is there, Sir, so that he will not worry about it anymore. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but it is evident that Members on the other side, judging by the content of the speech of the Honourable Minister of Health who just sat down, intend to poke at the crease and in due course play for light. 11.50a.m.

There will be no draw in these matters. The debate has already been determined by the people of Barbados since it was publicised arising out of the discussions last week. I speak only on matters before the House and in the best traditions of observing the Standing Orders of this Parliament. What I am saying is that the people heard views ventilated at the last sitting on this matter and they have already formed an opinion.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Your Honour was not in the Chair, and since I was Acting Leader it is my duty to acquaint Your Honour with the facts.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas spoke after the matter was introduced, and therefore for the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to say that all the deus were expressed last week in the face of speeches from the Honourable Member for St. John and the Honourable Member for St. George South - at least those two, Sir - for him to now say that all the views were heard last week after those two Honourable Members have spoken is to mislead the House, because he is suggesting that what those two Honourable Members had to say was a repetition of what was said last week, or had so little content that it made no difference to what was said last week.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I never said that all the views were expressed last week, so members can make a judgment as to who is trying to mislead this Honourable House. I said that the people have formed a view of the matter before the House already, judging by the publications in the Press up to this morning, and so on.

There are one or two areas, Sir, I would like to address arising out of the Honourable Member's speech. I think I have a duty as Leader of the Opposition to former members of this House to make it clear that I have never considered Senator Boxill to be a man who speaks in certain terms in order to create false impressions. I want to make that clear. I rise to defend Senator Boxill from the unjustifiable attack made on him by the Honourable Minister of Health. If I may continue,...

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you assisting the Speaker in his....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am trying to assist you, Sir, and at the same time defending the honour of a former member of this Honourable House.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I would ask Your Honour to have that matter struck from the record. I did not attack Senator Boxill, but rather, Sir, based on what that Honourable Member had said about the former member for St. Thomas repeatedly Tuesday after Tuesday, he used to make comments which led me to a conclusion about the former late Prime Minister. The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, used to make comments about that honourable gentleman which brought me to the conclusion which allowed me to say what I said.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member, Sir, is confessing that I misled him all his life.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is true, Sir. He used to be over here and I believed him. Now look where he is.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I only hope, Sir, that he will continue to place the same credence in my words as he has always done, and he has done well. He always did well when he placed credence in my words, and I will go further and say that I always take seriously what the Honourable Member says, particularly when he is Acting Leader of the House. When he gives an undertaking that certain members introducing motions before this House will have unlimited time in their speeches, I take him at his word, because the people of Barbados took him at his word and believed what he said, and I would hate to think that the Acting Leader of the House would say one thing one week and then change his mind the following week.

If I may continue, Sir, on this particular Bill relating to the judges....

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the Honourable Member is confessing that what he said before was not relevant...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. If I may continue on this matter....

Mr. SPEAKER: I was gathering the impression or the opinion that what was debated before might not have been relevant to the context of the Bill, and in as much as that observation could be determined by what the Honourable Member has said, I just want to say that I will not allow the debate to ramble into some of the areas in which it has just tended to go. I would ask Honourable Members to keep

very close to the substance and content of the Bill before the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I thank you, Sir, for your early recognition of the virtues of self-confession. We certainly on this side support this Bill which seeks to improve the status of the Judges in our community.

The Judges in Barbados are at the pinnacle of a judicial system which does not exist just for the sake of existing, but it exists in order to assist in the ordering of society in order that we all can enjoy a better life and create the conditions in Barbados which would lead to orderly development of our society at the social, economic and other levels.

I too would like to lend my support to the suggestion by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, who I feel made a very learned presentation on this matter, in supporting the concept of pension arrangements whereby persons who have distinguished themselves at the Bar and who would be able to bring to bear to the Benches a different background of experience would find it an easy transition in the later years of their lives to move from the Bar to the Benches.

This has been a tradition in the United Kingdom and certainly in the Commonwealth countries from which many of our judicial practices in Barbados arise. Many of the outstanding luminaries on the Bench over the years have in fact been persons who had their grounding at the private Bar. So that although there is a tradition in Barbados of moving from the Public Service to the Bench, I think the time has come when we should be creating appropriate conditions for senior lawyers of experience to move in that area, and one area would be pensions. Salaries will also be a very important consideration.

I do not know what would be the kind of remuneration which a senior lawyer at the Bar would enjoy today, say at age 50 and at the top of his career,....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ... but judging from the experience of the Honourable Leader of the House who, unless I did not hear correctly, assures me that in his experience it would be about half a million dollars, if it is divided by ten it will only result in \$50,000. However, I think it is important to remember that very often money is not the only factor that would lead people who have been successful at that point in their careers to go to the Bench. There must be the other conditions. 12.00 noon.

The kind of conditions which have been discussed here in terms of, as I say, pensions, reasonable salaries, housing and the other things that go with the job. And of

course job satisfaction. This means that we must create an environment in which people can have adequate fulfilment in the practise of their profession with appropriate supporting staff, access to a well organized library and opportunities for people to practise the law at that level away from the hustle and bustle of the Bar. I believe that there are many persons in Barbados, who, if the conditions were right would easily move probably at age 50 or so from the Bar to the Bench. Like the Honourable Attorney-General, Sir, many of them would have made sufficient money over the years that they can easily go into semi-retirement and enjoy more and more intellectual activity and look at the law from a completely different perspective.

One area, Sir, which I think I would like to see some attention drawn to is this whole question of the laws in Barbados relating to libel and slander. We in Barbados in this Parliament which represents perhaps the ideal forum where one can draw some evidence as to the extent to which freedom of speech is enjoyed in Barbados feel that people should have a right, within reasonable limits, to comment on matters of public importance. In this Honourable House, Sir, we enjoy certain protections, the Immunities and Privileges legislation and all those ancient rights and privileges which you rightly claim on our behalf at the beginning of each session, you or your predecessors in office at the beginning of each session.

There seems to me, Sir, to be a growing habit in Barbados where persons of wealth and position, people who are clearly wrongdoers in the society try to prevent public comment on matters of public interest by the process of hiring a lawyer and filing a case before the courts and after that, the whole matter is silenced as far as comment in Barbados is concerned, on the grounds that a matter is before the court, however bogus the case turns out to be or if it ever turns out at all. And judging from the speed with which these matters come before the court, by the time they are dealt with by the court, public interest in the matter has long departed.

I think that for some time, on the Floor of this House, other Members have canvassed the critical need to get the laws of slander and libel upgraded to relate this somehow to legislation which exists in North America which gives the people of a country the right to examine people in public office and also examine public issues without fear of being unable to tell the truth because they may be dragged before the courts or indeed, might find themselves in contempt of court. This is a serious matter and in the roughly ten, eleven years that I have been in here now, again and again this matter has been raised and nothing has been done about it. And I would say that within the past years I see increasing evidence of an erosion of freedom of speech in this country through that mechanism. And, Sir, the judges of course in Barbados are powerless to do anything about it because, as has been pointed out, by other persons steeped in the law, they are there to administer the law as is. And it is in here

which is not just a talk shop, this is not just Parliament but it is also the highest court in the land.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which is the highest court, the Constitution?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which one?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member assures me that this is no longer a court. I always thought it was. Anyhow, it is the place where the laws are made and therefore we have an obligation to examine these matters and recognize the trends that have been taking place in Barbados, otherwise we may find that our cultural tradition of freedom of speech can be eroded by those who have no other interest than to protect their wrongdoing by hiring expensive lawyers to file lawsuits and stop any person in this country from speaking about it, unless they are prepared to run the risk of being sued and then go through that whole legal process.

Certainly there must be some mechanism within our laws which recognize that there is an area of public comment which should be so allowed by the law where people can be free from the kind of fear and terror which such individuals are imposing on members of the community and indeed, Members elected to Parliament.

I am glad, Sir, that the traditions, the Westminster tradition and the traditions of this Honourable House where debate on these matters are allowed, except in cases of criminal matters that that tradition will continue. Because at least, on the Floor of this House, there is an opportunity for somebody to give some expression to matters which are affecting the public of Barbados when attempts are made to stifle that expression by going to the courts and just filing a lawsuit.

The second matter I want to address, Sir, is the matter of conditions within the courts of this country. Again, for many years I have heard all sorts of statements being made about the appalling conditions in the courts. For many years, very little has been done. For many years, vast sums of money have been voted in this House for other purposes. If we are serious about it then I think that a programme must be instituted to upgrade the conditions under which the officers of the court have to work. It is also very important, Sir, that persons who have to attend the court, either as witnesses or otherwise are able to perform that public function in some reasonable degree of comfort.

The next area, Sir, which I want to address is the whole question of the breakdown of law and order in this country. It is evident to me and to most people that there are many trends developing in Barbados where the judiciary would have to play a very important role along with others in the society in helping to stem these trends. 12.10p.m.

My concern, Sir, is very much in relation to the young people of Barbados. My concern is in relation to the lack of sense of direction, lack of leadership being given to the society, and the result seems to me to be a general decay. Whenever has there been a time in Barbados where so many crimes of violence and murders seen reported in the newspapers week after week, if not a murder some serious crime of violence. I am concerned. I am scared and the pace at which this has happened too is absolutely alarming, and this underlines the importance, Sir, of our supporting this measure. It underlines the importance in order to strengthen the position of the Judiciary in this country.

Having said so, Sir, and having established in my view the right of people to comment on any public institutions in Barbados, it is important that we should use our language with care and we should not be using loose and derogatory statements about any sector of the Judiciary as a group whether it be in this Honourable House or outside of this Honourable House, because those signals, Sir, are picked up outside. Make no mistake when we signal, whether in here or outside, that we have grave concerns about the wisdom of any group of persons in Barbados responsible for the administration of law and order.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is just being his very pleasant self. He is trying to say, Sir, that if you say anything unpleasant about the Government that that creates problems outside. That is not so. People understand the cut and thrust of debate and regard that as a positive sign that leads eventually to the unity and harmony in the goal of national development. When it is done in relation to any group of those who have the responsibility for the administration of law and order, we are creating serious problems. Signals are being sent to people that they are being unjustly treated. It is, therefore, not surprising to see that groups in this society have been reacting in a very unusual way in terms of decisions taken by the Judiciary from time to time.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not trying to establish any connection. All I am saying is that these things must be a matter of concern to all of us, because all the talk about economic development and social development could only

take place, Sir, in a society where adequate attention is paid to law and order and the orderly development, of the society.

This brings me, Sir, to the question of the cost of litigation and at the same time the general feeling of alienation by large numbers of the poor in Barbados, a sense of alienation from access to due process because of the cost of litigation. I am not going to get into the business of lawyer's fees and this kind of thing like that. What the lawyers charge is a matter between them and their clients. What I am saying is that we have reached a stage in this society where I am sure, and I am absolutely sure that the Honourable Attorney General would like to introduce something in the legal system within the period when he is Attorney General by which he may be remembered. I am going to give you the opportunity to introduce something now. Give the poor people greater access to the judicial system. Let them feel that whether they can afford it or not that not only in criminal matters but also in certain similar matters that they will have the opportunity to go before the court and be properly represented.

I know, Sir, hundreds of poor people who have been wrongfully dismissed. They have no money. They cannot take the appropriate steps. They cannot even visit a lawyer's office. It is as simple as that. Those who can afford it or those who can find a lawyer who is prepared to work on their, behalf often go to the courts and get some degree of satisfaction if they have a just cause. But remember for everyone that you see receiving some kind of compensation through the judicial process, remember that there is a large number out there who because of penury have been unable to have access to the judicial system.

There is no point in looking at me and saying to go to the unions. The unions cannot undertake that function. They can fight on their behalf. The unions in Barbados cannot incur that kind of outlay, except they may do it I would imagine in specific instances where you may have a group application or where it is very necessary to take a stand that has a wider application. I do not think that the unions can be expected to get involved in that area of activity nor indeed, Sir, do I think that any member of any union can get up and criticize the stand that I take on this matter. If they were to do that, Sir, I will defend the rights of the union members whom they would have departed from intellectually, psychologically, and otherwise.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is enjoying himself. He tells me that I am exhausting myself and I should start poking and that I have scored too many runs, but they will come on. The runs will come on. Do not worry. They will come.

Now Sir, the question of our young people. Another very disturbing thing is that it does not seem to me that enough attention is being paid to the plight of the young people who attract the attention of the courts. I think that looking at the newspaper reports that I read from time to time, when I look at the large number of first offenders being sent to prison as the law prescribes in many instances, and when you consider the environment in which those first offenders will operate probably for the period that they are incarcerated, it would seem to me that we are not giving them a fair break. In other words, what I am saying is that you need to establish some kind of arrangement where young people who are sentenced to prison should not be exposed to hardened criminals because at the end of the day you are just probably going to be creating a larger group of hardened criminals within the society. 12.20 p.m.

That is a matter that needs to be attended to. Ten years ago this was not the major problem, because it was very seldom that you saw young people being committed to prison. Now this is almost a daily exercise, and, when you look at the list of offences you will see that the Judiciary really has: «<? no alternative but to do something in terms of the penalties set out under the particular laws under which they are prosecuted by the police.

I would make a plea for the Government and for the Attorney General to address this particular matter. The Attorney General has an opportunity again here to make his mark on our penal system by recognising the plight of the youth. We know, Sir, that there is only so much that a more humane or more enlightened penal system can do, because persons will come in contact with the law after an offence or other offences have been committed.

We know that these people find themselves in this situation for a variety of reasons not connected with the Judiciary at all, but more connected with failure to generate jobs in the society, failure to deal with the question of drug abuse and so on. We know the kinds of problems, but that is another group of people that will have to be dealt with at another time. I will concentrate on the Judiciary at the moment.

I would like to see positive steps being taken to deal with the question of the first offenders and the young «* offenders who have reached the point where under our laws the Judges and the Magistrates have no alternative but to send them to prison.

Now, Sir, the question of the police.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Honourable Member will have enough time, he has about one minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Seeing that I only have one minute more, I was pleased, Your Honour, that you gave me the opportunity to point out to the Honourable Attorney General two areas in which he has yet a further opportunity to make a mark during his period of office, and I hope that he will take my advice and will not let these go abegging as he has allowed others to go abegging in the past.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, this Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pension Act has got unanimous support all around the House, so therefore I should be able to just sit and do nothing further about it. All this Bill is asking is that the Governor-General be allowed to make regulations retrospectively in order to confer benefits or remove disabilities attaching to the holder of the office of Judge.

In the course of this debate we have had far and wide ranging comments on the police, on the prisons, on the penal system, on Senator Boxill.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I would never do that. The Leader of the Opposition even proffered me some advice on how to make a mark. I do not want to take any advice when it comes to the law from the Leader of the Opposition. He can advise me when it comes to medicine, but I am not going to take any advice when it comes to the law. I will tell you why. You have made a statement, for instance, about first offenders being sent to gaol as required by law. There is no law which requires that first offenders be sent to gaol. The whole point about gaoling persons rests with the courts, and I think the statistics will show that perhaps 95% of first offenders do not go to gaol.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not wish to deal with matters

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How do you mean do not get into the debate? Do you think that monkey law will stop me from getting up? What I am saying, Sir, there are certain categories of offences in Barbados for which bail is not granted, such as murder, and if a youngster commits a murder he goes to gaol.

Hon. M. A. KING: I have no response to that. I am told; Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is an expert in monkey law. I really do not know what that is, but the point is if the Honourable Member's response to me is that a first offender for murder will not get bail, I have no answer to that, I have to admit that he is totally right on that score.

Another area in which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made a comment with which I cannot agree,

he leans to me and says "give poor people access to the judicial system." Now I do not know that poor people in this country do not have access to the judicial system. He seeks to underscore his point by saying that unless they can pay for some expensive lawyer they do not have a chance. When *sotto voce* remarks were made in relation to the assistance which institutions like the Barbados Workers' Union give to poor people in this country, he seemed to belittle the suggestion that the Barbados Workers' Union can play a very substantial role in this regard.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. What I did say was that the Unions will make an effort but they cannot be expected to cover all the persons who require access to that kind of assistance in order to seek redress before the courts. They can help, but they cannot provide it on a national basis.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Barbados Workers' Union, for sure, I know, has made a very substantial contribution in the area of assisting people with wrongful dismissals, severance payments claims and all that, because I have done thousands of cases on their behalf. I have done thousands of cases also and assisted thousands of people who have needed assistance in relation to wrongful dismissals, who were not able to afford the cost of litigation and who were not members of either one of the Unions. There are a number of lawyers in the profession who lend their assistance in this area. I think the Honourable Member for St Thomas will tell you that too.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: No, no, I think the vast majority of people.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not take the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas too seriously, because we have not had the benefit of hearing him today on the substance of his contribution.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Not yet, I am dealing with this Bill, because last week before this House you delivered a very politically mischievous speech which was lacking in substantial content. It was rambling. The Prime Minister even on one occasion characterised it as being quite loose and said that you were making a mockery of dealing with the Judiciary which is an important institution in the country. Do you not remember that? 12.30 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: And your comments too - and the Leader of the Opposition should pull you up on this,, but he did not do it - were biased against the poor. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas was suggesting that we should what he calls retransfer the jurisdiction in wrongful dismissal cases back from the magistrates to the Supreme Court. And I was making the point that that would be a matter which was against the interest of the working classes and against the poor.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Because I was making the very point that the Severance Payments legislation provided an option for working class people who are dismissed and who could not afford it to be able to go before the magistrates to present their case where, if they lost, the most they would be saddled with would be costs of \$250.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: If they go to the Supreme Court and that is the jurisdiction that the Honourable Member wants us to go back to, if you prevent the magistrates from dealing with it and take it back to the Supreme Court now you have the body and soul. The workers would be....

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Cost certified, fit for two counsels.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: And those are the pressures, those are the economic pressures which you are asking us to put the working classes of this country under by taking away the jurisdiction from the Magistrates* Courts.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I let him talk, Sir, I think it was even carried in the press, Sir, that what I said was if you did not do that, when the Attorney-General made the point about the choice that you have now under the law, I pointed out that because of the proliferation of cases that what you could do is set up a separate court dealing with wrongful dismissals and industrial matters. He has not addressed that. I listened to him the whole time. Talk about that. And you could set up a separate court dealing with that and you could have the limitation of costs just as you have now in the Magistrates' Courts.

The point is that the magistrates as they are, Sir, are overloaded with these cases and they are complaining.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I have not ignored that aspect of your argument as well because I am going to come to that.

But I was dealing first of all with the first limb of your argument....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: where, in my view, you were delivering this very strong and poor statement that you must insist that they go to the Supreme Court.

Now one of the advantages of the Magistrates' Courts in this regard is the speed with which the cases can be done and the vast reduction in cost which can result from going to the Magistrates' Courts.

Now the Honourable Member for St. Thomas speaks about, as an alternative, to establish a separate court.

Hon. M. A. KING: Now the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, I believe he was on his feet or *sotto voce* asked him, well look are you asking us to set up.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: He was on a point of order - industrial relations court as there is in Trinidad? He asked that

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member for St.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members.....

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. I have allowed each Member who spoke today to make his contribution with very few interruptions. I will not permit any Member who has been given permission by me to make a speech to be interrupted outside of the Rules providing for interruptions.

And may I say also that Standing Orders in reference to points of order require that that point be simply directed to me for my decision. In other words, no second reading speeches would be allowed for points of order.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the protection but no Honourable Member over there is going to put me off from what I have to say.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas made wild statements last week and we have to deal with them one by one. On this industrial relations court I said - they are not listening to what I am saying - I said that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy rose on a point of order and asked the Honourable Member for St. Thomas

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Did he not rise on a point of order?

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: He rose on a point of order and asked if the Honourable Member for St. Thomas were calling for an industrial relations court similar to what they had in Trinidad. And the point was being made that you would need the whole process of an industrial stabilization Act I believe that even in Trinidad questions have been raised about the constitutionality of the court. But that is beside the point But questions can be raised about these issues.

The creation of a gun court - I personally am against creation of special courts for special purposes.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I believe in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: And as far as I am concerned, whilst I am Attorney-General, the Supreme Court of this country is going to have jurisdiction to deal with all the issues that affect the people of this country.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am not going to set up any special courts to deal with special and specific issues.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: We do not have a family court That is ignorant This is a small jurisdiction. Stop trying to mimic and follow other people all down the road. You are dealing with a small jurisdiction, 250 000 people and you want to set up the whole paraphernalia of the large and huge jurisdictions without even thinking about them.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: And you will find - let me tell-you something - that even in the United Kingdom and in Australia - Australia has been the area where the idea of the family court came from and there is an abundance of views in Australia, I believe maybe even from the judges who are responsible for administering the courts saying that if they had to do it again they would not set up any separate jurisdiction as a family court. Because what in essence you are doing, let us deal with it in the context of Barbados, you are setting aside one specific judge who is going to deal with family law matters all the time. Okay.

Are we big enough? You compared the situation in England and had a foolish comment over there about small minds.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The courts in England have divisions, they have parallel divisions right up.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Court of First Instance, Court of Appeal and the House of Lords being the common demoninator.

Now, are you asking us then to set up here a family court with a parallel family appeal division or are you saying that the appeals from the family court go to the regular Court of Appeal. I am going to continue.

Mr. Speaker, my problem is that I do not have enough time to deal with all these issues as fully as I would like because there are other matters.

I am going to leave this matter with the comment that I am basically against setting up special courts.

But there are other issues which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas raised which I think I have to comment on. One of the mischievous things he dealt with was the Court of Appeal Allowance - the Honourable Member for St. Michael West dealt with that - giving the people of this country the impression that Court of Appeal Judges are paid \$12 a day.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: No. It is not so. Do not say that it is so. It is not so.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member made the point it is trivia anyhow. It is trivial. Because by the same token, one could argue that in your time you paid them less than \$12 a day.

But that is not a sensible argument. Because the fact is that in the system of court which we have, as you well know, the judges of the Court of Appeal are the same as the judges at first instance, and the same judges who sit at first instance sit on appeal. And the judges who sit at first instance draw salaries of judges of the Supreme Court. So that on the occasions when they are sitting as judges of the Court of Appeal they are not sitting as judges of the High Court....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: or first instance. When they are sitting on appeal they are not sitting at first instance. But yet, they have their salary which is not deducted from them when they are not sitting as judges of....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: You did not say it.

Aside.

12.40 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I said last week that in addition they get the equivalent of \$12.00 a day when they sit on the Court of Appeal as a Court of Appeal allowance but, of course, they still draw their ordinary salaries. I said it. All right. Well, the other Members said that I said it.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the impressions which have been created in the minds of the public by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Yes, but you make the point that you are not concerned about what the public feels. It is in your interest to create the impressions. It is in your interest to create the impressions which will reflect negatively on the Government. Why should you care about that? Why should you be concerned about that? I have to be concerned about it and I will deal with it and seek to create the opposite impression.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Now I am not through dealing with this Court of Appeal thing yet though. The Court of Appeal Judges get the allowance - you see one does not want to burden the House or even the public. You really do not need to deal with the issue of how often do the Court of

Appeal Judges sit. You know you have not dealt with all these issues but tried to create an impression.

The fact is that this is not as pejorative a position as the Honourable Member wishes to create.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy again pulled them up on the question of pensions when h6 was seeking to make the point that we are being unfair and unreasonable to the Judges. The truth is that they should get more pensions in this area.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: That is why the Honourable Member pulled you up last week. That is why he pulled you up last week.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Why have they come in to distort? In anticipation of lashes to come later, or what? Let it be understood, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, not physical lashes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not share lashes in here.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Verbal though. Let it be understood, Sir, that last week I made it very clear that I was not concerned about the pensions the Judges were getting. If I started to say something and they took it out of context without hearing me finish, it is a matter for them. It is clear that there is no quarrel about the Judges' pensions. It is fully tax free. There is no quarrel with that. If they had a misunderstanding, it is up there.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The truth is that you really do not know what you said last week.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to be saying that he has no quarrel with the Judges' pensions now and that he is satisfied with what they get, then I will leave the matter. All right. When you are dealing with Judges' pensions and conditions of employment generally, you have to remember, too, that we do not strictly follow the Westminster system as we call it. In the United Kingdom, I believe that Judges after retirement do not work anymore. Judges after retirement in Barbados work. The former Chief Justice is now presently Ambassador of Barbados to the United States and he gets a full salary and he gets his full pension. The other Judges of the Supreme Court of Barbados who have retired have done consultancy work and things of that kind. All right, you said that you are not quarrelling with pensions.

Asides

Hon. M. A. KING: The question has been raised, Mr. Speaker, about the desirability of appointing Judges from the private Bar. The point has been raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I did not say that that was missed. I will say what was mischievous and frivolous.

Asides

Hon. M. A. KING: I am about to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that that particular issue is not one which creates any difficulty with us. It is a position which we have always adopted that Judges should be appointed from the private Bar as well. We have no difficulty with that. That is a position I think with which we all agree. I suppose traditionally it has not been the easiest thing to do. The fact is that lawyers in private in this country traditionally have become very polarised politically. Those who have not been overly political have tended to be the people in the Public Service.

So that if there are lawyers in private practice who are willing to serve on the Bench and who qualify, we have no difficulty with that and we would welcome on this side the opportunity for having lawyers from the private Bar serving as Judges.

Asides

Hon. M. A. KING: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best Judges which we have had in this country has been the late Sir Deighton Ward, the late Governor-General of Barbados, who was recruited from the private Bar. He was an extremely good Judge. I have no difficulty and he was appointed during the Democratic Labour Party Administration.

So that I think all sides - when the Barbados Labour Party administration had the opportunity to appoint Judges, I mean they appointed a Judge from the Public Service as well. We do not quarrel with that. I think that we are at one.

Asides

Hon. M. A. KING: I know it is not the point. I am saying that we are at one. I agree with you. Do you not want me to agree with you that it is desirable where the candidates are available to appoint Judges from the private Bar? -

Now let me spend a moment, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this question of the Caribbean Court of Appeal. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas has made the point that he wishes to see the inbreeding and appointments to the judiciary stopped. I believe it was a failure to say.... Well look he does not want perhaps to see - I do not know, if I am wrong, you can correct me - a system of appointment of

Judges to the Caribbean Court of Appeal which would reflect political considerations only.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the Minister asked me to correct him if he got me wrong. What I was talking about was the inbreeding of the appointments to the Bench throughout the region from the Public Service to the Judicial Service rather than from the private Bar.

Hon. M. A. KING: Okay. You recognise it as a problem with the region. I accept that and I have no difficulty agreeing entirely with you on that.

In relation to the Caribbean Court of Appeal, Mr. Speaker, the point about what has been termed the Caribbean Division for the Privy Council has been addressed this morning. So I am not going to deal with that at any length except to say that as an issue it had been considered by the Attorneys General of the region when they considered this whole concept about the Caribbean 'Court of Appeal and they rejected out of hand the suggestion that we should use the device of the Division of the Court of Appeal of the Privy Council. There were a number of options which the Attorneys General considered. 12.50p.m.

Among those were the first option of maintaining the status quo as it existed, the option of creating a new court in the Commonwealth Caribbean to serve as a final appellate court for all those jurisdictions who wish to use it, the third option of continuing the link with the Privy Council with an enhanced involvement by Caribbean jurists either for the foreseeable future or as an interim step towards the ultimate emergence of a new court, and the final option considered was the abolition of the right of appeal to the Privy Council, leaving the highest existing domestic court as the final Court of Appeal in the judicial hierarchy.

The Attorneys General of the region examined those four options and came to the very considered opinion that CARICOM Governments should avoid the option of a transitional enhanced involvement by Caribbean jurists in the Privy Council as a step towards the ultimate emergence of a final appellate court. They favoured instead taking the immediate steps towards the definite and expeditious establishment of a Caribbean Court of Appeal as a final appellate court for the English speaking countries of the Caribbean. That has been the decision which the Attorneys General recommended to the Heads of Government and which the Heads of Government have accepted.

In relation to the methods of appointing Judges to the court, and I believe this is an area about which there has been some concern - it certainly was an area of concern to the Attorneys General of the region - it was agreed that the President of the Appeal Court would be appointed by the Heads of Government. The other members of the court would be appointed by a regional Judicial Service

Commission which would be constituted as follows: The President of the court, two Chairmen of the Judicial Service Commissions of the participating countries, the Chairman of one of the Public Service Commissions of the participating countries, the Secretary General of the Caribbean Community and a distinguished jurist appointed by the President of the court after consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Law of the University of the West Indies, and Principals of the regional law schools.

That is the method of appointment which has been agreed by the Heads and it is an attempt to take the whole thing out of the area of pure politics.

I hope that against that background there are no reservations about the establishment of a Caribbean court. Some of the countries of the region have difficulties about it because of their own internal constitutional arrangements, where they need referenda in their countries to secure the passage.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to have adequate time to deal with the Judicial Centre. The suggestion is made that we need a long term plan for the courts and the police, *et cetera*. A plan does exist, Mr. Speaker. I do not have enough time at this moment to give all the details of it, but if we are sticking closely to what we are talking about, the Judges, the Judicial Centre for sure is on stream. New accommodation will be provided for the Judges. I think everybody knows the location which we have in mind at the moment, at the corner of Country Road and Whitepark. It may not be an area which finds universal acceptance, but we think it is the best that can be done in the circumstances and in relation to the cost.

That Centre will house the Supreme Courts, the Judges' Chambers of course, the Supreme Court Registry, the Court Process Office and the Legal Services Commission. I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas knows all the details.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Architects have been appointed for the project already. The Architects appointed are Gillespie & Steel. The Structural Engineers have been appointed, Consulting Engineers Partnership. The Mechanical and Electrical Engineers have been appointed, A. DeB. Consultants Ltd., and the Quantity Surveyors, Ferdinand Hart & Leonard, have been appointed.

The Architects have already been having consultations with interested parties, like the Chief Justice, the Registrar and various other persons who are interested in the Centre, and are in the process of putting together a package for discussion.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas asked about the cost of the Centre. We are not in a position at this time to give a figure on the actual cost because the planning has not reached to the stage yet where the Quantity Surveyors and the Architects can come to any final figure on cost. Mr. Speaker, I assure the Honourable House that in the fullness of time full details of the proposed Centre will be brought to the House. Suffice it to say at this time that provision is being made for at least six Supreme Courts and two Courts of Appeal with all the attendant facilities. A couple more points I need to make, Mr. Speaker. I am very conscious of the time at my disposal. The Honourable Member for St. John raised an issue about criticism of courts, a point which has been raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as well, and the attitude which needs to be adopted to criticisms of the courts and of judgments and of public officials and things of that kind.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made the point about the need for laws to be amended to stop people from filing matters in court in order to stop comment. At the basis of the submission I suppose, Mr. Speaker, is, « some reference to the concept of matters *sub judice*. I think there is a misapprehension in this country to some extent about the extent to which you can deal with and talk about matters once they have been filed in court. I believe there is a misunderstanding that once a matter has been filed in the court that that for ever bars anyone from even mentioning it. That is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker. I do not have time to go into that at this moment and I do not propose to spend any time on it.

The area where I propose to spend a little time is in relation to the wider area of criticism. The Honourable Member for St. John has made the point that one is free to make comments about the courts and about judgments, and those comments may be even what has been described as rumbustious, may be very acerbic comments, provided they remain within the bounds of respect. The English Judges have commented on this at length. For instance, they make the point, and this is what we need to understand, that the authority and the reputation of the courts of this country are not going to depend on whether you shut up people from speaking about them or not. 1.00p.m.

It is going to depend on the quality of the judgments which they give, the way in which judges conduct themselves and the respect which the judges create for themselves in the community. And that point was underscored by a number of English Judges. For instance, Lord Justice Salmon as late as 1968 makes this point that:

"The authority and reputation of our courts are not so frail that their judgements need to be shielded from criticism.... Their judgements which can, I think, safely be left to take care of themselves, are often of considerable public importance. It is the inalienable

right of everyone to comment fairly upon any matter of public importance. This right is one of the pillars of individual liberty - freedom of speech, which our courts have always unfailingly upheld.¹¹

Lord Justice Edmund Davies in the same case makes the point that:

"The right to fair criticism is part of the birthright of all subjects of Her Majesty. Though it has its boundaries, that right covers a wide expanse, and its curtailment must be jealously guarded against. It applies to the judgements of the courts as to all other topics of public importance."

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: And Lord Justice Denning:

"Let me say once again that we will never use this jurisdiction...."

the jurisdiction of the court:

"... as a means to uphold our own dignity. That must rest on surer foundations. Nor will we use it to suppress those who speak against us. We do not fear criticism, nor do we resent it. For there is something far more important at stake. It is no less than freedom of speech itself. It is the right of every man in Parliament or out of it, in the Press or over the broadcast, to make fair comment, even outspoken comment, on matters of public interest. Those who comment can deal faithfully with all that is done in a court of justice."

And all of this is summed up, Mr. Speaker, in the judgement of Lord Atkin, unless you feel that because we have a colonial heritage we have to be different. Because there was a view in England, at one time expressed by Lord Morris in 1899 as follows, that:

"Courts are satisfied to leave to public opinion attacks or comments derogatory or scandalous to them. But it must be considered that in small colonies consisting principally of coloured populations, the enforcement in proper cases of committal for contempt of Court for attacks on the Court may be absolutely necessary to preserve in such a community the dignity of and respect for the Court."

I would hope that we....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: - Precisely - ... in Barbados have moved away from that, where we feel that if we comment on the courts that we are doing something wrong and that it

is necessary for the courts and for us to be under heavy manners, so to speak, because we are what this judge calls coloured populations living in small communities. I hope we have moved away from that and that we have reached that present state of the law as articulated by Lord Atkin when he said:

"But whether the authority and position of an individual judge, or the due administration of justice, is concerned, no wrong is committed by any member of the public who exercises the ordinary right of criticizing, in good faith, in private or public, the public act done in the seat of justice. The path of criticism is a public way: the wrong headed are permitted to err therein: Provided that members of the public abstain from imputing improper motives to those taking part in the administration of justice, and are genuinely exercising a right of criticism, and not acting in malice or attempting to impair the administration of justice,...."

in those circumstances: "...

they are immune."

And then this time hallowed sentence which he used which was referred to by the Honourable Member for St. John:

"Justice is not a cloistered virtue: she must be allowed to suffer the scrutiny and respectful, even though outspoken, comments of ordinary men."

Those sentiments, Mr. Speaker, have to be the guideline for us when we are dealing with the issue of criticism of the courts and of the judges and of the magistrates.

Criticism is permitted. It may be, as one of the judges said rumbustious, but the important thing is that it should not go beyond the bounds of respect.

I know I am out of time, Mr. Speaker. But I think this may be an appropriate point at which to end this contribution. I will have a lot more to say when a time is presented, on the full programme on the Ministry of Legal Affairs, in relation to the courts and the rehabilitation work which is being done on them in relation to the police stations.

And I would just draw to the attention of the House that we have recently appointed a Buildings Officer who is going to coordinate and supervise the whole programme of repairs and rehabilitation of the courts and of the police stations which we imagine will be in full swing towards the end of this calendar year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Aside.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE Mr.

CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and were passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 1.10p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Judges Remuneration and Pensions (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1989.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.40 p.m. today, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak, Sir.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 2.40 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.12p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas - No. 95.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 95, Sir, to ask the Minister responsible for Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development: Will the Minister please state:

1. What is Government's policy with respect to the employment of firms or companies for the purpose of carrying out building and/or construction works for Statutory Boards under his Ministry?
2. Whether the Child Care Board employs any particular firm or company to carry out building and or construction works on its behalf? *
3. If the answer to 2 above is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state the name of the said firm or company?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95 asked by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is as follows:

1. Government policy with respect to the employment of firms and companies for the purposes of carrying out building or construction work for Statutory Boards is to adopt the procedures set out at Part XII of the Financial Rules 1971 as amended. In addition, Cabinet has determined that notices inviting tenders for public contracts should include a clause stating that any company/business indebted to the National Insurance Scheme or to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue would only be considered for the award of contracts if such firm or company agrees with the Director of the National Insurance Scheme or the Commissioner of Inland Revenue on a programme for the satisfactory discharge of the outstanding obligations from the proceeds of the contract. 4K* -*
2. The Child Care Board tenders in accordance with government policy for contracts for building and/or construction works as stated in (1) above. The Board has used the services of several contractors to carry out mainly repairs and maintenance work valued at less than \$25,000. ***
3. The names of contractors used for repairs and maintenance are:

Anthony Hoad Associates Ltd.
Lawson W. Hooper Michael S.
Harewood Pativan Enterprises Inc.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any Supplementaries? The Honourable Member for St. George South, Parliamentary Question No. 105.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Question No. 105, Sir, to ask: Will Government state its policy in relation to the use of ^ ***

Government owned vehicles by Ministers of Government and whether this policy has changed since Government's assumption of office?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 105, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

In a statement to the House of Assembly by the Prime Minister on 23 February, 1988, the policy was stated. There has been no change in the policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any Supplementaries? End of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there be no objection, Private Members' Business, Order No. 2.

RESOLUTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES

Order No. 2 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution of no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the following Resolution and at the conclusion of my speech I would like to move its passing:

WHEREAS the agricultural sector of Barbados is faced with a deep financial and production crisis

AND WHEREAS the livelihood of hundreds of persons has been seriously compromised by this crisis

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has failed to institute policies to prevent, alleviate, arrest or reverse the serious decline in agricultural output

AND WHEREAS the incompetence of the Minister has placed the future of an entire sector of the economy of Barbados in jeopardy,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House has no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate shall begin by explaining what I believe is agriculture. It is the tilling of land, the growing of plants, and the rearing of animals, namely cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, poultry, et cetera. Genesis 3 clearly states, Sir, that man was ordered to eat the herb of the earth and to till the field for his survival. You

see, Sir, agriculture shall always be the lifeblood of our existence and that is why everyone in charge of agriculture in every country on this earth gives it their undivided and ever careful attention except, of course, our Minister of Agriculture.

Laughter.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, by his incompetence, non-performance, indifference, and his total disregard for the well being of the people of this country, I shall show that the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries clearly lacks the temperamental gift and business acumen demanded by this role.

Sir, history is replete with repetition. The dissolution of the monasteries in England in 1536 which saw the conversion of arable land into pasture caused that country in a very short time to be a country of beggars. I was a master at history in my time.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: So too, will the Minister's blatant disregard for our agriculture, if permitted to go unchecked, land us in a similar situation. Oh, how I wish we could have a historical repetition of centuries ago of one like that proposed by the great Roman Senator Tiberius Gracchus of 133 in his agrarian reform. This is what he had to say to the Romans: "Living in squalor in the city, the unemployed and starving are made worse than useless and are a menace to the state. We are called the masters of the world, but you have not a foot of ground to call your own."

At the moment, we are losing more than a thousand acres a year to active arable farming which, if you are not vigilant, in the twinkling of an eye will be planted with houses. The Minister's only interest in arable land is to plant houses preferably in blocks, concrete, and steel. 2.50 p.m.

He sure knows how to cut up land, Sir, not with plough and harrow but with chain and theodolite.

I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries which firm does the land surveying for ADC. I want the truth and nothing but the truth, lest I may have to resort to documentation.

Without a positive agricultural policy Barbados will be losing a vital economic factor in the form of much needed foreign exchange through export and foreign exchange saved by producing locally up to half of the \$170 million of imported food. There was a time when we could boast that we could feed ourselves. Today we cannot say it. We have the land lying idle, overrun with bush and weeds while 23,000 of our people are unemployed. Let these same unemployed who have an interest in agriculture call a few

acres of Government land their own. We have the Belle, Fairy Valley, Coverley, Graeme Hall, Groves, Haggatt, River, plus several agricultural stations, and these are just a few. Why not establish suitable co-operatives for these unemployed and starving and give them seed money and let us feed ourselves?

It is time that the Democratic Labour Party put their hands where their mouths are and raise the living standards of the under-privileged. Mr. Speaker, I would like those on the other side to understand that the advancement of poor private persons will be to the advantage of the public.

Now this morning, Sir, there was a discussion on Judges' salaries and all kind of things about Judges.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have to caution the Honourable Member. You cannot reflect on any vote. Lest you get to that stage, I am just cautioning you.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I only want to make a reference, Sir. I want to know when will we be discussing the agricultural workers' salaries and wages, whether it be a worker, a bookkeeper, a truck driver or a plantation manager.

Mr. Speaker, the DLP Manifesto of 1986, page 10, item 7(d) states "demonstration plots and other devices (will be) designed to expose small farmers to new appropriate plant varieties and to new techniques in fertiliser application and pest control." I would like to know from the Minister when therefore shall this thing be. Seeing that I am getting on in age, I wonder if it will happen during the lifetime of the present Democratic Labour Party.

The most modern up to date technology is held secret, resting in files at the Ministry of Agriculture unavailable to farmers. The words "agronomics" and "soil management" are like a foreign language to farmers. This information is withheld, for whatever reason, while a large technical staff remains idle, without aim or direction. By now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture was on the ball, every farmer would know what his land is best suited to produce.

Now, the 1988 Economic Report lists some decreases in agricultural production. Sugar is one, cotton, onions - well peanuts was 100% - yams, sweet potatoes, beets, pumpkins, cucumbers, cabbage, pork, beef, mutton and eggs. Sugar has always been the mainstay of our agriculture, and that is in decline. Our soil is heavily dependent on sugar cane for protection and sugar is also a foreign exchange earner.

The Right Honourable Prime Minister is reported to have said in the daily paper of Monday, 17th July, which was yesterday, that the Minister is being blamed because rain did not fall. Listen to these statistics, Sir. Sugar in 1984

100.4 thousand tonnes, we got 53.3 inches of rain. In 1985 100.2 thousand tonnes, 53.1 inches of rain. In 1986 111.1 thousand tonnes, 44.8 inches of rain. In 1987 83.4 thousand tonnes, 45.7 inches of rain. In 1988 80.3 thousand tonnes, 56.7 inches of rain.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! May I have order, please! You do not have to appeal to me, I will handle the situation. I am going to warn Honourable Members very early that I will be using one of the most effective rules in this Chamber to control interruptions. I will lose my patience if I allow members to speak freely and others do not allow others to speak as they have been requested to do. Such a member will know where to find himself. I can quote the rule for you and I do not want any more interruptions.

Speak on.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Sir, if you look at the rain pattern of Barbados, it is consistent. Our rain starts to fall heavily in the sugai cane planting season - June, July, August, September - then it starts to fall off in November. Whether we get 56 inches or 44 inches, that is the pattern.

Another misleading statement by the Right Honourable Prime Minister. "From the beginning of Barbados as a colony there have been problems with agriculture." It would appear that the Prime Minister is not too well acquainted with the island's history. Early in our history these were the crops tried - cotton, tobacco, aloes - and from the introduction of sugar cane Barbados' agriculture went ahead by leaps and bounds. There was a time when Barbados was called the garden of the Caribbean, the garden of the West Indies, and there was also a time in our history when Barbados was called the richest British possession in the Americas. This included the Caribbean, South America, Central America and North America, including the great giant, U.S. of A. Any of you can contradict that. You can read it from *The Development of the British West Indies*. Try and buy the book. It might be out of print now but you will still get a copy from W. Heffer & Sons, London.

Sugar production for 1989 was 66,263 tonnes, the lowest in 48 years. We have no sugar for the world market and we had to reduce molasses to 13,000 tonnes below our contractual market, which we only managed to preserve by the wisdom of the sugar producers, by keeping stocks to deal with this matter of shortfall. 3.00 p.m.

The sugar industry now, Sir, is asking for \$1 250. But if the Minister had any serious interest in agriculture, instead of offering \$950, he would offer them \$1 000. There was a time in this country when king sugar paid for

everything. And I am of the view, that if at some time you contribute to something, when you are down and out the other people should respond accordingly.

Asides:

Mr. E. BOURNE: Dairy farmers. The dairy farmers for five years were trying to get an increase in price. Only last year they were offered 3 cents per kilo by the Minister. After a study was done indicating they needed an increase of 24 cents to break even, it was later revised. And the Minister gave 70 cents leaving them with a shortfall of 20 cents to cover costs.

Now how do you expect these people to live? Do you want them to go and pick wilts? The only people who know about picking wilts are the people from the sea coast, and the numbers of wilts are scarce.

I should like to know, Sir, why are the dairy farmers mistreated? Is it because of vested interest? The pig farmers are crying out, the importation of pork, high cost of feed, no market for their pigs. The beef farmers are crying out, high cost of feed, no grazing land, no markets for the beef because of import licences. The sheep farmers, the same thing, imported mutton, expensive feed. A farmer told me the other day, after six months he can only make \$5 on a sheep, so he has to give up.

There was a lot of talk about an abattoir to cater to the farmers. I, who have the interest of my constituents at heart and the country as a whole at heart, got a study done of an abattoir that would suit Barbados. The cost is \$1.25 million. It can handle 3 cattle or 20 pigs or 20 sheep in an hour. In addition to that, the study also gave me a by-product plant which will handle the offal from the pigs and the waste from the sheep in order to make fish meal, animal feed and that type of thing. This plant is self-contained..

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: From the fish. You know what I mean. From the fish. Behave. Take it easy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard any asides. If you respond to asides then I will have the whole exercise withdrawn or removed from the Record. I am not hearing asides.

' Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: This plant can cope with a live animal and end up with all kinds of packaging. It is a complete plant. You can have everything done at the plant all in the same process.

Now these are the things that the Minister of Agriculture should be looking at, if he wanted to do

something for the country and if he wanted to do something for the agricultural industry.

He talked a lot about feed for animals. Cassava for years was used as animal feed. I remember as a boy when S. P. Musson & Son was the sole exporter of cassava starch in Barbados. There was a gentleman from Bridgetown called Murphy. He used to travel to Silver Sands, all over Below Rock and Parish Land and those areas buying cassava flour to feed animals.

He should embark on a programme which would produce enough animal feed to save us the necessary foreign exchange in trying to buy expensive animal feed, and then he would be doing something for the farming community.

Guinea corn which was used for years at all the dairies in Worthing, Peronne - well they have a fancy name for it now, sorghum and all those things, but it is still guinea corn. A rose by any other name is still a rose. Proper grazing land should be provided for farmers. This the Minister has shut his eyes against. Extension Officers, we do not see them any more. Some of them report to me they do not travel because they do not get travelling allowance so they do not travel. You cannot travel without travelling allowance. And irrigation. They talk about the Springhall Scheme in their Manifesto, they would like to have more Springhall projects. Could you imagine 400 acres of land and they only have two wells to supply this land with water? It is ridiculous. That is why the people at Springhall are having a hard time. And those fellows who manage to get out have to throw their produce away because there is no market for them. BMC cannot handle them and ADC which is another marketing agency cannot handle them. And do you know why?

The people are fighting among themselves. This guy does not want to do that, the other guy does not want to do that. And the Minister is standing looking on idly by. The DLP presented a Manifesto promising the world for agriculture. The PM says it is nothing to do with that, it is the rain. The pigs did not get wet but pork has fallen off.

The cows did not get wet but beef still fell off. The sheep did not get wet, mutton fell off. Rabbits cannot get wet because they will fall sick and die. So the rabbit farm has never started. All the talk from the Minister about rabbit farming. And you know, fish is always wet and we are getting less and less.

Mr. Speaker, that is the measure of the incompetence of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture. Agricultural failure or success is highly dependant in

Barbados on the efficiency of Government It is within the power of Government to determine for better or for worse the following vital areas:

Land use policy, that is, subdivision of agricultural land or other purposes.

Credit to industry through the Barbados National Bank.

Interest rates.

Marketing.

Price guarantees.

Abattoir facilities.

. Import licences. Well the public knows about these import licences, so I would not elaborate on that at all.

Law and order in relation to praedial larceny. They talked a lot about that and nothing was done.

Taxation policies.

Price supports.

Debt management.

Transport cost.

International agreements, like fisheries - the Agreement with Guyana where it does not profit anybody in Barbados who can catch a fish. The range of our boats is too small and that was just a good waste of time.

Credit policies for fishermen. The point I am making, Sir, is that the Government and the Minister in particular have all the instruments at their disposal to improve agriculture. And he has been a miserable failure. The worst Minister since the introduction of Ministerial Government in this country.

I am therefore demanding, in the interest of the nation, the removal of the Minister from office for the damage done by his incompetence and his conduct - which, if I get the time to demonstrate I would show is not consistent with those standards of propriety which the public of Barbados demands. The Minister of Agriculture is what I will refer to as an obstructive agent of good administration.

I should like to get home, Sir. And you know, my address on agriculture is never complete, except I get home, and that is in the sea, Sir. So I will have to get my notes here to give him a little tickling on the sea. We were promised by the Minister about the Trinidad Agreement in June. I should like to know from him, which June? June 2010? I would be dead and all of us would be dead. 3.10p.m.

Asides

Mr. E. BOURNE: Naturally from starvation, Sir. Oistins jetties, lights, and fendering still need fixing, Sir. All the boats are falling apart and what made it worse was this. Could you imagine the fishermen at Oistins had to

contribute to what we call a tarpaulin muster? This body will come up with 50 cents and the other guy with a dollar to buy piping and a tap to get water at the Oistins jetty. The Minister of Agriculture, although he went down there at one time and seeing the condition of the place, refused to look after that Well, they are people from Christ Church East and East Central. They are just barefoot fishermen so the Minister could not care less. The time is coming when you . will have to answer to these barefoot people who are being neglected not too far away, in less than 2 years away if so long.

The new Fisheries Complex - the staff at the new Fisheries Complex had been hand picked by the Minister and not a man from Bridgetown. The thing that hurts is that they knew not a shark from a dolphin or flying fish from a king fish. When you go in there, all they do is waste your time. They cannot reckon. They cannot manage the scales. They cannot do anything.

Asides

Mr. E. BOURNE: Now this is something that I do not unders^nd. He has brought a fisherman here to train our fishermen. I would like to know from him what he has done for the 3 years that he was here. How much did our fishermen benefit? Talk to any of the fishermen and they will tell you.

I understand and I have checked it out myself that there is a plant going up at Fairy Valley to can vegetables. Work is being done up there by a company by the name of Summit and I would like to know from the Minister this. I did not see any tender advertised in the newspaper. I would like to know from the Minister if he knows about this company whose name is Summit. I understand that the registration of Summit - let me see where it is, Sir - is Franklin House, Wildey. That is the registered office of Summit Construction and they are doing ADC work and the Minister is responsible for ADC. I think that means Agricultural Development Corporation. He is the Minister. I want to know from him about this Summit Construction. I feel that everybody in this country should have a fair share at tendering whether you get the contract or not. I would not want to say that it is a conflict of interest, but I would like to know. As regards the Democratic Labour Party, wherever there is interest in the Democratic Labour Party, there is always conflict.

Asides

Mr. E. BOURNE: You can understand that at the new Fishing Complex scrapped tires were used for the fendering. Would you believe that they were bought at \$20.00 a piece, when you can go at all the tire people around here and get them for free? They will pay you to take them away. They were purchased at \$20.00 a piece for

the new Fisheries Complex... old scrapped tires. I want the Minister to tell me why this was done.

When you come to licensing, you get all kinds of relatives holding licenses for the importation of vegetables. One of my constituents, when I was on the other side, came to me on a Saturday and I was very mad, too, because I had a couple of drinks and I wanted to sleep. He said, "Skipper, I know you are sleeping. I am mad with you." I said, "What is wrong?" He said, "Well, I went to the Minister of Agriculture. I am trying my best. I gave up my job and I am trying with agriculture. I went to him and told him the problems that I am having in selling my produce, because the produce is coming in from Guyana and they are underselling me." He said that. Anytime you can bring me as a witness. He asked me what did I expect and if I did not want the people in Guyana to live too. Can you imagine the Minister of Agriculture telling a Barbadian that he would like to give the Guyanese preference over us for the produce and he is talking about helping agriculture?

I would like to know from the Minister who get these licenses to bring cabbages along with white flies into Barbados. White flies are a big menace now and I have been told by some authority that it will be very, very difficult for us to get rid of the white fly menace. This is all due to his incompetence.

I would like to know why the ice at the new Fisheries Complex is more expensive to the people who are using it than ice sold at commercial places outside. I want answers on that.

I would like to know why fishermen who operate near the Flour Mill can operate as they like and send to the Government any figure they like. There is no supervision. There is no scrutiny. I want answers on that. I want to know who own Fish of Barbados too. The law clearly states that you cannot sell fish within a 2 mile area of a fish market and Fish of Barbados is less than 2 miles. I want to know why all of this is allowed to happen. Mr. Minister, whenever you get up to make your reply, I want these questions answered.

Now there was a boat which was thrust upon us for experimental fishing in longlining. Well, some fishermen complained about the boat's name and the registration number. I know he had to get a boat and I could not care less where he got the boat from. I want to know why are we spending all this money on this experiment and the money spent cannot compensate for the amount of fish caught, and we are paying a very high price for the boat rental. Mr. Minister, I want to know why. I want to know why you refused, Mr. Minister, the offer from the USA and Canada of training for our fishermen and you undertook to go to England. It is a proven fact, because when you go fishing and you do not bring back fish, you are not a fisherman. Get that straight. Guys in their pleasure boats go out on

weekends and you see them in the newspaper 'holding dolphins and all kinds of fish and this master fisherman, he is called, cannot bring back one to Barbados. So something has got to be wrong with him. Well, fish do not look into a boat to see who is throwing over a line. They bite any line that go over as long as the conditions are right.

I want to know what he is doing here. What is wrong with him. Where did you find him, Mr. Minister. Whenever you get up to answer me, I want those answers.

The Guyanese built the jetty at Oistins and here it is the Minister of Agriculture cannot get anybody to repair it, although I gave him the name of a contractor who would do it as requested by him and a list of necessary materials. I mean, if he did not want him, it is all right with me. It was nothing to do with me. I was just helping him out in the way I thought fit, but my contention is this. If the Guyanese built the market, surely the same Guyanese should be able to repair the fendering at the market. It is only greenheart and some old tires, Sir. It is no big job, just greenheart and tires. He has waited until almost all the tires have fallen off. One of the cubicles where you walk across now is broken almost in half and the fork-truck is getting a difficult time to pass. I am sure that in another couple of months you will not be able to use the Oistins jetty at all. Mr. Minister, I want you to get up and do something.

There was a time when he talked boldly about going to Windward of Barbados, and by that I mean the South East side, Sir. If my marine jargon confuses you a bit, you can ask me for an explanation. He was talking about going up there with the Coast Guard to do exploratory fishing. I want to know from you, Mr. Minister, what have you done about that. I am saying this to you, as an honest man, that that would have been a good thing had you continued with it. 3.20 p.m.

But, you see, you are indecisive, you are incompetent, and like I said you are an obstructionist to good administration.

Swells in the North Atlantic start ten degrees north of the Equator. I am going to educate you in marine technology. Barbados is approximately 13 degrees north. That makes a difference of 3 degrees. Every degree is 60 miles, so 3 by 60 is 180 miles. You only have to go out 180 miles. You were on the right track, but incompetence prevented you from doing what you were supposed to do. Perhaps some fellow whom you believe knows it all had advised you against that, but you were right. Commonsense will tell you that no Japanese or Taiwanese would travel ;ui these thousands of miles to come in the same area to waste time. It v ould have to be profitable, otherwise they would not be arc und there.

This fishing agreement, Mr. Speaker. On May 24, 1989 the Prime Minister of this country initialled - as they say, I was not here - this agreement but did not sign with Guyana and it is left for the Minister of Agriculture to finish this. I am saying to you, Sir, that is a farce. Anybody with any iota of commonsense would know that our 44 foot boats cannot cover a distance of almost 600 miles one way. No. 2, various types of fish call for different types of fishing equipment. Our boats are not fitted out for that type of fishing. No. 3, the ice capacity will be too small. Even if they had somebody to stop by and give them fuel, the fish would spoil before they get back to Barbados. But here it is, an agreement was signed, we will have five trawlers, we are paying them U.S. \$5,000 per trawler for six months. We have 82 ice boats and I would like to know from the Minister which of the five will get a licence to fish in Guyana, because I will want one for mine. That is a waste of time. You are just laughing at the people, you are laughing at the fisherfolk.

What you should do, in all fairness to the people of Barbados, is to go to Trinidad and demand a proper agreement from them. This is what I do not understand about the average Bajan administrator. He cannot go to Trinidad and demand an agreement, but the Trinidadian footballers can come here, run back home, say all kinds of things about us and we will try to give them satisfaction. Do you call that representation? I was not trained that way. That is poor representation. I am saying to you, Sir, that you must let Trinidad know that if they want to use us we will have to be in a position to use them.

Something has happened to a Barbadian fishing boat. You are going to laugh until Christmas when I tell you. This Barbadian fishing boat, named the King's Art, went down to Trinidad to collect some fish for one of the fish processors. The police boat in Trinidad damaged the King's Art and do you know what was the result? The Trinidadians told them they were not paying for it, they would have to bring the lumber from Barbados to Tobago in order to get it repaired in Tobago. Mr. Minister, you cannot tell me you do not know about that. You know about it. What have you done, Sir? I want the answers. Like I have said several times, fishing is nearest and dearest, to me. I want the answers.

Licences have been issued to certain people to bring fish from around the world here. They claim they bring the fish out of season - one tonne, two tonnes, five tonnes, whatever the amounts - but nobody has ever bothered to check to see whether they bring 50 or 100 tonnes. Mr. Minister, why do these things happen? I want answers. You cannot tell me you do not know.

In your Manifesto you talk about fish farming. The US AID people went here and spent a lot of money in St. Andrew with tilapia. That project fell apart as soon as the

Peace Corps left. What are you going to do about that? My good friend, the Honourable representative for St Andrew should be making a noise about that, because if it was me it would be hell-o-hell. I too would want a lot of these things for my people, but I am asking you, what has become of that project?

During the last bad weather - you cannot say this is a lie - you personally supervised the lifting of the boats down at the Harbour and the price was \$150. When they were ready to go back in, the price became \$300 and no receipts were given. I would like to know from you if you know about it, and if you do not know about it, carry out a very serious investigation so that this will not happen again. It is ridiculous and unfair.

When you put all these things together the poor fishermen and boat owners will be at a disadvantage, because they are in no position to add these prices on to the fish. That is dead money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member has been speaking in excess of his time. I would think that in that circumstance I will ask him to wind up. I will also afford the Minister or the person on the other side who will be replying to your presentation similar time. In the circumstances I will give you about three minutes to wind up.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, three minutes is quite a short time for me to say what I would like to say, so I will wind up and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the Resolution and reserve my right to speak. 3.30p.jn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand you reserve your right to speak. In that case....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has already indicated he will reserve his right to speak so I will give the Minister....

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I sat and I listened for a long time to the Honourable Member for Christ Church East as he went through what he thought was the litany of woes in the agricultural sector to justify the Resolution brought by himself and Members of his party. And I want to deal with the things he posed, as I made a note of them, starting from the beginning and then dealing with the subject.

Mr. Speaker, in his first presentation, the first thing he talked about was that he described agriculture as tilling of land, the growing of plants and rearing of animals, and he subsequently added fishing in the longrun. He posed a series of questions which I will get out of the way very early and then deal with him.

The last question he posed was whether or not I knew that the boat owners were charged \$300 when the boats were being lifted in. No, I did not know. I knew the boat owners were charged \$150 when they were being lifted out because it was brought to my attention that there was only one piece of equipment available at that time. We were expecting bad weather. The boat owners were querying whether or not they themselves wanted to take their boats out. Some opted to leave their boats inside, others decided they would come out. The price was tolled and those who decided that they would come out, they were lifted out. I know of it. I would enquire about the putting back price of \$300 because I know nothing about that one.

The second one he posed was the licence to bring fish into Barbados. I am very glad to be able to supply him with information. I can make it a document of the House; it contains all of the persons who were allowed to bring fish into Barbados from the time I became Minister. And, Mr. Speaker, this can become a document of the House.

In 1986, the persons were: Jonathan Morgan 20 000

Ibs Atlantic Fishmongers 20 000 kg Challenor Jones

12 000 kg National Fisheries Ltd. 50 000 Ibs. Some of

the others that have been added on to that are:

Barbados Fishing Co-op Society, Atlantic Fishmongers, National Fisheries Ltd., a Henry Barrow, Shamrock Trading Co., Fins & Fathoms, Lloyd E. Wood, a J. Tudor, Hanschell Inniss, Shane Julien, BELCAR, Shamrock Trading, J.R. Seafood, Terrence Thorpe.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure behind this is that during the off season between July and October, people apply to the Ministry of Trade for licences, the Ministry of Trade then seeks our advice. We look back over the last three years to see the quantity of fish that was used and we allocate licences in keeping with that quantity of fish. That is the procedure that has been adopted since I became Minister and is the procedure that we will adopt for that time. So that takes care of the licences for the fish.

The Barbadian fishing boat that has been damaged -1 got a letter on my desk about three days ago seeking the Ministry's assistance through its diplomatic Ministry to bring about a satisfactory solution. This letter has been passed to my PS and he is dealing with that.

The Fishing Agreement, Mr. Speaker, with Guyana calls for 10 boats, 5 Barbadian boats and 5 boats up to about 80 feet long. The reason it was so was because we were aware of the fact that there were very few Barbadian boats that would make any sense to go down to Guyana and come back up. We decided that the Agreement would allow us to have 5 lease boats up to 80 feet long. One of the stimulations is that they must fly the Barbadian flag. They would all accompany each other to Guyana, they would fish, the Barbadian smaller boats would remain fishing down there and the bigger boats would alternate in bringing back the fish to Barbados.

The difficulty to date with that has been that the 'Agreement stipulates that the boats must fly the Barbados flag and because of some international problems with the changing of flags, we have not been able, to date, to satisfactorily make arrangements for the 5 boats to fly the Barbadian flag. We are having discussions with boat owners in Canada and boat owners in America and as soon as a satisfactory arrangement has been worked out to allow them to fly the Barbados flag, we would then carry out that Agreement with Guyana.

We are looking long-term and there is an accompanying form between BMC and an American company looking at the long-term arrangement of buying 2 or 3 bigger boats. The Agreement would come into effect as soon as we are able to meet the requirement and get into the Guyana waters. That Agreement is for six months, in the first instance.

So the Ministry was very aware of the fact that the present fleet of Barbadian boats would not be able to do it. You have to understand there was a short-term arrangement in an emergency because of the continuing discussions with Trinidad and Tobago. And therefore, that was intended by Guyana to serve a short-term purpose. We are having discussions on a longer policy for Guyana.

Coast Guard, Mr. Speaker. We discussed this with the Coast Guard and because of the limited amount of boats available to them, they could not pull a boat out at that time. However, Barbadian fishermen in convoys have been going to the East. The catch they experienced has not been substantially greater than what they have had and therefore, we decided not to go on that any further. I still intend, at the appropriate time, when arrangements can be made satisfactorily with the Coast Guard to try that experiment. Also training for fishermen, I am not aware of that. I will seek to find out and let this House know at some time.

Fish of Barbados. As I say, I cannot tell you who owns Fish of Barbados. I can tell you who contact us when they come on their usual business for Fish of Barbados. There is a Mr. Morgan and there is a Mr. Stoute. These are the two persons who contact the Ministry, in their usual every day business like anybody else, when they are trying to have their licences processed.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: They are Barbadians. As far as I know, they are Barbadians.

White Flies in Barbados, Mr. Speaker. My technical people tell me that White Flies have been in Barbados for some time now. They also tell me that because of the fact that the chemicals they used before were removed because most of them were too toxic, and they are now using one with lower toxicity, that the White Flies have built up a kind of resistance to it. The technical people are working on it. I am satisfied they have been able to bring about some type of control over the White Fly situation and they would continue to work on that, along with other pest diseases in Barbados.

Licensing of importation of vegetables. I also took the time out to satisfy my friends on the other side about this, and this too, I am going to make a document of the House. The arrangement for importation of vegetables is the same thing. The people apply to the Ministry of Trade. The Ministry of Trade in turn consults with the Ministry of Agriculture on the quality and we make our recommendation....

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: ... based on the availability. We always consult with the Barbados Agricultural Society and sometimes with BSI before we grant these licences. And then we ourselves in house do our own surveys to make sure that it would not put the Barbadian farmer at a disadvantage. As I say, I am going to make this a document of the House. People who were granted licences from the 25/2/1987 down to the 13/12/1988 with the last one issued by the Barbados Marketing Corporation. 3.40p.m.

Some of the names which I will go through very quickly are: R. L. Seale & Co. Ltd., Rafix Mehter, James Steward, Terrence Thorpe, Malini Lai, Elliott Enterprises, Kings Agro Food Ltd., Ramona Eastmond, French Trading Co., Sylvester Cumberbatch, Norman Matthias, Marilyn Barry, Yvonne Sandiford, Winston Gibbons, Sylvia London, Pamela St. John, Shamrock Trading, Big 'B' Supermarket, East West, Doriel Trotman, Eion Sealy, Junior Hensford, Kings Agro Foods, Richard Eastmond,

Terrence Trotman, George Fruit Depot, Harriet Reid, Tony Walcott, East West International, Beaulah Grant, Barbados Marketing Corporation and this, too, can be made a document of the House.

Mr. Speaker, once again the procedure is very straight. The licenses are applied for at the Ministry of Trade. The Ministry of Trade consults with us and we send our recommendation back to the Ministry of Trade which issues the licence.

The Fisheries Complex, Mr. Speaker. The staff was recruited for the Fisheries Complex the same as staff is recruited throughout the Government Service. Staff throughout the Government Service is recruited through the Chief Personnel Officer from those persons who make application and the Bridgetown staff was done in a similar light.

Now that you are talking about the Bridgetown staff, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a little time out to spend on Bridgetown. Mr. Speaker, we have spent millions of dollars to build the Bridgetown Complex. Since we have built the Bridgetown Complex, Mr. Speaker, there have been at least 5 attempts at sabotage of the Bridgetown Complex. Let me repeat. Since we have built the Bridgetown Complex, there have been at least 5 attempts at sabotage of the Bridgetown Complex and I want to go back to a very serious matter. During the time, a meeting was held on June 19, 1989 on the request of the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers and it was in order to thrash out the problems with a few members of the staff who work at the older hospital. At that meeting, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. Brathwaite, the Deputy Permanent Secretary, was the Chairman of the meeting. The other members of the staff were Mr. Maynard, who is the Senior Personnel Officer, Mr. Bynoe our Personnel Officer, Mr. Colin Evans our Senior Superintendent for Markets, Mr. Hinckson, the Administrative Officer, Mr. J. Goddard the General Secretary of NUPW, and Mr. Sealy of the NUPW. During the meeting, Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, let me make the point again. I have allowed the Member who introduced the Resolution to speak without any interruptions. I, therefore, expect Members to allow the other Members to do so.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: During the meeting, Mr. Speaker, and I refer to the Minutes of that meeting in Paragraph 10, Mr. Goddard went on to say:

"The union was not asked to advise on the proposed hours of operation" and that sometimes the only way to bring attention to problems was by sabotage.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Goddard went on to say:

"The union was not asked to advise on the proposed hours of operation" and that sometimes the only way to bring attention to problems was by sabotage."

Mr. Brathwaite warned about the use of emotive language. Mr. Hinckson was then called upon to give the meeting the results of his contacts with the Markets Personnel. Despite the warning by Mr. Brathwaite, Mr. Goddard repeated the word "sabotage".

As a result of that, Mr. speaker, when it was brought to my attention, I was very disturbed because within days of this meeting we had some serious attempts at sabotage at the new Fisheries Complex. The first attempt at sabotage was that we have some lifting cranes that carry a hydraulic fluid in them. The Officers went one morning and found that the caps were taken off and all of them were filled with water. We subsequently had to seal them and put a special lock on them.

The second one, Mr. Speaker, was that the ice maker which is nearly worth about \$5 million has a very sensitive switch and only persons who know of the switch would know that, and we found one day that the persons got into the ice maker and tampered with the switch. Luckily, for the Complex and the Government of Barbados, the electrical engineer the next day himself went to restart the ice maker and saw the attempt to sabotage, and reported it and fixed it too.

The third Aye had, Mr. Speaker, is that the navigational lights that lead into the harbour, which you can only get to either by swimming or by a boat or going along the jetty that leads to it, were not burning and, when we discovered, the electrical cables were all severed and cut.

I instructed the officer in charge to report the matter to the police. As a result, I felt it was a serious enough matter that we should have brought it to the attention of the President of the National Union of Public Workers and my P. S. wrote this letter and addressed it to Mr. Nigel Harper, President:

"Dear Sir,

Mr. Joseph Goddard of the National Union of Public Workers sought a meeting to discuss conditions of employment for employees of the Bay Street and Cheapside Fish Markets in anticipation of they being re-assigned to Bridgetown Fisheries Complex where conditions of work are different, principally, in respect to the requirement to work on Sundays and public

holidays on a rotation basis. The meeting took place by mutual agreement on Monday, 1989-06-19 at 10:00 a.m., and was chaired by the Deputy Permanent Secretary.

This letter serves not as a report on that meeting but to bring to your attention the following incident which occurred during the meeting.

Mr. Goddard, after stating that the Union had not been asked to advise on transitional arrangements for staff, particularly the hours of operation, remarked that sometimes the only way to bring attention to problems was by sabotage.

The Chairman of the meeting cautioned Mr. Goddard on the rather strong and emotive use of the word "sabotage" and Mr. Goddard confirmed his awareness that he was using strong language and reiterated the sentiment.

the incident has been the subject of serious internal discussion, all the more since -

(i) it was made in the presence of two junior staff members for whom Mr. Goddard had requested permission to be present at the meeting;

(ii) by coincidence or otherwise, a number of recent incidents have occurred at the Bridgetown Fishing Complex which have aroused our suspicion.

This Ministry has always viewed the NUPW as a serious and responsible Union and would wish to continue doing so. The remarks of the kind reported above give rise to serious concern. I have been asked to bring the above to your attention and to seek your assurance that sabotage is not a course of action advocated by the NUPW.

Yours faithfully,
Permanent Secretary"

We have not got a reply from that letter as yet from the National Union of Public Workers. 3.50p.m.

Oistins jetty, Mr. Speaker, lights and fendering. We have repaired on more than one occasion the lights at Oistins jetty and within two weeks of the repairs to those lights all 16 of them were working. The last time it was reported they were down to four. I have issued instructions again to once again check the lights, and we can only do that every time to see if the lights are working.

Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions we have tried to get people to do the Tendering. We have finally been able to get Willie Hassell from the diving team to do the tendering and at last we have got that going on. It has been brought to my attention that there could possibly be some structural problem on the jetty and I have instructed Mahy and Chadderton to do the necessary inspection and to report to the Ministry to carry out the necessary repairs on the jetty.

The Trinidad Agreement, Mr. Speaker, discussions are continuing. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has taken over the lead in these discussions and at the appropriate time the Minister will report to this House. I can only say that we have been having ongoing discussions at the ministerial level and we have reasons to believe that there has been some movement from the last position. We cannot obviously discuss our negotiations at this time, but the negotiations are going on and we are hopeful that we will have a satisfactory agreement fairly shortly with Trinidad and Tobago.

The next matter is price support. Let me spend a little time on this matter of price support. Mr. Speaker, the whole area of price support started in 1982 when the industry fund from that year's crop realised only \$742 a tonne. The year before, 1981, the industry fund was \$828 a tonne. Having only realised \$742 a tonne, the industry approached the Government of the day for some type of mechanism in order to make up the industry fund to pay the farmers a bit more. The 1982-85 price support that was introduced by the then administration at that time sought to expand the tonnage of sugar and it was so geared to expand up to 130,000 tonnes of sugar for that. As a result the price support had conditions which said that if the industry expanded its price, et cetera, it could be converted to loans. The sugar industry people then introduced a pricing system by which they paid farmers in the least viable areas for sugar cane higher prices - this is the low rainfall areas - than those in the higher rainfall areas to encourage those on marginal lands to put their lands in sugar in order to meet that expanded quota of 130,000 tonnes.

Those broadly were the parameters of the 1982-85 price support. In 1982 the industry fund was \$172, the price support was \$193, which allowed the industry to have a final fund of \$935 and that price support was \$17 million. In 1983 the industry fund was slightly higher, \$755. You had a price support of \$10 million which allowed the industry average price to be \$872 per tonne.

In 1984 the industry fund slid even further to \$704 a tonne, there was a price support of \$15 million, which allowed the industry to get \$854 a tonne. In 1985 the industry fund was \$716 a tonne, there was a price support of \$20 million which allowed the industry to pay \$916 a tonne. The price support then changed from 1986 onward. From 1985 the price support conditions changed when the Government of the day made a decision to reduce the sugar

to about 90,000 tonnes, and that was against the background of meeting the preferential markets plus the domestic markets, plus a small percentage, because at that time the price of sugar on the world market was so low that we were losing a tremendous amount of money on world market sugar, and therefore it was a conscious decision of the Government of the day in 1985 to reduce the limit to 90,000 tonnes, which this present administration has stuck

In 1986 the industry fund was \$679 a tonne and the support element was \$168, making the money available to the industry \$847. In 1987, because of the exchange rate being favourable to the Barbados dollar, the industry got from their own funds \$972, and I want to repeat, the industry got from their own funds \$972, and I can say that the industry in 1987 did not seek a price support. May I repeat that the industry in 1987, having received industry funds of \$972, did not seek a price support? I believe that was against the background of two things. One, in a Paper done by Walker and Hudson, they said that the industry was able to survive at the 1987 level of \$972 a tonne if the industry returned its yield to what was acceptable and what they had achieved before and introduced better management in the industry. This also, in my opinion, was confirmed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Barbados Sugar Industry Limited, in the person of a Mr. Errie Deane, in a letter that Mr. Deane wrote to Mr. McClean on 14-1-1987 - Mr. Wendell McClean who was then Chairman of the Barbados National Bank - and in that letter Mr. Deane, among other things, wrote:

"Scrutiny of the appropriate appendices will lead one to conclude production for contractual markets is viable in the circumstances outlined and conditional on the non-sugar crops being charged with their fair share of fixed overhead costs."

Mr. Deane was saying that he was of the view that production for contractual markets was viable, and I will say something about this later, because the contractual markets to which Mr. Deane was referring were 54,000 tonnes for the EEC, about 15,000 tonnes locally, and at that time there were about 8,000 tonnes on the U.S. market. He was saying that on 77,000 tonnes of sugar at those preferential prices the industry could survive. His words were: "The market is viable, the industry was viable."

In 1988 the industry received funds of \$996 a tonne and once again the industry did not apply for any price support. May I repeat? In 1988 the industry received funds of \$996 a tonne and the industry did not apply for any price support. 4.00p.m.

I need to spend some time to explain when and not what time price support is sought from the Ministry. The farmers of this country usually put in their first crop claim

in and around October. And it is usual that the final price is very seldom known until around November or thereabouts. And it is only when the final price is known, Mr. Speaker, that the industry applies for a price support

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that in all of those years that there was a price support the industry never knew until the month of December that they would have gotten any price support. But the industry in good faith and acting as good corporate citizens went ahead and planted their first crop in October. They plant in October.

So this year, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about the programme we have offered against that background. Let me repeat, price support was never intended to be a long-term solution. As a matter of fact, the former Minister of Agriculture made that very clear that price support was never intended to be a long-term solution.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: And he said that 1983 would have been the last year for price support. That is a Minister before me.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: It is a fact that we could never, Mr. Speaker, look at an industry that is supposed to be one of the economic industries in this country and think about it as a long-term situation of price support

I have said, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, and I want to repeat clearly that this administration, this Minister and this Ministry acknowledges the importance of sugar as an agricultural product. We have always said we would diversify around sugar. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we have always insisted that we must have maximum efficiency in the industry and wherever possible all the latest techniques in agronomy and research must be applied to return the industry to the days of viability.

Let me speak a little bit about something this year, Mr. Speaker, that has become very emotive, that has led people to believe that this is the worst Minister in the world, that this Government is the worst Government. Mr. Speaker, in the 1988 crop we had, I believe, 28 484 acres of land under sugar. And that produced about 80 036 tonnes of sugar as far as my memory is concerned.

For the 1989 crop, Mr. Speaker, we had 28 000 acres of land. We only had 484 acres of land less. In 1988 we got a yield of 25.71 tonnes of cane per acre which produced, as I said, 80 000 tonnes of sugar. In 1989, Mr. Speaker, we got 21.37 tonnes of cane per acre. If you subtract 21.37 from 25.71, you will get about 4.48 tonnes of cane per acre less. If you then take a conversion rate of canes to sugar of about 1 tonne of sugar from about 9 tonnes of canes, you will

realize that we lost about 4 1/25 tonnes of canes per acre which is about 1/2 tonne of sugar per acre, and of 28 000 acres, we lost 14 000 tonnes of sugar, which is 14 000 tonnes of sugar from 80 000 tonnes of sugar to give us our 66 000 tonnes of sugar this year.

When we look at it, Mr. Speaker, what were the circumstances? When I asked the industry in December of 1988 for an estimate for the cost, the industry's first estimate was 80 000 tonnes of sugar.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: When I asked the industry later, Mr. Speaker, they reduced it to 75 000 tonnes.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: And then when I finally asked, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the crop when I visited Andrews it was 66 000 tonnes of sugar. I enquired from the industry the reasons for the yield, they had reduced the reduced yield. They told me it could possibly be ratoon stunting disease which they found in some crops, they told me it could be a matter of compaction, as a result of mechanical harvesting, they told me it could be a matter of the fertilizer that they used that year, they told me, Mr. Speaker, that it could be a matter of the fertilizer application for that year, and they told me, Mr. Speaker, it could be as a result of the variety of cane 62163 which is now about 25 years old, reaching its end of the line. My technical people tell me that when a variety gets to that age, the yield almost always reduces.

When I enquired, Mr. Speaker, from the sugar cane breeding station why there was that heavy dependence of 62163, nearly 85% of the crop, I was told by the officer in charge that they have had some good varieties and that have showed a lot of potential but the Ministry did not put them in to test them because it takes about 10 years to test a variety, and the industry has decided that they will stick with the 62163.

Mr. Speaker, I was also told that, believe it or not, the abundance of rain had something to do with it. When I enquired, what they told me was that the fertilizer they used releases all the nutriment very quickly and that in the month I believe October, or November, we had about 15 inches of rain, and that as a result, it took all of them, below the root level and therefore the canes did not benefit from the fertilizer. All of those things I was told, Mr. Speaker.

As you know the sugar cane people have their own agronomist, they have their own plant breeders, their own pathologist and they have all of them. Between the Ministry and BSIL we are searching for the answers.

Let me address the crop that is coming now for 1990. I am advised by the sugar industry that there is some 27 900 acres of cane already in the ground. I believe the statistic is right. I am further advised that the industry is projecting, like now, a yield of about 23.81 tonnes of canes to sugar and if we achieve that yield that from the 1990 crop we should return our crop to about 75 000 tonnes of sugar.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that this Minister or this Ministry can do for the 1990 crop, except what the Government has done. And that is, that the Government has arranged for an early disbursement of funds from the bank to allow the plantations to get their fertilizer and their chemicals, et cetera. I have made a special plea to the sugar industry to apply their best husbandry possible so that we would get somewhere about 78 000 to 80 000 tonnes of sugar for the 1990 crop.

The Ministry in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, as we have done in the past and we will continue to do has started discussions with the industry about a programme. We wrote and offered a programme to Barbados Sugar Industries Ltd., after we had spent a long time inside the office examining it with all our technical people, and we came to the view that in order to return some type of confidence to the industry, we would have to offer the industry a 3 year programme. Because if you offer them a 1 year programme, the industry would say, well look you are not serious because to get the best returns from our canes we must have at least a 4 year cycle. We said, we would offer you a 3 year programme to demonstrate the Government's intention and goodwill and to show that we understand the importance of the industry.

One of the things the sugar industry has always complained about was the fluctuation of the Barbados dollar against the ECUs. 4.10p.m.

. . . which we paid for and they have contended on many occasions that despite the fact that the ECU's have gone up that they got less because of unfavourable exchange rate in the Barbados dollar. I said to the Ministry then after discussion with my colleagues that we would take that exchange risk. Let me repeat. I said the Government would take that exchange risk. Therefore, that removed one of the problems from the Barbados Sugar Industries Limited.

I then said to them that we are going to offer you a package which, we believe is one that if you got down to hard work, would allow the industry to return to viability. The package was built around a complete farm programme and not sugar alone, because sugar is never a complete farm programme. At anytime the minimum you should have is about 20% of your arable land out that you can use for alternative crops.

We sat down and we went through very carefully, Mr. Speaker, all the statistics available to us. We analyzed the

costing of the industry and we looked at it carefully and I made a proposal to the industry which is now common knowledge, because while the negotiations were going on somehow or the other information reached the public. I said to them that we would offer you a package, which was a 3 year package, for the years 1990, 1991, and 1992 of \$950.00 a tonne for sugar and for the year 1990 as an incentive, if you reached 79,000 tonnes of sugar, we would add an additional \$25.00 which will make it \$975.00 and for 1991 and 1992 \$950.00. We did not stop there. We went on and said that in order to complete the package we would then offer you a guaranteed minimum price on a variety of items and these, as far as my memory serves me, consist of cotton at \$2.15 a pound, yams, hot peppers, potatoes, eddoes, pumpkins, and squash, I believe. All of the crops are root crops that the sugar industry have been accustomed to planting because they are familiar with them. We are of the opinion that we can market those crops and we offered a minimum price. The minimum price which was communicated to the industry which I believe is acceptable to the industry because up to now I have not gotten any real feedback on the non-sugar crop. The only feedback I have gotten so far is on the sugar crop. We also asked them for a particular acreage. I believe we asked for about 1700 acres of potatoes or about 1400 acres of yams - I am speaking from memory now - and about 200 acres of hot peppers, et cetera.

Now the programme was intended, Mr. Speaker, to allow the industry to form a complete programme from their non-sugar crop for which we have given them a minimum guaranteed price and assured them of a market to be able to provide enough revenue together with sugar that would make those plantations viable.

The industry in their discussions with us to date have produced a series of prices in which they have offered, Mr. Speaker, and have suggested that their true cost of production for 1990 would be about \$1605.00 per tonne and that included I believe a 5% increase for inflation plus a 10% profit margin. They came down to the lowest position which they put to the Ministry which was \$1222 per tonne.

That is where the negotiations are at the moment. As I have said, unfortunately, the matter came into the public domain. They have asked for a meeting with the Prime Minister of this country. The Prime Minister is agreeable to the meeting and, whenever that meeting comes off between the Prime Minister, Ministry, and the industry's representatives, the outcome of that meeting will be reported back to Cabinet and the people of Barbados.

I can only say and I hope time will be available - Mr. Speaker, the Government has demonstrated its goodwill. The offer of \$950.00 was not a frivolous offer against the background of what I just went through carefully. It was a serious offer intended to help the industry work itself out with the industry's own application to itself. Mr. Speaker,

there is evidence, and I do not want to call names, that some of the industry is viable. In a particular balance sheet for one of the group of plantations for the year 1988, that group of plantations made some \$416,000 in profit. I would, obviously, not call the group of plantations' name. There is evidence from an available balance sheet that the plantations that apply themselves have been able with a good farm programme to balance their budget.

All I am seeking, Mr. Speaker, is the goodwill and the cooperation of everybody concerned including, as I have said, my friends on the other side wherever they are. Let us sit down and look for the solution to an industry that is critical to the lifeblood of this country.

Let me talk about the Landell Mills Report. The Landell Mills Report was commissioned. We are waiting for that Landell Mills Report. We have requested comments from the industry. They have asked for an extension until the July 15th. As far as I know, up to today's date, they have not replied. I cannot wait much longer for the industry to reply in order to get my comments to the Ministry and the Cabinet with a complete programme. I will give them another week because I expect to take to Cabinet very shortly a comprehensive programme dealing with the entire sugar sector including its debt, application and solutions to the problem, in order to bring back to life the sugar industry which is the lifeblood of the country.

There are indicators, Mr. Speaker, that we can solve the problem with sugar, I know we can with the goodwill of the people. The non-sugar sector had a slight reversal last year compared with the year before, but when you take it over the years it has done very well and is continuing to do very well. The indicators for the first 5 months of the year showed that there is continuation of growth in the non-sugar sector. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to be able to work out a solution to return the agricultural sector to the health that it has always been in the sugar sector. I have always contended that you have production cycles in non-sugar and anybody who knows about agriculture will know that you have production cycles in non-sugar like in everything else. It was slightly down in 1988 but if you look back to 1984 and 1985, you will see that the cycle is still above that cycle of 1984 and 1985.

Mr. Speaker, I will now ask for a few documents to be tabled. The first document that I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, is the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries Sector Plan which was done after deliberate and extensive consultation with the farming community after a 2 day seminar. This document has been made available to the farmers of this country. It has been widely circulated. We do not have anymore, but any person who needs it can have a copy. I want to make this a document of the House. It is the Barbados Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries - Agricultural Sector Plan 1988 and I ask that this document be now laid.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to lay with that the Fisheries Development Plan for the same period 1988-93. Mr. Speaker, I also want to lay a list of the people who applied to my Ministry for vegetable licenses during the period which I had the honour to be Minister as well as the one for the fishing licenses, Mr. Speaker. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on 22nd March, 1989 Dr. DeLisle Worrell, who is the Director of Information and Research at the Central Bank of Barbados, an Economist and a Public Servant in good standing and with much credibility, was invited to participate in a seminar, the topic and thesis of which was "The Economy of Barbados 1989 and Beyond" and he had these words, in the course of his address, to say about the state of agriculture today and the state of agriculture as he perceives it is likely to be in the immediate future, and I quote, Sir: "Notwithstanding anything...."

Mr. SPEAKER: What page are you quoting from?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The document, Sir, is a publication by the Rotary Club of Barbados entitled "The Economy of Barbados 1989 and Beyond" and in dealing with agriculture, on page 5, it states:

"Notwithstanding anything you might have heard to the contrary, agriculture in Barbados is in decline and we must take urgent action to arrest and reverse that decline."

In many respects, Sir, the totality of the statement, beginning with the caveat that notwithstanding anything that you might have heard to the contrary, presents itself as my line of departure in making a contribution to this debate, which I truly believe may well turn out to be one of the most crucial debates that this House will undertake during the course of this particular term.

There is, Sir, a crisis of production in Barbadian agriculture, and this crisis manifests itself in terms of a serious and steady decline not only in sugar production but also in non-sugar production. There is also a serious crisis of confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, a crisis of confidence not represented only in terms of the views of members of the Opposition, but a crisis of confidence represented very concretely in terms of the perception that the Minister of Agriculture enjoys or does not enjoy in every section of the farming community of this society. Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious lack of credibility on the part of the farming community of this country in the capacity of this Minister to get the job done, precisely at a time when in the judgment not only of Dr. Worrell but in the judgment of the experts, to whose report the Minister has access, that this agricultural sector of Barbados is facing more serious decisions than it has ever faced at any time in its history.

I say that notwithstanding anything you might have heard from the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister of this country to the effect that the problem is a problem of rainfall, we have to get to terms very seriously in this debate with the real causes of the tremendous crisis of production, the crisis of confidence which may cause this part of our economic culture - because that is how I see agriculture - to vanish from the land with distressing consequences for constituencies like that which I have the honour to represent.

It has, Sir, to do, in my view, with bureaucratic anarchy at the Ministry of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture is presiding over and deeply immersed in bureaucratic anarchy, to the point where the Minister of Agriculture is engaged in public with attacks on his Public Servants. There is an anarchy of policy formulation to the point where the Minister of Agriculture is engaged to too large an extent with foolish and bitter conflict with important sections of the farming community.

We have been told by no less a person than the Minister of Agriculture that the farmers of this country stand to be condemned because they are too concerned with prices and markets. That economic philosophy can only be inspired by a backward thinking person, can only be the product of a backward thinking mind which fails to understand that agriculturalists are businessmen too, and just as persons in tourism and manufacturing must be concerned with prices and markets, so too must be the farmers of the society, and it reflects the confusion and anarchy of policy that in many respects allow us to understand why Dr. Worrell can tell us that notwithstanding anything we have heard there is a decline and that we must arrest it, while this report speaks in terms of our having today to take fundamental decisions to make sure that agriculture does not vanish from this land.

There is also confusion in Government's land use policy and Government has to face up to it. Some people may speak darkly in terms of the ministerial conflict of interest in relation to subdivisions. Whatever may be the facts of the matter, Sir, I see it as Government sending confused land use signals to those persons who have to take critical decisions in relation to the existence and the future of agriculture in this society, and until we can get clear signals in relation to land use policy in this country, agriculture will continue on its rampant decline.

There is also, Sir, the failure on the part of the Minister to use policy leverage that has been allowed to him under the auspices of existing price support systems. The real tragedy of this particular Minister of Agriculture as far as I am concerned is that he more than any other Minister in the history of this country has been given the opportunity, by reason of the character of the 1985 price support system, to use real leverage in determining and helping to shape and structure the total agricultural programme in this society.

If there is one area in which I must voice my greatest lack of confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, it is either his inability or refusal to utilise policy leverage to the benefit of the agricultural society of this country. I will come back to that point, Sir, in due course, but the Minister of Agriculture knows what I am talking about and I trust that before I leave this debate the entire House will understand what I am talking about.

Let me deal, Sir, with the bureaucratic anarchy in the Ministry of Agriculture. It shows up in the manner in which the Ministry of Agriculture has either succeeded or failed in giving effect to stated and ambitious priorities of this particular administration. The Democratic Labour Party, on the assumption of office, made a major public issue out of the fact that it was going to bring on stream a new agricultural diversification programme. I would think, therefore, that in so far as this was going to be a new project by the Democratic Labour Party, it was going to be something that no other administration had attempted in the past, a holistic new approach to agricultural development funded through the Capital budget of the Ministry of Agriculture, that the Minister would have seen it as a priority and that we could therefore determine whether the Ministry was serious or not in terms of the manner in which this particular project was executed.

So deep and so rich is the bureaucratic anarchy within the Ministry of Agriculture, that after two years of Parliament providing large sums of funds for this particular project, this, Sir, is the result. In financial year 1987-88 the Minister of Agriculture came to this House and asked us to vote \$1.2 million for an agricultural diversification development programme. We all gave it our complete support, because we understood the importance of agricultural diversification. The House voted \$1.2 million for aji^w project. What was the result? Of the \$1.2 million voted, \$19,317 was spent during the course of an entire financial year on a project which the Democratic Labour Party said was to make the difference to agriculture. They came back in financial year 1988-89 and again the Government asked us to put funds on the budget for the Government to try something new in agriculture, and they asked us to vote \$2.831 million for agricultural diversification. At the end of the year we came here in good faith and voted \$2.831 million to help the rural people of this Barbadian society. 4.30p.m.

And at the end of the year all the Ministry of Agriculture has succeeded in doing is spending just over \$1/2 million of almost \$3 million. It is so bad, Sir, even in the Minister's own constituency. He asked this House of Parliament in 1987-88 to vote funds for him to undertake a feasibility study to determine the best manner in which the waters that emanate from the Three Houses Spring can be used. And those of us, Sir, who are familiar with St. Philip, as I am, know the tremendous potential of the Three Houses

Spring, Sir, and the way in which it could affect agricultural production in St. Philip, running from Three Houses straight through, Sir, into River. And this House voted \$100 000 to allow the Minister of Agriculture to undertake a feasibility study to determine how an agricultural resource in his own constituency could and should have been used. And at the end of the day, Sir, we voted \$100 000 and not a cent was spent. And I ask this House, Sir, if the Minister would do that to his own constituency, what would he not do to the rest of Barbados? That, Sir, is what this debate is about!

The Minister, Sir, would give us a lot of figures about import licences and that documentation is fine. But when I speak about a crisis in confidence and a crisis in credibility, the facts of the matter are that Dr. Worrell is right. Because notwithstanding what you might have heard, those figures are not right.

And earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the General Manager of the Barbados Agricultural Society speaking in his capacity as the General Manager of the Agricultural Society made a statement which I am asking leave of the House, Sir, to repeat which blows all of the statistics presented by the Minister of Agriculture completely out of the water. He was speaking, Sir, about the negative and disastrous impact that the legal and the illegal importation of vegetables into this country was having on the fortunes of small farming in Barbados. And I stress the point, Sir, legal as well as illegal. Because the Minister is telling us about those licences that have been approved. But what he has not been telling us, Sir, is about the vegetables that have been coming in by all kinds of subterfuge. And this, Mr. Speaker, is what the General Manager of the Barbados Agricultural Society had to say. He said, Sir, and it is reported in the press on April 20, 1989, that he knew of at least 10 tonnes of produce including cucumbers, sweet peppers, water melons and seasonings which were being imported from Guyana every week hidden in cabbages. A statement, Sir, issued by the General Manager of the Barbados Agricultural Society in his own name.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Ten tonnes per week.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And if there is anybody in Barbadian agriculture who would want to defend the interest of the Democratic Labour Party, it surely must be, as the Democratic Labour Party would know, the General Manager of the Barbados Agricultural Society.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You will have your chance to speak.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member would not want me to repeat again what I have been saying during the Debate.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope Honourable Members on that side....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: would not want me to repeat what I have been asking to afford Members to speak. Continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am obliged to you, Sir. What has been_x the impact, Sir? While this Government has been turning a blind eye to the produce being imported among the cabbages, from Guyana, as referenced by the General Manager of the Agricultural Society, Sir, among other things including diamond back beetles and moths and so on, Sir, farming production in Barbados has been dropping as a consequence.

I must cite, Sir, for the benefit of the House the Annual Report of BASIS of 1988 where it draws reference to the fact that during the year 762 acres less were planted in food crops on plantations in Barbados than in 1987. Food crops production in this country in terms of acreage fell by almost 25% at a time when 10 tonnes of vegetables were coming into this country, among the cabbages. And I really do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture must not come to the House and just give us printouts and statements about licences. That is part of the myth that now exists in this society which caused the entire farming community not to exercise any confidence in anything that the Ministry of Agriculture says and anything that this Government is now saying, in terms of the agricultural priorities. Because people know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is saying one thing but something entirely different is happening. Shopkeepers, supermarket people all across Barbados. Ask the General Manager of the Barbados Agricultural Society for the proof.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR But, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the open secrets in this society that there has been a flood of illegal imports of commodities that can be produced in Barbados from Guyana. And that it is as if the Minister is setting up defensive systems to protect the interest of those who are involved in these illegal imports, rather than protecting the interest of the Barbadian farmers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, are you imputing improper motives to the Minister? That regulation or Standing Order has not been rescinded.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you should withdraw that remark.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But if the Government does not want to believe, Sir,....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Is it withdrawn?

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Okay.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But if the Government does not want to believe that there is a flood of illegal imports of vegetables into this country, Sir, thy way not mine, O Lord. You can deceive yourself. But I would believe what Dr. Worrell was dealing with, notwithstanding anything that you might have heard, and what any supermarket owner would tell you, notwithstanding anything that you might have heard from the Minister, there are illegal imports of vegetables in large quantities, Sir, into Barbados and the important point is that the Government is doing nothing about it, precisely at a time when our own production of non-sugar agriculture is declining. And that, Sir, is part of the crisis of confidence in the Minister of Agriculture.

In relation to sugar, Sir, the Minister has talked about how the sugar industry people are difficult people. And they are difficult people. Sir. They have difficult interests to protect and they will be difficult people.

But the truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government, through its Minister of Agriculture has really been adopting a stop now, go later policy that cannot in any respect allow persons in the sugar industry to programme their production.

And I made the point earlier, Sir, that the tragedy of this Minister of Agriculture is that he had the potential to exercise far more leverage in bringing about change in Barbadian sugar production than any previous Minister of Agriculture. And his strategy, Sir, is that he has failed to use that leverage.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And I would explain, Sir. If you will recall the conditions of the 1986 price support, the conditions were simply this, Sir. We did not state a sugar tonnage. What we did was that we created a situation where persons getting price supports on the basis of the 1985 crop would have been able to convert their loans into grants, provided that they were to engage in the production of a selected set of approved projects. And a system was developed, as part of the 1986 price support system, Sir, where the industry each year would have its growers meetings and it would determine production targets as between sugar and non-sugar commodities for each individual grower. Then, thereafter, the industry and the Ministry officials would meet and by June of each year, a complete production programme involving each grower in Barbados, specifying how much of each commodity he would produce would have to have been submitted to the Minister of Agriculture and approved by the Minister of Agriculture as the condition upon which persons in this country involved on sugar estates would be able to convert sugar price supports into grants. 4.40 p.m.

For the first time in the history of this country the leverage was vested in the Minister of Agriculture to oversee each year a complete programme of agricultural production involving not only sugar but involving non-sugar. Mr. Speaker, there was a financial price attached to such that if the Minister was serious he could exercise leverage. The Minister, Sir, took no interest whatsoever in the given execution to that particular policy which could have existed in making a difference. The proof of it can be shown by reference to the fact that the Minister was so much asleep on the job that a price support on the 1986 crop ooiy reached Parliament for consideration in January 1988.

If, Mr. Speaker, you want any evidence of the incompetence of the Minister of Agriculture, it is the incompetence that can be measured by his own statement in this House today, that by December in any given year the farmers must be in a position to know what their final price is. It is upon their knowing in December in any given year their final price that they take decisions in relation to their future plans. This Minister of Agriculture, Sir, brought to this House in January 1988 a price support for agricultural sugar for 1986. Sir, if the agricultural producers, particularly the sugar producers, had to depend upon the leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture to take decisions in 1986 and 1987 as regards their future plans, Sir, they were simply not in a position to do so. What we are experiencing now in sugar, I am suggesting to the House, is a like effect of the complete indecision by the Minister of Agriculture in 1988. He is dilly-dallying, particularly in a situation when he had the capacity to be a force of good where that sector is concerned.

I am not going to get into any personalised attacks on the Minister of Agriculture, Sir. A lot of things had been said about him that either the job is too big for him or he has become too big for the job. It has also been said that the Minister of Agriculture's attention, Sir, is divided among other pursuits. These things, Sir, properly belong in this debate.

Now what I have to say, Sir, is that I see the value of this motion of no-confidence in the Minister as allowing us to systematically come to terms with the fact that a critical part of the Barbadian economic culture is under stress in a manner, Sir, that it has never been under stress before and that the Minister is dilly-dallying. The Minister, Sir, seems to be confused about a number of basic things. The Government itself seems to be confused about its land use policy. In my humble submission, Sir, any discussion on the proposed land subdivisions are relevant not only with respect to whether they shed any light on the financial fortunes of any particular firm. They are relevant to the extent that they shed some light on what this Government sees as the future land use of Barbados. I am hopeful, Sir, and I do not have the information, but I know the other person on the other side has the information, Sir. Let us be frank enough in this debate to discuss those land subdivisions of which the Minister is painfully aware in relation to what they may say about land use policies in this country for next year and in the years to come.

I must also say, Sir, that I am very unhappy with the manner in which the Statutory Boards under the Ministry of Agriculture, Sir, have been operated. I was a former Chairman of the Agricultural Development Corporation. I was a former Chairman of that Corporation, Sir. It was a corporation, Sir, in which, when I became the Chairman, 95% of its total agricultural resources were in sugar and 5% were in non-sugar. We set about systematically to change that. We put in a system whereby we could start at the ADC to do what the sugar industry refused to do to meet the information requirements of the Sugar Industries Act, to begin systematically to cost the production of non-sugar agriculture grown either as pure stand vegetables or grown in rotation with sugar. We felt that the Government had to take a lead in being able to say what it truly cost to produce sugar and non-sugar agricultural products in Barbados. That work, Sir, was started.

We went to Bath, Sir, and got the assistance of the FAO to put in irrigation using waters that had been flowing free for centuries and to use lands at Bath to grow winter vegetables to penetrate and lead the way in developing a vibrant non-sugar export agriculture in this society. Tandew melons were brought to Barbados by a former Prime Minister as part of that effort. We revitalized the peanut industry of Barbados in that period. The ADC was in the vanguard then of revitalizing cotton and we went to Hope and completely rehabilitated The Hope.

Today, I am distressed to read that last year Barbados did not produce a peanut at all. The tandew melons, for which there was vibrant export opportunities and for which we were using irrigated lands at ADC, are not being produced in this country, Sir. We must ask you this question. What has become of the role of the ADC in spearheading serious agricultural change in this society? We must ask the question, Sir, about what appears to be the virtual collapse of the important thrust that was started through the Rural Development Programme.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to say so, to see a second Rural Development Programme because a large part of the agricultural problem in the other parts of the society is precisely because farmers in the other parts of Barbados, separate and distinct from those which were served by the first Rural Development Programme, do not have access to good feeder roads, irrigation facilities, and credit. The whole point and purpose of the Rural Development Programme was to assist small farmers who face those precise disabilities, Mr. Speaker, to over-come them through the ADC acting as a developmental spearhead. What is the ADC doing then, Mr. Speaker, in relation to rural development? The answer, Sir, is nothing. I say, therefore, that the ADC has lost its way and that that is part of the bureaucratic anarchy that expresses no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture. The Barbados Marketing Corporation, Sir, is in itself and others Members in this debate will have to speak to that.

As I said in the Budget debate, Sir, that we have if we are going to save Barbados' agriculture to stop the policy whereby the survival of the BMC is conditioned upon its capacity to import food and sell food. We have to make the Barbados Marketing Corporation a matter of policy if you are serious and sell not foreign and imported commodities, Sir, but they must sell Barbadian produce. I am prepared to support the Government in any scheme it may forward to make the BMC....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It surely has to be a contradiction. We have to face the fact, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture as we have known it can collapse in this country and it has to be a contradiction that we can have a marketing corporation in Barbados selling agricultural produce but they are not Barbadian agricultural produce, Sir. That has to be a contradiction and I do not care who started it, Sir. It has to stop. If it means that if we, as a Parliament, can find some other way of financing the Barbados Marketing Corporation except to survive on the cess or charge on imported commodities, let us do so as the Parliament has the courage to do so. It must stop, Mr. Speaker, and I am saying, Sir, that there is rampant disorder as well at the Barbados Marketing Corporation having not

only to do with its pricing and importing policy, Sir, but having also to do with certain administrative practices which I am sure that other speakers in this debate, Sir, are going to bring out.

Therefore, Sir, I must say that as a person who represents a rural constituency nothing has saddened me more than the great opportunities that exist and the manner in which those opportunities go abegging. 4.50 p.m.

The \$170 million of food imports in Barbados can serve as the basis for a new industry in this society and we have to develop an agricultural policy which says that we are going to get back to basics. We have to produce more yams, Sir, we have to produce more of the things that Barbados can produce and that we know how to produce.

Mr. Speaker, there has also to be fundamental land reform in this society, and I trust that in the course of this debate we can get into the nitty gritty of land reform and that we can discuss land reform in relation to the manner in which land is now presently being subdivided and ask the searching question, is that what we truly want for Barbados?

I am disappointed, therefore, in the Minister of Agriculture for those very reasons, nothing personal, but much more can be done. The opportunities are there. The farming community, whether it be dairy farmers, chicken producers, sugar producers, food crop producers, are all giving up hope. I do not have to tell the House, Sir, that some have also been closing their establishments and they have, in a real sense, already voted in this debate. They have voted in the most painful way possible for the people of this society. They have voted no confidence by sending home people.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to support this Resolution of no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, as I would like to say, not for anything personal against the Minister, but as a matter of interest I am from a rural constituency, like the member who just spoke, and for that reason I have more than a passing interest in agriculture.

For one moment when the Minister was speaking I did not recognise that what he was saying applied to the country in which I live. Not that I did not understand what he was saying, I could not understand the relevance of its application to Barbados. Many of the matters that were raised by the introducer of the Resolution, the Member for Christ Church East, are still to be answered, many of the controversial areas, and I trust that when the Minister winds up he will take the opportunity to address his mind to those controversial matters that he refused to answer.

I would like, Sir, before I get into the meat of what I want to speak about this afternoon, to refer to two matters that the Minister raised when he was making his discourse. One has to do with the fact that Barbados entered into a short term solution with Guyana to address its fishing problems with Trinidad. If I understand the Minister correctly, that seems to me to be foolishness, for the reason that nothing substantial has come out of the agreement with Guyana. So if you are saying to me that you have entered ^ into a fishing agreement with Guyana to address a fishing dispute you have with Trinidad, and up to now, since the signing of that agreement, nothing has become of the agreement with Guyana in terms of bringing fish to Barbados, which is the end result of the agreement, that seems to me to be nonsense and that the short term solution is no solution at all.

The other matter has to do with the very skilful way the Minister sought to make it appear that the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers moves around at night and sabotages Government's projects.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I understand the use of language. I say what I want to say. The Minister did this by a skilful juxtaposing of a alleged statement made by the General Secretary and acts- of sabotage committed against the «* Bridgetown Fishing Complex. This seems to me to be foolishness to suggest that somebody, whether they made the statement or not, goes around at night sabotaging Government. That is a lot of foolishness. I am certain that the Minister would not go outside of these walls and repeat that statement, because he knows exactly what will happen if that had to happen.

Si/, I want to get into the meat of what I want to say, because nothing that they say will deflect me from the * course I want to embark upon. In an earlier contribution to a debate on agriculture when we were in the Other Place, and when I was still very new to this Parliament, I conceded that the Democratic Labour Party was responsible for agricultural diversification in Barbados and I also went on to make the point that when the Barbados Labour Party came to office in 1976 they departed from that policy because they wanted to pursue a policy where they wanted to bring most of the idle lands back into production, and they had hoped to achieve a target of 150,000 tonnes of ^ sugar. After a while, when they realised that this was not a particularly good course to follow, they went back to a limited scale of diversification. I believe this was the time when Dr. Cheltenham was Minister of Agriculture.

Now, Sir, I said at the time that the efforts at diversification by the Barbados Labour Party did not appear to be very successful and were not convincing. I would like to concede, and I would like to make the point at the outset

of what I want to say now, that the present Minister of Agriculture is responsible for the present woes in sugar and non-sugar agriculture. He is responsible, to my mind, in that he did not respond to the challenge contained in the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto.

I want to put the balance of what I have to say in a particular context. In doing that I would like to refer to the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto, page 10, where it deals with agriculture. I want to refer to certain aspects of this Manifesto to show this Honourable House how certain Manifesto promises should have informed the Government's approach to agriculture.

In the third paragraph the second sentence begins: "The intention will be to infuse Barbadian agriculture with a new dynamism, which will enable it to reach the frontiers of scientific agriculture and become responsive to local and international market conditions." That is the first statement. This statement informed the Democratic Labour Party's strategy, or lack of it, on agriculture. That strategy was one that was aimed, and this is at paragraph 4 of the same document, on the same page, one aimed at providing a consistent climate of support, encouragement, co-operation, facilitation and accommodative regulatory action. Those to my mind are the things upon which the Democratic Labour Party's approach to agriculture and its policy on agriculture was based and informed.

To this end, Sir, there are certain aspects of Government's operations that will put the matter of which I speak in perspective. 5.00 p.m.

And I should like to refer to some other sections of this Manifesto. For example at page 10:

"Government will lead by example, by ensuring that Government owned agricultural land is fully utilized and efficiently farmed."

It also said, Sir:

"Special incentive schemes will be designed to facilitate the use of the various types of agricultural land in a manner which accords with an agreed agricultural land utilization plan."

I will get around to these things.

There was also another one, Sir, and I am doing all of this to put what I want to say in a particular context. I will get back to all of these things in more detail later:

"Agricultural out-stations will be reactivated to provide:

- (a) stud services;
- (b) technical and financial management counselling;
- (c) mechanical assistance in land preparation, planting and harvesting;
- (d) demonstration plots and other devices designed to expose small farmers to new appropriate plant varieties and to new techniques in fertilizer application and pest control."

There is another promise:

"The system of loans to farmers will be modified to any extent necessary to ensure that farmers have adequate and timely access to loans."

And so, there are many others, including the one that deals with praedial larceny.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: It is within that context, Sir, that I want to address some of the matters that I think would go to showing that the Minister of Agriculture has lost his way, or if he had a way to follow, he has not even begun to walk that way or to follow it.

For example, Sir, I want to look at livestock, especially the dairy cattle industry. Now my contention is that livestock production and development in Barbados is at a standstill. This is so for no other reason than that the approach taken to the disbursement of loans in the Ministry of Agriculture is not one that accords with good lending practices and things of that nature.

Now, Sir, there are two loan facilities that are administered by the Ministry of Agriculture. One is the Dairy Revolving Fund which I believe is a Canadian sponsored fund in the sense that the Canadian International Development Agency, CIDA is responsible for funding that Dairy Revolving Fund. There is another one called the Livestock Development Fund which I believe is one where the Government of the day, I think it was the Barbados Labour Party Government at the time had put up \$3 million out of Treasury funds to fund this fund. The money was to be drawn down in three tranches by the Ministry of Agriculture and only one was ever drawn down. The Government changed before the other two tranches could have been drawn down. Now the first fund, the monies that are part of the first fund is a soft loan, the CIDA loan, Sir. Both funds contain money for loans for farmers.

Sir, one of the promises made by the Democratic Labour Party in its manifesto had to do with the system of loans to farmers. And they said that it:

"will be modified to any extent necessary to ensure that farmers have adequate and timely access to loans."

Now, Sir, my information is that this has not been the case, that there is only the one loan that has been given since 1986 for livestock development in Barbados. That loan, I have been informed was made to a farmer by, should I say, the former Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, outside of the criteria that was laid down by the Ministry. Now the criteria is very stringent for access to any of these loans. And it gives the lie to the Manifesto promise that:

"The system of loans to farmer will be modified to any extent necessary to ensure that farmers have timely access to loans."

One loan has been made.

Now the criteria established for access to these funds as I said is very stringent. Any farmer who wants to access these funds must have security, he must also have a guarantor. And if for some reason that farmer had obtained a loan from the Dairy Revolving Fund and he had not repaid it, then that farmer, before he could access those funds would have to repay the loan. Now we know the condition of livestock development and production in Barbados. And it would seem to me that if anything were to be made of the Manifesto promise that the criteria which were approved by Cabinet should have been modified to allow farmers to have better access to that money, to have easier access to that money. It is for that reason, Sir, that livestock production in Barbados is at the standstill to which I earlier referred.

Now I am told that many people have not been repaying the CIDA loan. I am told that the number one cow in the matter has said that he will not repay his loan until another person has joyously repaid his. And for those reasons, nothing is happening in the Ministry in terms of allowing farmers to access loans for the development of their livestock.

Now, Sir, I want to make another point in relation to this. For example, the Committee established under the Livestock Development Fund has only met once. This Committee is chaired by the Deputy Permanent Secretary, there are others, the Chief Economist or his nominee, the Chief Agricultural Officer for Livestock, there is also a CIDA livestock officer, the Administrative Officer is Secretary, and also a representative from the Ministry of Finance and a representative of the dairy interest. This Committee has only met once. It would seem to me that it is

important that if the loans are to be administered in a way that farmers could avail themselves of these loans, then the Committee must meet more often and make recommendations for these loans to be accessed.

Similarly, the Dairy Development Committee established under the Livestock Development Fund is in a similar situation. Many recommendations have been made for loans but none of the loans have been disbursed because the criteria is too stringent. In these circumstances, Sir, it seems to me that livestock development in Barbados cannot thrive, and the disbursement of these loans should not be administered by the Ministry. But it would seem to me that the Barbados National Bank would be the more desirable agency through which these loans could be administered and disbursed.

Situations like these would persist because for a long time the Minister knew of and presided over a situation where the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Agricultural Officer were hardly speaking. What positive results could occur in this situation? The answer must be nil.

The Member for St. Peter referred to a system of bureaucratic anarchy. I would agree with that. Because if you have a situation where your chief persons that would direct agricultural policy are not on speaking terms, what must happen? Anarchy must reign.

Efforts were made I know, Sir, in the Ministry of Agriculture to bring this situation to a head and to find a solution so that the Minister and the Ministry of Agriculture could get along with its work, its very important work that it has laid down for itself in the Manifesto. And all the Minister could think about was to see if he could shift the Chief Agricultural Officer to somewhere else. But happily, Sir, I believe that that problem would not persist any more because the Permanent Secretary whom I was referring to is no longer in that Ministry. He has now gone to another place. 5.10p.m.

Now Sir, what is Government's example in the area of agricultural land utilization and efficient farming? This is a matter that the Member for St. Peter referred to. I think that these matters have got to be debated in this debate. They have got to be brought to light. Land use policy, which is regulated by the Ministry of Housing and Lands, must bear some relation to agriculture in Barbados. We cannot have a situation where all of the agricultural land or a lot of it is now being lost to other forms of development, whether that development be housing or some other kind.

I am not convinced that the Government has a very good or very strict land use policy and it is something that we must look at. We have got to examine that very, very closely in this debate. As I said, I do not think that this is a debate that has anything to do with me against them. This is

a debate that has to do with the future of an economic sector in Barbados which appears to my mind, Sir, to be going downhill fast and nothing is being done about it.

The Minister made a very laudacious statement about asking everybody to join and so on. I remember when we had the debate on the Estimates when the Member who introduced this Resolution, the Member for Christ Church East, got up and spoke pointing out certain things that he thought was wrong with agriculture, Members on the other side sought to laugh him to scorn, especially when he raised the whole matter of the Oistins Complex when the Member for St. Lucy sought - he was not here the day before, but came in the next morning - to say that the Member for Christ Church East was trying to get the Minister to do something illegally....

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Doing something illegal. That is what you said. I said you were not here the day before.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: What I am talking about< Sir, is that this is a very serious matter. I do not look at this as scoring any points against anybody. We will begin to score points when we go out in the hustings. Right.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: We want something to discuss in here. We do not get anything to discuss, so we want something to discuss. Right. We are discussing agriculture. Well, you ought to be glad that we did not bring one against you the other day when we had the discussion on the chickens. Keep quiet, man.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please! May I have some order please?

Certain remarks made by Hon. B. M. TAITF and Mr. P. / . M. MILLER were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes, Sir, as I was saying, this debate has to do with the future of agriculture in Barbados. When the time comes for the elections, we will start scoring points again and I will deal with the

Certain remarks made by Mr. R. P. BYER were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, we have a situation in Barbados where hundreds of acres of land are going out of agriculture daily, that the Barbadian landscape is now dotted by under-

utilized land. This year we have had the lowest sugar output ever. We have had no peanut production for 1987 and 1988. There are no guaranteed markets for farmers and their produce. Markets can no longer be guaranteed because of the flooding of the market by legally and illegally imported goods. There is to my mind, Sir, misuse of the licensing system in the importation of vegetables to the point where farmers have to plough back tonnes of produce into the soil.

Now even though the Minister laid today a document which shows who were given licenses and so on, I asked a question about that sometime ago. The answer has not been given. I suppose part of the answer is contained in that document. It just goes to show how quickly questions can be answered in certain circumstances. To my mind, I believe that when the list is properly examined that a lot of people will be fronting for other people. That is as much as I would like to say about that. A lot of fronting will be discovered when a close examination of that list is made. I say nothing more about that.

You have also a situation, Sir, where persons are being given permission to subdivide agricultural land to bail themselves out of debt. This is something that was brought to light or mentioned in the Landell Mills Report on the agricultural sector in Barbados.

Sir, I tabled a question in this House or I presented a question for scrutiny with the hope that it will be allowed to be laid or to be asked in this House. That question had to do with the subdivision of agricultural lands and the extent to which agricultural lands are being subdivided. I also wanted to know who were the surveyors contracted to do the work. I also wanted to know when the permission for the subdivision was given. I was told that I could not ask the question for the reason that the information was elsewhere. It is a Government document.

Now Sir, I accepted that at the moment but that is not the end of the matter. I will seek to get the information from where I was told that I can get it. If that does not succeed, I will come back to this House with the question again to seek to lay it here. I believe that these things ought to be known. I am not here to gouge out anybody's eyes. I am just here to try and find out and get to the bottom of certain things. That is as much as I would want to mention about that.

Now I want, Sir, to turn to the question of soil conservation. We had some heavy rains last year and great havoc was wreaked in St. Andrew. This, Sir, caused me to stand up and take some note as to what was happening in soil conservation in St. Andrew. At one time we were hearing that the Ministry of Transport and Works will be responsible for the rehabilitation of the roads and that kind of thing. 5.20 p.m.

I know the Minister of Transport and Works has said that certain studies have been carried out and efforts are being made now, either based on those studies or a study was ordered of a study, to make sure what would be the best approaches to rehabilitating those roads.

The destruction of the bridges in St. Andrew relates more to the soil conservation efforts of the Ministry of Agriculture than it does to the Ministry of Transport and Works. I know for a fact that not one piece of equipment at Soil Conservation is workable. All the equipment is down. All the tractors are being repaired, the crawler tractors, the back hoes, the excavators, and this is the hurricane season. This is the time of year when we get most of our rains. What will happen, God forbid it, if some disaster should occur in St. Andrew? What contribution can the Soil Conservation Department make on the rehabilitation effort, assuming that the catastrophe occurs? None whatsoever, because even though it has equipment, the equipment cannot perform the functions required because it is not workable. You do not even have proper tractors to haul the materials.

You have a situation where the Workshop Supervisor orders parts that bear no relation to the present requirements. You have a situation where Plantrac is given work that can be done by the mechanics at Soil Conservation. You have a situation where the Workshop Supervisor and the Executive Officer employs persons without the knowledge of the officer in charge. This is part of the bureaucratic anarchy that the Member for St. Peter spoke about. There is no relationship at all between the Executive Officer and the Workshop Supervisor and the officer in charge of Soil Conservation. No engineering work at all is being done at Soil Conservation. The Soil Conservation Department is just a department in name, because nothing is being done there.

No serious soil conservation work has taken place in the Scotland District now for some time. There is a little fruit tree maintenance and so on, the drainage pipes which run aground and allow for the drainage of water are not being cleaned, a lot of the pipes are broken, they do not have rods to clean the pipes, and that will not be of the best when the rains really come.

You have a situation where equipment is left to rust away. There is a JCB excavator at Bawdcn for the longest time. All it needs are tracks, no tracks were bought. A Gradall excavator also needed tracks or some other piece of equipment and that was left in Greenland. It can no longer work. The ADC is not really doing any serious work in part of the Scotland District, like Turner's Hall and Sedgepond, St. Andrew. All of these are ADC estates - Bawdcns, Haggatts, Greenland, Boscobel - and very little work is being done. Turner's Hall is a veritable forest, all weeds. Boscobel was under canes.

Sir, in summation I would make bold to say that the Minister of Agriculture must stand condemned for the present crisis which faces the agricultural sector. His condemnation is one for not acting to stave off a crisis, a crisis which has now plunged both sugar and non-sugar agriculture into the bottomless pit of debt, destruction and bankruptcy. His is a sin of omission. It cannot be otherwise, for he has done nothing. He has not brought that new dynamism to the Ministry that was required of him, that is, if he would successfully tackle the problems with which he was confronted when he undertook his task.

For those reasons, Sir, I say that this side of the House has no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture and he should resign.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a contribution to this debate and certainly to express my whole hearted support to the present Minister of Agriculture and to endorse the policies and programmes which are being pursued by this administration to ensure not only that our agriculture becomes viable but it also becomes a diversified operation within this country.

In listening to the Honourable Member for St. George South I really was at pains to find out any substantive point which he made to this particular debate, and it was extremely difficult to do so. He made the point of course that in bringing this Resolution they do not have anything against the Minister and it is not a Resolution with which they are seeking to score any points, but I am submitting that that is the basis for the Resolution. The basis of the Resolution is to try to destroy the present Minister of Agriculture and to score the cheapest political points one could ever think about.

The Honourable Member for St. George South, in concluding his contribution, indicated that the policy which this present Minister is pursuing has, and I quote, "now plunged the sugar industry and agriculture into bankruptcy." What utter nonsense!

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for St. Michael South Central, on more than one occasion during the period 1981 to 1986 took the Barbados Labour Party to task for their bankruptcy of ideas as far as agriculture was concerned, and also took the sugar producers and the people in agriculture generally to task for what they were doing to agriculture.

We do not participate in debates in here, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of who interferes with whom and who does not interfere with whom. This is a Resolution which is critical of this Government, according to the Leader of the Opposition, and therefore it is critical of all of us.

I am dealing with the Honourable Member for St. George South where he said that the policy pursued by this Honourable Minister has now plunged the industry and agriculture into bankruptcy. This is a revelation which he himself does not believe. The Leader of the Opposition does not believe it, because he knows better than that. It is a matter of record that the sugar industry, which forms the bulk of our agriculture, has been in a very serious financial position for a number of years. Just let me illustrate this by referring to an aspect of a debate which was held in this Honourable Chamber on Tuesday, 7th June, 1983 in which the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central took the sugar industry to task. And at page 3664 he had this to say, and I quote: 5.30 p.m.

"The point I want to make is that if you were to look at the credit to the sugar industry, you would find it most alarming that in 1980, the year in which this country had bumper earnings from sugar, credit to the industry increased dramatically, and you would see that the cycle of normal fluctuations in the levels of credit to the sugar industry, which, of course, would vary at the time of cultivation loans and at the time of reaping loans, disappeared in the year 1980. I want to know what happened to the money that was earned by Barbados on sugar in 1980? Where did it go to?" And I think in another debate, I believe, that some Honourable Members will refer to this explanation as to where this money went to. Because he said it went into the Swiss Bank. His explanation, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central's, is that the money went into the Swiss Bank, went to buy race horses, went to educate the children and went all over the place.

And now the Honourable Member for St. George South is coming to tell us that this Minister is responsible for the bankruptcy in agriculture.

But the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central goes on and I quote, and he is talking about Portvale Factory now:

"I have called again and again for an inquiry into the building of Portvale Factory. Portvale Factory has undermined the sugar industry"

Doyou,hearit?

".....to an extent that it is absolutely incredible."

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I was not a Member of the Honourable House then, but I know the style of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and I

wish that I were here to hear him. I could see him rising to his full height when he made the point. And he is a tall man, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: "Portvale Factory has undermined"....

I am repeating this for emphasis:

"..... the sugar industry to an extent that it is absolutely incredible. There have been many problems there; it is not only a question of cost overruns. That is one of the main reasons why the Barbados National Bank is in the state that it is in, and why the sugar industry is in the state of bankruptcy that it is in."

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: June 7, 1983 the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central speaking. And I could go on and quote from this speech because it is revealing, Mr. Speaker.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I gather that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central behaves like a man for all seasons. Because the following year I am told, again I was not here, the following year, when the Barbados Labour Party....

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES:... anticipated the onslaught of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central on the sugar industry, it brought in the sugar barons and sat them down in the Gallery.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Well in the Gallery. When the sugar barons came down and sat down in the Gallery of this Honourable Chamber, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had not one word to say.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: And the then Leader of the House

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: the then Honourable Member for St. James North who was Leader of the House cried shame on the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, even to the extent to say, but you are not anything at all.

Laughter.

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

Laughter.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I spoke.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please, order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House when he says that I did not participate in the debate in the year following 1983. That is not correct. I was the principal spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party on that matter and the two positions taken were quite consistent because the crisis in 1983 was caused by the utilization of current funds for the long-term project which caused the cash crisis in relation to Portvale until the CDB loan came through. The two positions were in no way inconsistent.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: You were the principal spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party on that occasion, and spoke in 1983 in particular terms and subsequently, in different terms.

So when one hears the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the position of the NDP and compares it with the position which was taken by the principal spokesman.....

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES:..... now Leader of the Opposition, one is really left to wonder. Because for them now, the sugar barons and the people who own the plantations in this country are lily white.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: They are without blemish,....

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: washed in the blood of the lamb, ...

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: and whiter than snow.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Now the fact of the matter is that they are not without blame. The Democratic Labour Party, through this Honourable Minister is making a sterling effort to ensure that the sugar industry does not go under has gone to the point where they have made a substantial offer of price support to the sugar industry which we understand that a large portion of them are willing to accept but which there are some who may want to play politics.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am not saying the NDP or that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has any influence on both of them because, based on the attack which was launched on them, there is no way that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central could have any influence on anybody in the sugar industry. So I do not even bother with that. Do not even bother.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Do not bother about that.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Now, Sir, having disposed of that matter and having established that the sugar industry has been in a state of bankruptcy long before the Honourable Member came on the scene as Minister and long before his sterling efforts to bring some life back, let me now move on to some of the other points which were

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East who introduced this Resolution, of course, Sir, you know the kind of difficulties which he had with the Resolution. I get the impression that he was like a man who is doing something where he really does not know what he is doing. 5.40p.m.

In the first place when he got up and gave notice of the Resolution last week, he moved immediately that it be passed. You see people talk about people not being able to speak freely and suggesting that the Democratic Labour Party is curtailing the freedom of speech and what have you. I know, Sir, that in this Honourable Chamber when I was a Member during the 1976 to 1981 period that if that happened there was a Speaker who would have put the vote there and then, and the vote would have been called for without any debate. That would have been the extent of his speech. We welcome this debate and that is why we indicated that we would give enough time for the debate to take place so that everybody could have their say. We

welcome the debate. The Honourable Member has been a Member of this House for sometime and one would expect, therefore, that he would know the rules and the procedure and even today

Asides

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: You see, Sir, there are some people who sometimes try to convey the impression that some Members may take advantage of other Members. There are some people who convey the impression that they are meek and lowly and people want to take advantage of them because it may appear as if they have certain weaknesses and what have you. I want to make the point that in here all Members are Honourable Members and, therefore, there is no quarter asked and no quarter given. That is very clear. So that when you come in here you have to understand the rules under which we operate. If you do not understand them, I am telling the Honourable Member for Christ Church East now to learn the rules. Learn the rules.

Mr. Speaker, just to show you the Honourable Member for St Michael South Central. His knowledge of the rules of this Chamber is such that I am sure that if you had heard what he said you would not have allowed it.

Asides

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: All right, Sir. Now Sir, the Member for Christ Church East - I was making the point that here it is that we are talking about price support for the plantations and he wants to know when will this House get a chance to discuss the wages for agricultural workers. Now pray tell me whenever did the House discuss wages for agricultural workers? They are not discussed in here. The Honourable Member must know that. They are not discussed in here.

Asides

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Now the other point which I would want to just deal with and dispose of very quickly is relating to the Honourable Member for Christ Church East in reference to the rainfall. He quoted a number of years indicating on the one hand the amount of sugar which was produced and he gave the amount of rain which fell, making the point for example that I think it was in 1987 83.4 thousand tonnes of sugar were produced and 45.7 inches, of rain fell and in 1988 80.3 thousand tonnes of sugar were produced and 56.7 inches of rain fell, which turned out to be the highest amount of rain that fell in the 5 year period which he used.

Now the point in all of this is that could be true. I do not doubt his figures on the rainfall. What he failed to acquaint himself with is the fact that rain could fall in a particular year because the rainfall is taken on a yearly

basis. It does not say anything about the distribution of the rainfall. There are times when the rain falls that it does not have any effect on the yield of sugar. So that the distribution of the rainfall is particularly important, that is in the month in which the rain fell. That is the important point which he has lost sight of and I thought that this would be an education for him.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I would like to explain to the Honourable Member for St. Lucy the rainfall patterns in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now venturing on a speech. You can only elucidate on something you have said before.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am dealing with the 1988 rainfalls, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but that is not elucidation. That is now making another speech.

Asides

Mr. E. BOURNE: The highest rainfalls for 1988 were September, October, and November and that is when we always get highest rainfall in Barbados.

Asides

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member obviously does not know what he is talking about Before he got up he had to get a piece of paper from the Leader of the Opposition. I do not require a piece of paper from anybody over here.

Anyhow, the point is that the pattern of rainfall is very important and that is the point which the Honourable Member has lost sight of.

Now the Honourable Member also made reference to the high cost of feed and import licenses for vegetables. Those are the 2 points that I want to deal with. First, let me say that the import licensing falls under the Ministry of Trade. The policy which this administration has pursued is a very simple one. Any application which comes for a product relating to agriculture or fisheries that is received is sent to the Ministry of Agriculture for their recommendations. The Ministry of Agriculture consults with the appropriate body whether it is the pig farmers, Barbados Agricultural Society, dairy farmers, or whatever the interest is. Consultation is conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture and after that consultation then the Ministry of Agriculture makes a recommendation to the Ministry of Trade which then issues the license in accordance with that recommendation. 5.50 p.m.

Now, I think the point I want to make is that until quite recently, even during the administration of the Barbados Labour Party, there were no vegetables which were not 'paid' licence: "there is a fee. There were some vegetables from CARICOM which were not on licence. When we came into office, in order to give encouragement to the vegetable producers, we were able to first set up vegetables from extra regional sources on licence. We have, in the first instance, to make the Barbados Marketing Corporation the sole importer of vegetables, and also in order to make sure that proper licensing and control take place, and also to ensure that proper monitoring takes place. Then, quite recently the Cabinet agreed that all vegetables from all sources, which from multiple sources, would be licensable for purposes of monitoring.

But I think it is important to understand that there are times when production of vegetables may not be up to the demand which is required in Barbados in terms of the domestic use and also the requirements for the tourist industry. There are times when there are gluts, there are times when items are in short supply. There is something which happens to vegetables when there is too much rain or whether it is disease or what have you. What are you going to do? Are you going to wait until the next batch of Cabbages are grown before you make cabbages available to the consumers? I think that would be an irresponsible act on the part of the Government. The same thing goes for carrots, the same thing goes for any vegetable.

\

[What we are therefore trying to do is to ensure that we have in place the proper monitoring systems and if therefore by putting the Barbados Marketing Corporation as the agency through which these items are sold come, if and when you have to compare them I think that this is a positive I

' < '

One has to understand very clearly that this is not running counter to any policy which the Democratic Labour Party has in place and is promoting. We are interested in it, we are promoting it in this country because we believe that there is a future in it, we believe that there is money to be made in it, we believe that it can create the opportunity for people not only to produce but to earn a decent living in Barbados. Indeed, this is the policy which the AIC has established, it is in the process of completing, a food processing factory and this is going to be supplemented by a state of the art food processing factory which the IDC is in the process of completing construction at Wilkey, and it is geared for the production of agro business, this all ties in with the policy of the Democratic Labour Party.

Of course Sir, could also make reference to the fact that Fine Hill Dairy is also making strides in terms of its fresh milk intake and also in terms of its diversifying its product. One could go on and on.

Reference was made; for example, to the Land Lease Project. The Minister of Agriculture vinted it to get & study it, because I think it is very clear that that was the project which started off on the wrong foot. In the first place, the wrong type of farmers, not all of them, but many of the people who were selected were not really farmers and some of them have left the farms. The farms were too tight, the housing which was supposed to have been built for the people had all sorts of problems. There were leaks in all sorts of difficulties. It is very > > * . * : - ; < < :

-' "Aside. { ^ - v . - .
^ : ' if ^ ' 4 " * . . ' . — / " ik ' - * ' . / •

fi6ii. fi. E. dRSSAV^ES: How do you mean you find foot but the houses for them? Did they build the House themselves? The point is the limits of the things were wrong with that and the Minister of Agriculture stands.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Government of Barbados (and not the Barbados Housing Corporation for the Housing of the Landless, it is the Housing Corporation) organise loans for the farmers to build their own houses, so that if they built the houses with the loan it cannot be attributed to any previous administration representing the Government of Barbados, and the member for St. Lawrence

m SPEAKERS The point has been made. ^ '

Minister: E. E. GREAVES The final report of the evaluation of the Spriggs Land Lease Project, March 1987, Agricultural and Management Consultants Ltd) had said that about the houses, Sir. The plan for the settlement of the houses on the project had the prior approval of the Town and Country Planning Office. However, in some instances the siting of the houses on individual lots varied from that which was approved. This gave the appearance of random planning. The contract houses are poorly constructed, elementary building procedures have been ignored and individual units are not properly secured. Sewerage ^

^
SPEAKER! The Honourable Member's time is

^ -
Hon. fi. E. GREAVES: The point I am making, Sir, is that the project has been made, which it is designed, as it will be redesigned, for making a very important contribution to the whole question of land distribution and agricultural diversification in this country, and when one takes every thing on balance it is very clear that not only the present Minister of Agriculture, but this Democratic Labour Party and his Government is fully conscious of the fact which agricultural has to play in the development of this country,

and we are committed to that, and we will continue to give the support which we know agriculture deserves, but it has to be done in a responsible way, and we are satisfied that when we are finished Barbados will be better for decisions which we have taken.

I therefore want to indicate that I cannot support the Resolution and I would give the Minister my unswerving support.

I thank you, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in this debate, not with any sense of pride, because quite frankly ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member proceeds, I am going to ask the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member may proceed.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, I rise to make my contribution to this debate not with any particular sense of pride, because quite frankly I believe that this debate coming as it does at this time in the way it has come should not bring any pride to any of us in here today. In fact, I would say that the main actors and agents in this debate are not present. 6.00p.m.

There might be one or two here, symbolic representations. But the real battlefield of this debate is not among these Parliamentarians and certainly, not among the people in the galleries either. But the real persons about whom this debate revolves have been able, over the centuries, to manipulate certain people to do their bidding, when they do not even understand when they are being manipulated.

Now when my friend the Honourable Member for Christ Church East stood to address us he went back to the dissolution of the monasteries, probably quoting from George Macaulay Trevelyan which he would have read about, how many years ago? Forty years ago, Dissolution of the Monasteries. And he quoted about Tiberius Gracchus which he read some time forty years ago too. And he quoted about Barbadian economic history, probably quoting Carter, Bigby and Murray or Ougier and Gordon or Parry and Sherlock. But I believe he was probably quoting from third form CXC text when he was talking about the economic history of this country and particularly, the role of sugar in history.

All of us who are discussing agriculture today know we are talking about sugar because when you are talking about agriculture in Barbados, except for fisheries, everything else revolves around sugar basically. They are not my words. You have to read people like Dr. Colin Hudson and others who know what they are talking about. When you are talking about livestock, non-sugar, whatever you have to look at the sugar sector. That is the pivot around which everything else operates. Those are not my words.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I do not claim to be an authority on that I am not getting into debate with you either.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: But you are talking about sugar agriculture. You are talking about the state of agriculture in this country today.

Let us understand very clearly that the sugar industry in Barbados is a private sector concern. Nobody would think that you all are talking about a private sector concern in here when you are putting the blame for the state of the agricultural economy on the Minister of Agriculture. It is true that Government intervenes. Government has certain regulatory agencies. It has to set policies and programmes in place.

But this is the vaunted private sector that the NDP talks about all the time, the private sector that can do no wrong. You give them the lead and they will do everything right. But sugar, which has been par excellence a private sector concern from the time there was sugar, which is carrying down this country, and a Minister of Agriculture gets the blame for it. Let us understand the depth of the ignorance that this debate can expose by those who do not understand what they are getting into. Sugar is a private sector industry. Let us understand that very clearly.

I would expect anybody who is leading a debate of this nature to talk about the Norman Commission in 1897, the Oliviere Commission in 1930, the Shepherd Report in 1945, the McKenzie Report in 1957, Farley's in 1961, McGregor in 1979 and Landell Mills which is now available to us which is a magnificent study for those who have taken the time to read it! Nobody should open their mouth in a debate about agriculture in Barbados in 1989 without having consulted these sources. And for the persons who are leading the debate on it, not even to mention them in a long delivery shows that some people seem to be making sport about very important issues.

This is not a circus. It is not a circus for NDP and BLP to be attacking DLP with friends and relatives in the Gallery and the really important people staying home and

laughing at us. I did not become a Member of Parliament for this kind of foolishness, to be casting stones at myself - basically, that is what is happening in here today - to be used and manipulated by others. None of us came in here for that reason. We have big work to do in this country and we will not be stopped by the frivolousness of a few people who are pursuing personal ambitions and personal vendettas and trying to pull back this country from where it has to go. Let us be clear about that. Just look at the McGregor Report 1979 and Landell Mills and you will see where they were locating the problem in this country.

And let us understand, why do you think Hagelberg had to run out of Barbados? Because the same people that brought him down here and used him, when he started giving them advice could not take it and he had to run. And the same Dr. Colin Hudson who is doing such a magnificent job in this country, you start reading his work. They will soon start to run him too! They will soon want to get rid of him too! He runs up against the big boys, the plantocracy that all of you think has disappeared, but that is still there pulling the strings. I am not afraid to talk about them, like some of you over there, some quislings. I am not afraid to talk about them. I stand where I am. If my great-grandfather could look down and see me now, he should be proud of what I have to say. I do not know what your great-grandfather would think about you all, the kind of position you take in these debates.

One of the biggest problems in this country has to do with the ownership and management of the sugar industry, and therefore those who own and control agriculture. I did not say so. I want you all to go and read, the Barbados Sugar Industry, the McGregor Report, Landell Mills, carry it right back. Do you all know that there are 126 estates in this country? Do you know who control them? Who do you think control the 126 estates? You all are making sport about serious matters.

It is true we are at a crisis in this country. Big decisions have to be made. They will be decisions that will be made by big men and decisions that were shirked by others before us. But we will have to make certain decisions. Let us understand that. Who do you think own the five estates and so on? BS&T, Newton Associates Ltd., Fairfield Investment Company, Plantations Ltd., C. O. Williams Associates & Co., Kingsland Estates, Carlton Estates. They are some of the big ones. Go and find out who own those. Those are only names.

Because remember, sugar plantations used to be owned in Barbados by individual families up to the 1920s. Then they got sense, they formed private limited liability companies. Then they got more sense and they formed public limited liability companies. And they hide behind those names. And they continue to manipulate you all without you all understanding what is happening.

Look at the distribution of those estates. Recognize who owns them, who controls them, who milks this country, who are the people that milk this country! Carry away money from all of us in price support. It is coming from the poor people out there. Where do you think it is coming from?

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made a speech similar to this some time ago.

Aside.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He has made similar speeches.

Aside.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Words might change now.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mine are not changing. The ones he does not change though, the reality does not change, whether it comes from him or from me, the reality does not change. It is the fact.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Listen, out of these 126 estates, 85 were controlled by the attorney system, a system that is a carry over from slavery. There are 24 Attorneys in all but there is a big 7. Seven Attorneys that dominate agriculture in this country. You know there used to be talk about Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, this is a case now of Snow White and the seven giants.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Snow White inside here and the seven giants outside.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Seven Attorneys who are responsible for most of the agriculture in this country. And the evidence suggests that wherever there are Attorneys, estates are losing money. But we do not blame them, we blame the Minister of Agriculture because he is just like us. You can see him. He is visible. He is always here. Point a finger at him. Any time you have a fault, Franz Fanon wrote about that a long time ago, how we treat each other. When we have problems outside, turn the ship on your own. We will get to that at another time.

Do not talk about the big 7, the ones who control all of those estates out there and who are interlocking directorates who control this country still, in spite of these faces about here, who own all the land and land is the biggest source of wealth in this country. Attack him. He is sending good messages to your children and to your grandchildren, all the kids in school and in the University. Attack him. He is destroying agriculture in this country. He is an Attorney. He runs all of these big estates in this country, the 126 of them. Attack him. 6.10p.m.

I accuse the Minister's accusers of ignorance and inferiority complex, lack of vision, and backwardness. That is what I accuse his accusers of. You do not want the name of the big 7. You can find them, the faceless ones who move about here with power but allow all of you to attack one another. They are very present in this country, but a lot of you do not even know them. That system of attorneyship has to be put under serious scrutiny if you really want to know where the problems in sugar are in this country. It is an overlapping system where you have attorneys and managers. You do not know who is who or what is what. Managers are not being allowed to manage effectively. Some of them do not have any autonomy in the area that they are operating and that system that has existed for a very long time is no longer tenable in a country like Barbados at this time. There are serious reforms in the attorney system that have to be undertaken and that has been told the sugar barons for the longest time, and they have not changed.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter, as I have said before, I have some respect for him as an economist. As a politician, I think sometimes he does not go with his true feelings unfortunately. When I heard him talking about their ability as a Government, the Barbados Labour Party, to control the sugar barons, I laughed. I have to laugh.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am sure they are still laughing right now. Let us be very clear about these things. I am saying that one of the greatest problems that the sugar industry experienced is that the Barbados Labour Party gave them all the money they ever wanted. It was an open door. Look, you want more credit, come for it. They were fairy godfathers of the sugar barons. The sugar barons from the time I have studied them in economic history have manipulated one source or another. They manipulated the British Government to get protection in the market. They have been doing it from time immemorial. They have used preferential systems and every scheme possible always to milk somebody else. They have milked the Barbados Labour Party so successfully. Nobody will believe that in 1980 the sugar industry in this country owed only \$1.5 million to the BNB. I read from McGregor also on page 60. This is already a document of the House.

"In 1977 Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank made available 102 cultivational loans totalling \$12 million. At the end of that year 40 cultivational loans with a principal of \$2.2 million were still outstanding. By contrast until the mid-1960's virtually all cultivational loans were repaid by the time the harvest was over."

The sugar industry used to pay its way. They did so effectively in the 1960's and 1970's. By 1980, as I said, \$1.5 million was owed to the BNB. By December 31, 1987, it was owing the BNB \$168 million. One hundred and sixty-eight million dollars - Do you think that is a little bit of money? That is what we are talking about. Are you blaming him? In December 1987, this Administration had just taken over. Let us understand clearly what is happening here. Let us understand very, very clearly what is happening here. By December 31, 1987, by one estimate, the sugar industry was indebted \$231 million. What does that have to do with him? Why are you all making this kind of sport? Subsidy after subsidy, money was going from the Barbados Labour Party. Listen to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in this House of Assembly, Tuesday, December 13, 1983, Page 231:

"If you look at the escalation and credit to the sugar industry between 1979 and 1983, you will see the \$66 million that we have been putting back in over the past few years is about the same \$66 million that found its way out of the industry. You will find some in South Africa. You will find some in Swiss banks. You will find some in the Channel Islands. You will find some in Canadian banks. You will find some supporting various commercial organisations in Barbados and in other areas."

That was the truth then. It is not the truth now you see.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member give the reference for the document you are quoting from?

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Page 231 of the Debates of Tuesday, December 13, 1983.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS:... Dr. the Honourable Richard Haynes who at that time was R. C. HAYNES. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East who led that Resolution, who said that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture does not know how to dictate agreements to Trinidad, should tell the sugar barons to take the \$1 150 per tonne as the agreement. He is not going to dictate anything that he has given away to them. Argue with Trinidad. That is what he was telling them. Tell them what to do, but the

sugar people you can give them that. His Leader had said that, when you give it to them, they do so and so. Give them all they want. No problem. The Leader said - you give it and they will siphon it off.

The Honourable Member for St. George South knows what we are talking about in this debate. He is not happy about this debate either from what he said.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: That is true. He is a man of conscience. The Barbados Labour Party will not escape unscathed the history of that period in the 1980's when they opened their hands to the sugar people believing that they could be controlled. You cannot control the sugar people. You cannot control them. They know how to manipulate you and they always will. They have their strategies to control you and when you put up your mechanism to report back to you, they are not reporting. You ask them to put things in control. They do not put things in control, but they will come back all the time and basically what they will do is to hold this country up to ransom. Let us understand what happens here. They hold you up to ransom, they will threaten you, and they will make you feel real bad. We will close down and Barbados will go down the shoot Come up with the money or else. We will close you down and then all of us will be called communists, radicals, and leftists, etcetera, or whatever they want to call us because the Minister of Agriculture might say that our policy is - "Look back in supporting yourself. We are not coming up with anymore money." He would then be accused of causing a financial crisis in this country.

Well, we are not put here to be manipulated by any agencies. We have been educated to represent the people in this country, the small people in this country, to give them the best representation possible, and to understand and analyze issues. That is what we are here for collectively. Let us make it very clear. We do not speak with any animosity towards any individual out there in the private Or any groups in the private sector. We are not against the sugar planters. We know the sacrifices they have made over the years. We know the contribution they have made in the country. Let us make this very clear. All of us make our contributions in our own field. There is no altruism in this. If I am a good trade unionist, nobody should go about and pat my back for that. I am expected to be that. If you are a good sugar planter, you should be good. There is no pride in being bad at anything you are doing. Do not let us believe that we have to walk backwards in praise to people who are not doing a job well. We must understand that very clearly. 6.20 p.m.

There is need for a radical change in the management and the ownership of agriculture in this country. Whether this generation has the will to do it, I do not know. Whether

we can all expect this particular Minister to perform the miracles of the century and do it, I do not know, but I know some of us have to have the resolution to make the attempt. It is not going to be done through division, it has to be done with a solid phalanx of understanding that what we do, we do for the good of this country and that what we do we are not forced into a position to do it because a small group is manipulating all of us, so that the more things change the more they remain the same. Let us understand this very clearly.

On the issue of sugar, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I end by saying that in my view the Landell Mills study by itself would defeat the arguments of the other side. If you look at that study which was commissioned by the present Minister of Agriculture - and if I understand how one should carry out policy, carry out a proper study, get an action plan and work from there - you cannot operate in a vacuum - look at that study and you will see that is a magnificent study. I have looked at all of them from the Norman Commission right down. I have had to read them at some time or another, and this is a trail blazing study. It is a landmark study, and if Barbadians from all walks of life take the opportunity and get the chance to look at it, and if this administration is given the opportunity to implement some of the proposals in it, I think somewhere down the line we will be part of a change in sugar. That reminds me of what happened in the late 19th century when the Cojurt of Chancery system had to be introduced in Barbados, when a similar deep crisis attacked this country and the Court of Chancery allowed a new group of owners to come into being and to move the country forward until now we are back in crisis again.

Barbadians know how to respond to crisis and you cannot respond to crisis by blaming any one individual. This is not an opportunity to take cheap points at anybody, either inside here or outside, this is a time for all of us to come together, to realise that it is a massive task ahead of us. It is a challenge to every Barbadian, from the richest baron, including the man who owns the greatest amount of land in Barbados but who writes as if he just came from yesterday being poor, the single biggest land owner in this country who will write his biography in the newspaper and tell you he was just a poor boy. It might be true, and I admire his ability to go from rags to riches. I have no problem with that at all, but I would like to see some more rags to riches stories on the other side of the fence, quite frankly.

I am not one who supports the movement of individuals, I like to see classes moving up, whole groups of people moving up. That is part of the work of this administration, to move up whole classes by our educational system, et cetera. Whole groups of us must go up, not one at a time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not end without looking at the Oistins Fish Complex, that very narrow area of fisheries. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East and I, as well as the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, because our boundaries are contiguous, have to go to the market and we have to have some responsibility for what is happening there. The Honourable Member for St. John is a frequenter of the market on a very regular basis and he is very well liked there, I am told.

The Oistins Fish Market has been experiencing problems. That is true. There is a number of very vociferous people in the market, many of them of the Barbados Labour Party persuasion. Many of them never thought that perhaps the Honourable Member for Christ Church East and myself would have been representing that area, and they have remained entrenched. They are there. Our policy is not to interfere with people, whatever their political persuasion, they continue to be there. They have voiced their opinions in this Barbados under the Democratic Labour Party where if I go in there they can tell me anything, if the Member for Christ Church East goes they tell him anything, very openly, very vociferously. There is no problem, because I always say if they tell me things I can tell them back. That is my position. They choose the language. I will follow them, I know the language, so I have no difficulty at all in going into the Oistins Market, but there are a number of problems that they have.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East knows as well as I do that the problems at Oistins Fish Market are not of our making. The problem with the ice machines was not our problem, that was a problem with the original machines that were put in.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I have a difficulty in this time. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition gave the Minister of Agriculture seven days to come up with an agricultural policy. I do not understand the relativities. If he has given the Honourable Minister seven days to come up with an agricultural policy - and I believe he asked him to implement it in the same time too, I am not too sure - are you saying that three years is too long to correct problems at Oistins Fish Market? We need to look at these things seriously. But quite frankly there are not all problems that can be corrected in three months, six months or whatever. We know that. We suffer if the problems exist or if we were being given no consideration at all by the Ministry of Agriculture, but it would be true to say that not only has the Minister gone on tour but the Prime Minister went on tour, money has been provided in the Estimates and action has been taken.

It is true that the lights have been installed over and over again. I drive through there and the next thing I see, no lights, and I know there are people who have a vested

interest not to have any lights at the jetty, and they might be people with ice boats and they might be bringing more than ice and fish to the island. That is entirely possible, but I know that there has to be some reason why those lights keep going out all the time. The last thing I asked for, after going on a visit, was a beacon. The beacon was delivered. I drove down there afterward, no beacon. Must we pillory him for the fact that there is vandalism in our constituencies? I do not blame myself for that vandalism. I want to be very clear about that. I do not blame myself for vandalism in my constituency, I do not blame myself for the bad behaviour of people in my constituency. I am not part of that. Let us be very clear. Do not blame ourselves for things for which we cannot humanly take responsibility. Do not let us do that.

You know who had the tender to maintain the ice machines, too. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East knows who had the tender, a man by the name of Mr. Bolden.

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

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Thank you very much, Sir. Mr. Bolden under the last administration had that contract to deal with the ice machines and the ice machines were breaking down all the time. Mr. Bolden had the contract in our time too and the ice machines were still breaking down. Do you want to blame the Minister for that? You have to get completely new ice machines. That is understood.

There was a difficulty with the jetty fenders. They have tried to put on some more of the old tyres again. Maybe they have to go back at it. I understand now that an attempt is being made to look at that and we will see the outcome.

The sewerage and waste disposal system. When the architectural design for the fishing complex was made, as I understand it, there were supposed to be outlets to separate wells. The fish offal would go to one and sewage would go to another. In the wisdom of the contractors one well was placed there. Clearly after a time there was saturation and there was a feedback. That has been corrected. If you went down there recently you would have seen that that has been corrected. It has taken time, but it has been corrected, and there is a whole number of other problems which are being addressed. That is what you will expect of an administration, that after a time it will deal with problems. 6.30p.m.

But let us understand clearly that while I support the quest of every fisherman, fisherwoman and hawker in Oistins or Silver Sands, and while I believe strongly that they must be given the best available facilities, when you are looking at things in a matter of scale, when you are

looking at matters of national concern in terms of a scale, one has to determine one's relativities very, very early.

What are parochial matters? To what extent, I as a representative would be pressured on parochial matters to make them national issues? These are the things one has to look at. We all face them. And we have to know how to weigh them in the balance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said, I do not join this debate with any particular pride. I cannot support this Resolution. I believe that it is malicious, whatever others on the other side may say, it was meant to pillory a person and an administration.

And I should like to say that I congratulate the Minister for his majestic delivery.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He was fully in control of his portfolio.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: And the Honourable Member for St. Peter was saying that it is bureaucratic interference from his side. When the late Right Honourable Errol Barrow was around, they used to say, all roads led to him. Now they are saying all roads lead to him in his Ministry. Some people want that approach. When you do not get involved, they are saying now, no leadership, no vision. You do not know how to please them. But you can only do one thing. Do what is right, do it well and live by that!

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we started this debate today, I really thought that when the Minister got up to speak that he would have availed himself of the opportunity to enlighten us as to what programmes he and his Government had for agriculture in this country. Of course, hours after, all we have had so far is an effort to defend himself, his Government and really what was a recitation of some statistics about sugar, and a rather weak attempt to align some Mr. Joe Goddard with sabotage at the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour which was easily dismissed as utter nonsense. I do not know if it is the same Mr. Joe Goddard who may be a candidate in St. Philip North, if that is the kind of cheap politics that I heard another Member speak of on that side. I do not know.

The Honourable Member who has just sat down has a way, Sir, since 1986, of always making the same emotional

speech, this emotional speech that is supposed to be made to stir up - I am talking about the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central - these feelings. But at the end of it all when I am waiting to hear him say what the recommendations are, if all of these things of which he accuses us over here now which he did not accuse us of before when we were over there are so wrong and the positions.....

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation. When it comes to recommendations, Sir, I refer this Honourable Chamber to the McGregor Report and Landell Mills, a modern studies report. I leave that to the experts, after consideration, to decide where we would go. If he wants *ex cathedra* statements by me, I do not claim the same expertise as persons on his side to have answers to everything in Barbados. I am sorry to disappoint him.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no recommendations. He talks about two Reports. I have one of them here. I have read the Reports. And, as a matter of fact, it was very good of him to draw it to our attention because there are things in the Report that would support this motion

Now you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult - and this is why I say that it is the same emotional speech that I always hear from that Honourable Member - to understand how he can use language about people over here being ignorant and lackeys and puppets and all kinds of things like that and then expect to invite us, as a people, and I believe he means as a people of a certain ethnic background to behave a certain way. I know you may think I am a mulatto. You might put me in that category because you are very good at doing those things. You are very good at splitting us up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Not you, Sir. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, throughout his intervention he continued to ask us: Why are we asking the Honourable Minister of Agriculture about all of these things pertaining to agriculture?

First of all, he tried to narrow this whole debate down to just a sugar debate. I was under the impression we were debating agriculture which would include fisheries.....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: ... and small farmers of course.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: But it was narrowed down.....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER:.... to a sugar debate.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I am trying to get it back into an agricultural debate. Because he narrowed it down to a sugar debate and a few white sugar barons, as they were called, and a little bit about the Oistins Complex. If you want to call that fisheries well then, we call that fisheries, if you are talking about one fishing complex being fisheries for Barbados.

The Member who he continues to call his good friend from Christ Church East, the questions that he asked and the matters that he raised were not answered by the Minister. But we do not hear that discussion. We do not hear that intervention by the Minister. What we hear about is this narrow position that he tends to take regarding that matter.

Before I go on, Sir, to deal with the other areas, I just wanted to quickly touch on a couple of things that I believe the speaker just prior to the speaker who just took his seat, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy said. Knowing that Honourable Member, I have always looked to him, he always boasts of being in these two Houses for a long time, I have always looked to him for a little advice in terms of how to conduct oneself when debating.

I am very sad to say that today he got up and really said nothing that one can draw on, except that he did say that involved in the agricultural plan or programme which he claims this Government has was the construction of a processing plant somewhere. I believe that is the one that is going up at Fairy Valley, the ADC plant. And then he went on to mislead this Honourable House, Sir, and the public at large by saying that there was another plant, a state of the art - to use his terms, he is not in his seat now but I believe that is what he said, the other Members over there can correct me, if I am wrong - processing plant going up somewhere else which I have heard him refer to before which is the plant in Wildey.

That is not true, Sir. It is not a plant as such. And it is not involved in any particular agricultural programme. What it is in fact is a cluster block. It is a cluster of many spaces for people who want to get involved in any kind of food processing, whether you are processing products grown in Barbados or anywhere else in the world. So I do not think we can really use that as an example of part of an agricultural development programme for Barbados. I just thought that it would be remiss of me not to correct that misconception.

Sir, I said that this debate must be wider than just dealing with or defending or protecting or whatever term one wants to use, a few sugar barons or a few white members of the planter class, certainly as far as I am

concerned. Because, Sir, it has to do with, in the broader sense, a very serious aspect of the future of Barbados, in economic terms. It has to do with the future of Barbados in sociological terms. And I am sure that if we get the opportunity to hear the Honourable Minister of Finance on this one that he can do no less than agree that it is a serious matter and it is more than sugar. 6.40 p.m.

The future of the small vegetable farmers is what we are talking about today. Are they large white sugar barons? Did we hear anything about them? Did the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central address their problems? Did he address their problems while he was busy trying to flog us? I have not heard anything about the future of the small livestock farmers.

Asides.

- Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: There is a Member over there saying *sotto voce* that we should give an order to deal with them. We gave him 3 years. We gave him 3 years to deal with them. Do you want another hour? If I had the power, I would give him another hour to deal with them.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central - I have not heard him speak about the problems. Nobody can "sick" me on anybody. You see everytime you attack the private sector you are attacking me too. I earn my living from there and you are attacking a sector that employs most of the workers in Barbados. That is who you are attacking. Decide which side you are going to fall on - the workers or not. It does not happen. It does not happen in a vacuum. I am not equating anything to anything. I am saying that if you do not want to differentiate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and if Members want to get up and get emotional about things, that if you want to call a spade a spade - call a spade a spade. Do not let us go all over the place including everyone else just to make your point and score your cheap political points. That is the point I am making, Sir, and then be so holy than thou as to come and tell me about somebody else scoring cheap political points. So I am not being "sicked" on anybody not at all.

As far as I am concerned, if the Honourable Member for St. George South has a problem with his conscience as you tried to indicate, he will deal with that in the fullness of time and tell you what the problem is if he does have one. I do not have any problem. I have had the same position all along, sugar barons or not.

What about the small cane farmers? The Honourable Member for St. Philip South said that he wants to hear, but the people in St. Philip South seem like they are not hearing. What about the small cane farmers? Is this debate not about them too? When we talk about the failure in agriculture, has it not got something to do with the small cane farmers? What about the workers?

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I have to ask the questions because the answers must come from over there where you have the policy. Well, we are not running the country. Well, call the election and let us decide who is going to determine the answers then. You are not running the country.

Asides

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what about the workers? Is not this debate about those thousands of workers who are involved directly and indirectly with agriculture in this country? Is this not what this is all about too? I heard *sotto voce* - is that what the Resolution all about? The Resolution is about no confidence and it was reduced to a sugar debate. I am trying to bring it back into the area of no confidence in agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one has to address the problems of agriculture and to come up with answers or solutions for these problems, one has to look beyond just a matter of whether we are here to argue who has the money and who does not have the money, or whether we are here to argue, in fact, or whether we are here to debate what is the state of agriculture in Barbados. I think that is what has brought about this whole debate - the whole state of agriculture. For instance, do we understand that like most small businesses and some small to medium sized businesses in Barbados, particularly small black owned businesses, there always comes that time where because they are more often than not under capitalised. The level of capitalisation at the start is low. There always comes that point where your cash flow shrinks to that point and because of prevailing conditions market-wise that you need that assistance. Sometimes that assistance can come by way of loans, overdrafts from the banks, or it can come by way of rescheduling of previous debts. Is the Minister aware of the number of boats that have been seized by the BDB, for instance. If we are serious about assisting the small-fishermen, could we have looked at some rescheduling of these debts rather than the seizing of the boats? No, I know there are people who will jump up right away and say, "Man, you expect these people to take up the people's money wildly and then you give them more money again." These are the same small people.

My position is that I am not really here to argue whether they seized 1, 8, or 20. The point is the principle of the matter. The principle is what I am dealing with. If you have a policy to assist the fishermen, you have to assist them at the level of financing them or providing the programmes, climate, or environment that they can get the financing for the boats. You can assist them by putting up some infrastructure like the Fishing Complex at Oistins and Bridgetown. I will not get carried away with criticising those complexes at this point, I can use that at another time.

I am not going to argue whether it is a small swimming pool or not, as has been said before. You can assist them with providing marketing and, in the final analysis, you give them no help in trying to take away the boat which is the means of their livelihood. You are taking away the man's basket and hoe. That is what you have done. What did you say in your Manifesto 1986 of the Democratic Labour Party, page 12 - Fisheries. You said here that you will provide substantially increased assistance to fishermen in relation to repair and re-equipment of their boats. Are you going to repair and re-equip a boat that you have already taken away from them? Let us move on.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know. You would like me to stop, but I am not ready yet. Last year the Honourable Prime Minister and the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, who is not in his seat now, travelled down to Long Pond - I am sure you remembered that, Sir - and they looked at an area. I will not be quoting them verbatim. I recalled hearing that work would start very soon on what was called "fish farming". They were going to put in a shrimp fanning project to be precise. Some people may want to argue with me later that it was shrimp and not fish. Well, let us say what it was, a shrimp farming project - in the first instance supplying Barbados with shrimp, a very laudable programme.- In the first instance, it will save us some very valuable foreign exchange. Beyond supplying us with shrimp and, when I say us I mean both the permanent and transient population being the tourists, you hoped that sometime in the future to be able to export some and probably earn some foreign exchange - another laudable idea. Needless to say and I think that it would be remiss of me not to say it, the idea came from the Member for Christ Church East. You said to me that all I do is ask questions. Yes, I am going to ask - what has happened to this fish farming project? We have not heard anything more about it. Is that something to do with the barons again? Did they stop it? 6.50 p.m.

Did the barons who the member for Christ Church East Central spoke about stop the fish farming project too? Was not that to provide some employment, along with the other things I spoke of?

I do not think, Sir, it is a matter of anybody coming in here to pillory the Minister of Agriculture as a person. We are debating a no confidence motion. We are dealing with the policies not only of the Minister but of the Government, and if any member wants to take that as a personal thing, there is something wrong with that member. Who do they expect to debate things of national interest in here if not those of us across this floor?

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He said the Minister was incompetent? If the Minister has done things to indicate not only to the Honourable Member for Christ Church East but to a large number of the general public that there is some incompetence on his part, what is wrong with the Member for Christ Church East saying so?

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Member for St. John, who keeps interrupting me all the time, has said before, not directly pointing out any particular member in this Honourable Chamber, but he has said things about Magistrates putting people away and that sort of thing, and I thought he meant a certain member. He laughed when I asked if he meant him, so I cannot tell if he did or not.

Was the whole question of the shrimp project just some more lip service? You see, Sir, sometimes when I try to use this Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party for 1986 to refer to things, I have difficulty, because I have heard not only the Honourable Prime Minister but others who seem to have discarded it. They have said things to that effect. Sometimes it is difficult to wonder if one should really bother quoting from it in relation to the Government.

Now, Sir, I heard another Honourable Member say earlier that Government would lead by example. There is a part in the Manifesto, on page 10, where they said: "Government will lead by example, by ensuring that government-owned agricultural land is fully utilized and efficiently farmed." That is the exact quotation, but I listened to one Honourable Member over there who was talking about some diversification at Pine Hill Dairy, and stopped just short of saying that they were using some local produce. I was glad too because I know that Honourable Member would not want to mislead us deliberately.

Some years ago, back in 1974-75, a project was started at Haggatts. A Barbados cherry, known in other parts of the world as the West Indian cherry, known elsewhere by all kinds of names but still the Barbados cherry, very successfully farmed in Brazil, Puerto Rico, Texas and other places. This project was started by a previous Democratic Labour Party administration. It survived to some extent through one and a half Barbados Labour Party administrations. The trees are still there, so I cannot say it is a dead project, some of the trees are still alive, but one has to wonder.

When we start to talk about agriculture and we get into the broader aspects of agriculture beyond sugar cane - because I believe enough has been said about sugar cane today and I believe other members will get up and talk about sugar cane again, that I would rather deal with some other aspects, which may look like the smaller ones, but I like to deal with the small aspects and the small people, and if you provoke me I will talk about small minds - but the

project was started at Haggatts and the laudable intention was then that we would produce products from these trees.

The Barbados cherry is internationally recognised as the single largest richest known source of Vitamin C of any fruit, beyond that of Rose Hip pound for pound and even far beyond the orange. We had in that crop an opportunity to earn some valuable foreign exchange. There are large pharmaceutical companies around the world who extract the Vitamin C from the cherries, pay some very good prices for it too, and if it is handled properly and packaged right, it could be a good money earner for Barbados.

I am told by the experts that whereas in the past one thought that you needed about three to five years to get a crop from planting a tree, I am told that there are some people who have hybrids that will produce very large cherries in about 18 months. I have to ask what has happened with that project, but if I do not ask here, who should I ask? If I do not ask of the Minister of Agriculture, then who should I ask? What is happening with the cherry project? How long do we go on importing the cherry pulp from Brazil when we can produce it in Barbados? Can we really produce it in Barbados at a good price first? Have you done the research? If you have done the research and we can produce it and it is viable, then how long will we go on buying from Brazil before we can produce our own local ones?

That is not the tree crop we should be looking at, we have to look seriously at all of those tree crops and the fruit crops you planned for the same area in Haggatts, like guavas and other crops. My question is, what has happened with the project? Simple things that one using pure commonsense would understand, even my good friend the Honourable Member for St. John would understand, and that is a big fee, but would you believe that next door at Soil Conservation there is no water for the cherry trees at Haggatts?

/

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know the Honourable Prime Minister agrees with me. I know that was the problem. But the water is next door with a pipe to be pumped over, and two Government Departments cannot get together to put the water on the cherry trees and let us get some more cherries. Whoever is trying to say *sotto voce* that I am looking at a narrow thing, that I am going to buy the cherries, do not worry about that, I can go out of the cherry business any day. We never made any money on it anyhow. We would more be doing some research and development for you, and any day the Minister wants it he can have it too. I am more interested in what happens to Barbados than any narrow considerations, so do not let us get caught up with that.

I listened too, Sir, to the whole question of the role that one expected the BMC to play. I believe that it would

take a full debate to deal with the BMC and the ADC, the roles that they play now, the roles we hoped they would have played and the roles they should play, but I am only going to deal with one particular aspect.

Someone said earlier that we produced some excellent melons - Tandew melons I believe they are called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have two minutes.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Prime Minister was in Vancouver at the time when there was a big exposition of Commonwealth countries. I was present and I heard buyers of fruit for the largest terminal market in Eastern Canada remark that the Tandew melon that Barbados was displaying was easily the best in the world, the best they had ever had to deal with, and they thought at the time that it would find a perfect niche in the up market, that although we had to send it from so far away - maybe we might not get as far as Vancouver because the cost is a bit high and the travelling time was long, unless we can do something with the arrangements for air travel - but certainly we could have sold it to Eastern Canada - Toronto and Montreal. 7.00 p.m.

The point I am making is, Sir, what research and development has really been done? I use the Tandew Melon as an example, but the Barbados green sweet pepper is another example, or avocado pear is another example. Right now there is a man walking around saying he is working for the Government. He came to my yard Sunday asking me if I am interested in selling the few avocados I have in a tree in the yard. Is that the research and development we are doing in terms of marketing? These are the kinds of questions the people need answers for. These are the kinds of questions we need answers for.

It is not a simple matter of getting up, getting emotional, keeping a lot of noise about the sugar barons again, until next year when we come back at Estimates time or some other time and shout about the sugar barons again. Let us start searching for answers. You are really talking about us getting together and finding solutions for the problems in Barbados, well then start putting your money where your mouth is. Let us start getting to the action. And I hope that when we are getting to the action that we do have a little vision.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when the Honourable Member for Christ Church East

Central spoke, for a moment I thought having heard the debate all day, that no one was going to admit that the agricultural industry in Barbados is in a state of crisis. But towards the end of his speech he let slip these words, "until now we are in crisis again". That satisfied me that for all the blustering that we have heard from the Honourable Member in sterling defence of the Minister, he is prepared to recognize that agriculture is in a state of crisis in Barbados.

If the Government itself is prepared to acknowledge that, then the motion that was moved on this side is justified. It is justified, Sir, because in the form of Government which we have in Barbados, Ministerial Government, even though the Minister himself may not own an acre of land, he is responsible for the agricultural policy throughout the length and breadth of Barbados. And there comes a time when he has to account to Parliament. That is what this debate is about today, an accounting of the state of agriculture in Barbados in 1989.

Without going into the various Reports that have been laid on the agricultural industry culminating in Landell Mills, it is obvious to anyone who drives about Barbados that our agriculture is in a very parlous state. Three or four Thursdays ago in the morning, I attended a wedding at Holy Cross Church, the reception was at Sam Lord's Castle. I had the opportunity about 11.00 o'clock in the morning to drive through St. John, but particularly from Oughterson where the Minister lives right across the race road, across to Sandy Hill and I saw for myself a state of desolation that there has never been in Barbados in my 49 years. I know St. Philip well and I remember, as recently as 4 years ago, flourishing canes all along the race road. When you got to Congo Road Plantation, there was evidence of vegetable farming. Now there is evidence of grass, cane stumps and flowering plants of every variety. If the Minister of Agriculture does not feel that he has to explain that state of desolation to the people of Barbados, that is a matter for him. He will be judged in due course.

Dodds Plantation and ADC Plantation in the same belt have some beautiful sour grass where there was once cane. On the road down by Summerville and around Oughterson west of where the Minister lives, he can see it for himself, right next door to him, an ADC farm in a state of chaos. That kind of evidence that is observable to anyone who has two eyes to see must cause Barbadians concern as to the future of agriculture in Barbados.

And this debate cannot be limited to a question of whether there should be a sugar support for the sugar barons as they have been described. There is much more to agriculture in Barbados than just sugar. But we must concede that sugar has always played a pivotal role and, as we have been saying for the last three years in here, policy has always been to diversify around sugar.

The Economic Report, the Central Bank Report all paint a picture of decline in every aspect of agricultural production, save and except one or two, carrots for example, but generally a picture of decline. And in all of that, the Leader of the Government says that people are blaming the Prime Minister, people are blaming the Minister because rain does not fall. The emptiness of that statement tells us something about the quality of leadership in this country, the sheer emptiness of it. This debate is not about whether rain is falling or not or whether any human being has control over the clouds. This debate is about what we are going to do.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: About politics. Yes.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is about what we are going to do to rescue this country from the parlous state that agriculture is in now.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want to deal with some specific areas of agriculture. We heard the Honourable Minister of Trade say in here something about an agro processing plant at Fairy Valley. I had conceived that we, as a country interested in the development of non-sugar agriculture would look carefully first at the identification of markets and the development of processing facilities, before encouraging local farmers to produce vegetables and so on. For three years, now we have been hearing talk about processing. Vegetables are produced in this country at times of glut and the farmers cannot get them sold. I have conceived that the excess would have been canned and exported to the CARICOM region first. I hear nothing about that. 7.10p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, you cannot can that little bit unless you do it at home. That, therefore, renders this document put out by the ADC nugatory.

The ADC is inviting private entrepreneurs to involve themselves in the agro-processing plant at Fairy Valley. Look what they want to produce, Sir - relishes for hot dogs, banana pickles, tomato catsup, cherry pulp and this is going to be imported, guava pulp, and stripped cut sweet potato. What about the farmers who 4 weeks ago could not get their carrots sold? The people at Springhall complained. I complained.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, you do not know. I am in the hot pepper business. They could not get their produce sold. I would have expected Government to have a programme for the processing of vegetables, not the processing of pulp from overseas to be processed at Spencer's - foolishness. I will hear the Minister tomorrow presumably on that. The reality is that the private sector people who have been invited have backed out. That will fail because the food technologist - I cannot call the man "Mullin" name in here. He got a job at the ADC which was never advertised.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...The food technologist, yes. For 18 months he has been up there and has not developed one process yet. What he does, drawing money in the ADC, is to make turnovers, coconut sweetbread, and roties for sale at Springer Memorial School where he has the canteen contract. Eighteen months and he has not produced an ackee seed yet.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They had a Food Promotion Officer who for 2 years never spent one full day at the ADC.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a Public Officer you are talking about?

Asides.

Certain remarks made by Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member may now please continue to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Let me say something to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One thing that I learned in politics early is that there are a couple of things you do not do in politics as politicians. You do not attack each other's wives in here or on platforms or talk about your women. That is a principle that I have never breached. I will not stand for anybody being slimy like an okra...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Slimy?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said that for anybody I will not stand for it..

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment before you go one moment!

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment. Pause for one moment please. The Speaker is resuming his position so perhaps...

Asides.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed...Proceed! Is the Honourable Member proceeding with his speech?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir, let us get back to the debate now. I was dealing, Sir, with some of the problems in the ADC and the lack of performance on the part of certain Officers there. I was dealing with the one who is the Food Promotion Officer. This is a Department under the control of the Minister of Agriculture who can issue directions under the Act, who can set the policy and, if the Department is not functioning properly, he must ultimately take responsibility and similarly for the BMC.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We have a decision in Barbados where Government has said that it is committed to the development of a cotton industry with all the problems it will bring of the pink boll worm, the diamond back moth, and so on. In spite of the fact that it will not assist in the control of the serious erosion problems which we have in Barbados, the Government is determined to pursue a cotton industry to the extent of committing hundreds of acres of the ADC lands - 1500 acres - to cotton production. All right, they are experimenting, but people are concerned even about the establishment of the cotton ginnery at Spencers, I think it is, that a former Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture was the very person who negotiated a management contract when he was leaving the Ministry to be employed at the cotton[%] ginnery, getting the same salary he was getting as Permanent Secretary, drawing his pension and in contract to age 70. That has implications that a person who had his eye on a job should be the one who should negotiate a contract for himself. 7.20 p.m.

The House deserves to have all the disclosure about the terms of that contract. There is a perception that agriculture in this country is not going to thrive in circumstances where there appears to be less than arm's length transactions between officers of Statutory Boards and their own private interests. It appears that the Minister has been content to preside over situations at the ADC where officers of the ADC contract to do work for the ADC through their own companies.

There is public concern, Sir, that as the Honourable Member for St. Peter said, whereas last year we lost 782 acres out of production, at the same time as we are losing that acreage, at the same time as we hear from the Chairman of the ADC and others concerned that one of the greatest problems facing Barbados is soil erosion, and we are losing a tremendous amount of top soil every year, notwithstanding that the Government seems to be bent upon a policy of permitting the unstructured subdivision of good agricultural land.

There are a number of plantations that have been cut up. Cane Garden in St. Thomas, Ashford in St. Thomas, Congo Road, Cottage in St. George, Ashford in St. John, Clifton Hall, Hothersal and Wakefield. Those last four are from particularly high rainfall areas. Only this morning I was given information that at Mount Pleasant in St. Philip, very contiguous to a Zone 1 area, Government has determined and granted outline permission to take ten acres out of cane. It is not only that, it is not limited to plantations, because at Sanford in St. Philip there is a gentleman who has now fled from Barbados, a former employee of MTW, who applied...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You know. The Minister of Housing knows. The development is called Wilfield Place, Sanford. He applied for permission to subdivide a little eight acre lot at Sanford. People next door to him had made similar applications and were turned down. He got his approval and boasted that he met the Minister of Agriculture at Trinity Church one Sunday morning and put pressure on him to get it. Whether his boast is true or not, the fact is that he got the permission when others on contiguous lots were denied.

I wish the Minister to explain for us what is Government's policy in regard to subdivision. I understood the procedure to be that the Ministry of Agriculture would have an input. Indeed the Chief Agricultural Officer was required to give an informed opinion as to the propriety of cutting up any land for subdivision. I would like the Minister, since he is going to answer questions, he is not going to hide from anything, to explain whether in relation to the seven or eight plantations I enumerated just now, and in relation to Wilfield Place at Sanford, the Chief Agricultural Officer made favourable comments. Indeed I would like to know if the Chief Agricultural Officer is still allowed to comment on applications for subdivision.

If we are going to have a proper land use policy in Barbados, it has to be accepted that the old plantation system which has been so offensive to black people must be changed. Agrarian reform is an issue that contemporary Barbados has to face up to, it cannot run from it, but in the context of subdivision and land use I would wish to hear

either from the Minister of Housing or the Minister of Agriculture what is an economic unit

In the old days when the DLP had been in power on the previous occasion a number of plantations were cut up. The Minister of Labour would say that I benefited. I bought a four acre lot at Neils in 1975, but Neils, Frere Pilgrim, Rowans and so on were cut up into four and two acre lots on the assumption that a four or a two acre lot was an economic unit which would encourage the holder of those lots to get involved in agricultural development of some sort. I believe now that with the passage of time the evidence is that the vast majority of those lots have not performed as the hope had been extended then, and so I think the Government must now examine again its policy. Does it accept that allowing a subdivision into four or two acre lots will really contribute to agricultural production in Barbados? If the evidence is that it will not, then there is little justification for the Government allowing subdivision, and it is a problem that we have to grapple with. I do not have available to me the information and the studies from the several people in the Ministry. 7.30 p.m.

I want to hear from the Government, what do they now consider to be an economic lot. I think, Sir, that when in 1987 on the 13th of May, Mr. William Demas said, at a Conference in Grenada, that the expenditure of US \$500 million a year in funds flowing out of the Caribbean community in a highly negative agricultural trade balance suggested that that kind of expenditure was, I quote his words now: "nothing short of scandalous", that is 2 years ago, we were being encouraged by an eminent Caribbean person to look at the question of feeding ourselves:

- (a) because you have to give your citizens food security;
- (b) in the context of the then economic situation and world economic situation, it has not changed dramatically, we could not afford as a Caribbean region the outflow of that kind of money.

We have read in the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto on pages 10...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has one minute only.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One minute? ... and 12, nineteen proposals as to what they would do with agriculture. Fifteen of those nineteen three years later have not been implemented. If I had more than one minute I would read out every one that I have marked here. I would read out every one, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. But I think, Sir; that we have to reach a stage where, apart from the criticisms, we have to hear and see something positive from the Government with a view to the rescuing of agriculture from the state that it is in. It is alright to criticize. But I want to hear from Government now, when in 1987 the Minister told us that within two years - it is here in the Estimates of 1987 - we would be earning \$14 million from cut flowers. Has it materialized? He was warned then, when in the same 1987 at Bill Miller's place in Oughterson he talked about fish farming and the development of a special kind of red fish, a special kind of red fish called the Tilapia and we were going to get into that. Has it materialized yet? Far from anything positive happening, all the negatives are clearly staring us in our faces, Sir, and I fear this, that with the denuding of agriculture, the trend to allow land to just remain idle and turn into grass will make Barbados an unaesthetically pleasing place and could have, not necessarily will, could have an adverse effect on the image of Barbados in terms of tourism.

Those who want to kill sugar, I want to ask them this. When you kill sugar have you found - ask yourself the question, what would happen to rum and what would happen to Barbados' position as the leading manufacturer and exporter of the best rum in the world? Do you realise you would kill a by-product too? Before you kill it, think of it.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Who wants to drink rum?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Who wants to kill sugar?

Mr. SPEAKER: Time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All those who inveigh against sugar...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...have to understand that when you inveigh against sugar, you are inveighing against 6 000 black people who are working out there too. Find jobs for them!

Mr. SPEAKER: Time. Time.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to this particular Resolution by looking very carefully at the terms in which the Resolution was framed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, the first paragraph of the Resolution states that there is a financial crisis in the agricultural sector. I would make bold to say, Sir, that this revelation is nothing new and that in the presentation of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central; he demonstrated that much of this financial crisis is historical in origin and results from a series of ill conceived and superficial agricultural support measures by Government and the bankruptcy of ideas, motivation and interest in the agricultural sector by the private sector.

Now, Sir, we may have some considerable debate relating to definitions on the private sector and I, Sir, cannot accept all the definitions that abound. And I believe that my understanding of the private sector whether it is the colloquial expression or even within its strict definition can only in essence mean the principal actors in the allocation of private wealth. Sir, we have had other definitions, all of the persons who do not work in the public sector are part of the private sector. Sir, that definition is puerile because it would be inexact. There would be a whole large number of persons who would remain unclassified, there would be small businesses that survive on the basis of Government contract. You cannot necessarily determine that they are part of the private sector because their future would depend on the money Government spends or the ability of Government to pay its bills, et cetera. So that that is the definition that I think is most critical.

If we look, Sir, at the Economic Report for 1988 we would see the allocation of credit from the commercial banks in relation to agriculture and we can compare it to all of the major sectors and we can see how low it is accorded, in terms of priority, in relation to the commercial banks and obviously, the lending institutions.

So that those touting these private sector doctrines in 1989 will not themselves be able to encourage one of these commercial banks or other persons in the private sector, as defined by me, to make any substantial change and they certainly have not convinced me that they are able to do so, or that if they had the opportunity, they would in fact do so. So we accept the financial crisis as a fact that exists.

And then, Sir, it refers to a production crisis in the agricultural sector. Again, Sir, if you use the strict definition, production crisis has been a fact of life in agriculture in Barbados and indeed in many other parts of the Caribbean from time immemorial. Therefore that is nothing new and in those terms, the Resolution is perfectly historically correct in respect of its first paragraph. It could have been written 50 years ago and perhaps it would have been also correct at that time.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East in his contribution attempted to bandy about history I thought

in a very flippant manner and if he interprets history in that way and uses those flippant definitions and perceptions of others to interpret history, he will find himself in a difficult position trying to interpret the present state of agriculture. 7.40 p.m.

So that, Sir, to say that Barbados was the prize possession of England at one time in our history, that is a fact of life but it has to relate to many other factors of Barbados' historical development and it cannot just be bandied around to compare Barbados' agriculture today to what it was 350 years ago or 300 years ago. Therefore, Sir, that cannot be a tenable position.

Another historical inaccurate position was that of the Labour Party when the spokesman on agriculture said that agriculture has never been in the position that it is in now before in the history of Barbados. Sir, all of us know better than that.

The second paragraph, Sir, refers to the livelihood of hundreds of persons which has been seriously compromised by this crisis. Sir, if that compromise exists now, it always existed. Agricultural labourers or workers, managers, small farmers, and distributors are not necessarily in any worse a position. If we look at the life of rural communities today, Sir, there is not any substantial change. It is true there have been social welfare programmes that have improved their condition and they have political rights. Sir, the percentage of them who engage in agriculture has declined. There has been no arrest of that. So they are no better off in terms of that. Seasonality still has to be an issue and the lack of insurance whether it is as a social welfare programme or insurance for farmers as farmers. Sir, many still live on plantation tenancies with an absence of roads and proper infrastructure, some with absence of water mains and drainage, and many with absence of proper transportation. That was the case 50 years ago. Sir, most are still in relation, to the land in the same economic relationship. They do not own the land except the small tenantry plot that has been given to them by the Labour Party which they herald as the most significant piece of legislation passed in the Caribbean. All they did was to let people own land that they had been living on for 300 years or more. So their relationship to the land has not changed substantially. They are not owners of it. They do not have long term leases on agricultural land and, therefore, their position in relation to the land is substantially the same as it was before.

I have already said there is little access to credit in the private sector and most of these persons are still considered marginal in terms of their political impact because of the nature of the configuration of boundaries of constituencies. Persons in the urban areas, basically, mean more in relation to the provision of services by Government than persons in rural areas. In relation to their power as people living in rural areas, they are still considered to be marginal and their problems and the issues of their economic development '

take second place, and since the policies of the nationalists came to fore have always taken second place to persons living in urban areas. Most dislike their conditions of employment. Those are facts of life about persons living in the rural areas whether, as I said, labourers, small farmers or whatever, and it has not changed substantially. There are no more compromises today than there were in 1950 or 1937.

Sir, therefore, the historical soundness of the Resolution is not to be questioned. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East - I spent a long time in Guyana with him recently discussing agriculture. I know where his views lie. I know that he may not bring this Resolution out of any malice or ill-will. He brings it because it is his belief that there are certain problems that exist in agriculture, but he should not be misguided enough to carry it a step further and believe (a) that he can blame one person for all of those problems, or (b) that those problems can be dealt with in isolation without any conceptual approach to the problems of agriculture which will be his task, obviously, when he comes to respond.

So that this Resolution could have been moved in 1940 or 1950. Sir, before the Second World War, we had the Moyne Commission and the state of agriculture as outlined by that Commission, if you took out what they said should be done to change agriculture about the problems of small holders and how they should be given land to work, et cetera, it is the same thing that we are saying today. So that basically for a substantial period of time in excess of 50 years, the issues seem to be substantially the same. I do not think that it behoves any of us to bring the sum total of history for 50 years, in fact more than 50 years, and place them at the feet of one Minister of Agriculture or at the feet of one administration when we ourselves, including you all at one time, have the opportunity to contribute to useful debate on the topic without this kind of adversarial situation that we are seeing today, where the only thing that can be gained from it is some kind of personal opportunity for somebody to demonstrate their capabilities in attacking the Ministry of Agriculture are better than other persons.

In 1989, we are still producing high cost export products on a mono-crop basis, if we say that agriculture evolves around sugar, and the plantation is still the basis of the agricultural economy. That is no different to what it was in 1838 and prior to that. So that I believe, Sir, you cannot look at it in a historical manner and you cannot do as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East did and just read out a litany of isolated problems and not bring the full discussion of agriculture into some sensible opportunity for us to look at the wholistic approach to the social problems that exist in the rural sector and how they themselves can effect the performance of agriculture in Barbados and all of the other factors relating to agriculture in relation to the economy. This lack of change, Sir, is really one of the issues. Sir, it is the result of persistent neglect of the

agricultural sector by what would be considered as nationalist Government. I am a child of the nationalist era. I am sitting in here with men who are men of the nationalist era and I believe that if our former Prime Minister, the great leader of this party, were here today, if he were to look in retrospect at the contribution of the so-called nationalist leaders in the Caribbean to our development, he would admit that if there was one error that was made it was that not enough attention was paid to agriculture in giving agriculture the resources that were necessary, et cetera. Instead of that, complete single-minded policies were pursued in relation to tourism, industrialisation, and other service sectors. Agriculture is now being recognised by people as a principal area of economic activity that can employ people and that can contribute to development, and that can propel indigenous growth in an economy. Everybody is walking around and talking about agro-industry will be the basis of their New Path Manifesto and all kinds of things. This is a natural corollary to the failure of the nationalist Governments to look at agriculture as a sector and to plan carefully for it and execute those plans.

Sir, years ago we had - I read about it at school - a lot of discussion about a regional food plan. It came to nought because we were too busy pursuing all kinds of other diversions and, as has happened in the economic history of Barbados, we are being too single-minded in our pursuit of certain options to the complete exclusion of others. That is a fact of our historical economic development, so there was a legacy of problems in agriculture; lack of research and development, absence of land reform, employment drift, land wastage and marginalisation, inadequate attempts to modernise the rural sector. These are conditions that you can identify in relation to looking at all of the islands in the Caribbean, the Caribbean economy. You can see it, except that, for example, Barbados has a unique history in some ways, in that there was nowhere for people to go after slavery, whereas in other territories peasant farming started immediately thereafter. The peasant farmers, however, were also neglected by the nationalists, so they should have been better off than we are today. 7.50 p.m.

We are perhaps now recognising the contribution of that element in our economic structure, and that is why a debate could take place in here. It should not be a debate expressing no confidence in any individual, it should be a debate that should signal a break with that political past, that economic past, and a commitment to future development in agriculture, recognising those historical factors that are important. A commitment to changing those economic relationships in the society which the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central spoke of, where we are not to be manipulated by other people but where we can look at creative options for ourselves and for the persons that we represent.

These problems did not start in 1986, they are not particularly unique, in my view, to Barbados and they could not be reversed in three years. Perhaps fixing a freezer in Oistins could be done in two weeks. That is one thing, but that in my view might not have a substantial impact on the development of agriculture in Barbados when you consider that the economic relationships of the people living in St. John, my constituency, in relation to the land around them has not changed, that a tenantry, the back side of a plantation, is given to people but the land around it is not theirs. Nobody looks at the options of perhaps leasing them land near to the tenantry for small farming. Those are the economic relationships that are critical and those to me seem to be the important things that should emerge from this exercise in here today.

We have a clear indication that the private sector, according to my definition, is intellectually bankrupt in that sense, that it had been in the past incapable of initiating the reform and taking risks and modernising and looking at development not in the capitalist or the individualistic manner, but in the wider aspect of development.

I am going to express a view contrary to the one that my colleague for Christ Church East Central expressed. We have a private sector that in times of crisis, in my view, has not responded well. He said Barbadians respond well in times of crisis and therefore what he means is that we as a country perhaps respond well. But it is not true to say that the private sector of Barbados has been particularly creative or responsive in times of crisis. We have a private sector in Barbados that wants to be led by the Government but wants to maintain its right to exploit people, which is foolishness. They want to say this is what Government should do but our economic relationship should not change at all. That has to be a tremendously difficult problem for us to deal with as politicians, as persons who serve a community and as persons who have to execute policy. You cannot have your cake and eat it.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter said that the Minister had leverage to oversee crops, as though he himself should send out directives to each plantation telling them that they must produce this and produce that. That to me is not an efficient way to manage resources of a country. If all of these decisions then end up on the desk of the Minister, every week you will have a Resolution coming in the House of Assembly expressing no confidence in the Minister. When I say that I mean the Minister and his Ministry, I am not talking about the Minister himself. It would not make sense. That financial leverage, as far as I am concerned, is a joke and in fact it should go contrary to the policies of your party, because I believe that you would want the creative instincts of the private sector that you support to come to the fore without having to force them either by leverage or anything else to take any decision.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The NDP, as far as I am concerned, would want to take the position that the private sector which is so creative and so lily white et cetera can make its own decisions about its own development without having to exercise any leverage over them, so you should not want to support that position.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. -THOMPSON: The point being, as far as I am concerned, Sir, that I do not think that locating that power and responsibility within the Ministry of Agriculture makes sense. There must be some other creative partnership between the owners of wealth in this country, between Government and workers that cannot or does not have to operate on the basis of draconian measures or on the basis of a situation where one party is allowed to exploit. I am saying that a scenario like that, tying that financial support to this kind of leverage, could be exploitative on both sides. It also could lead, if one is not careful by importing Government into this kind of decision making, to high levels of corruption, and I think you have to avoid those kinds of scenarios.

Government has its function, the private sector by that definition has its function, the Labour Unions have their function and they shall meet, in my view, in a creative partnership, not one that necessarily has to be motivated by coercion or by placing the ultimate responsibilities in any < one of those social partners.

This is a private sector that has taken the earnings of workers in this country, the same big seven and others that were mentioned, who receive our savings and our investments and use to their own advantage and not in any way, as far as I am concerned, to the long term benefit of agriculture or to the long term benefit of this country as a whole, because none of the investment activities of the private sector has any particularly useful long term implications. Most of those investments, not just the race horses, are short term investments which have no benefit to you or me.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, maybe. I know nothing about race horses, I just have a few cherry trees in St. Philip which I am offering the Honourable Member for the City to come and pick those cherries. I came and found them there.

One has to look also at the private sector when one is looking at agriculture. You cannot move a Resolution of no confidence in the private sector. It would be politically inappropriate, firstly, but it also would not make sense in terms of how Parliament operates, so what you decide to do is put all the woes in the plate of one gentleman. That cannot be reasonable. It would be as foolish as if somebody

moved a motion of no confidence in the Minister of Finance as he then was when he sat over here for problems that exist in the economy of Barbados which have escalated over time. He would not want anybody to do that and he would expect me to defend him because of the nature of the adversarial system of Government, but he also knows that I could defend him on principle when he was over here in relation to financial matters, which I felt was advantageous, but the day after he becomes Minister you could not move a Resolution of no confidence in him because unemployment was at 18%. It does not make sense. 8.00p.m.

And it is unfair and unreasonable of you all Honourable Members to take that kind of position on this occasion. That is just my view.

So that is the legacy of the nationalists that you have left for us young people in this country. And the question was asked whether we have the political will. I can say that my generation has the political will. There has been a consistent attempt, within recent times, to alter those economic relationships.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That, as far as I am concerned, is the political will that we are speaking of. So that my perceptions, Sir, have to be those of young Barbados which accept that fundamental reform in the agricultural sector is necessary before it will become an attractive investment for this generation. And the answers therefore cannot reside only within the bosom of Government.

A big debate is raging in this country outside of this Parliament on economic relationships, on the change of these economic relationships. And as far as I am concerned what I am saying is that too few of us are relevant to that debate. It means that we are therefore not understanding the nature of the agenda. We are not understanding and listening to the voices of the young university graduates who, as I have said already in here and I will continue to repeat, have benefitted from the political rights, the social welfare programmes and therefore now have to turn their attention to the economic relationships in the community. And they will not accept these piecemeal approaches, people shouting from the roof tops about full employment.

I did first year economics. I understand what full employment means. And I have said in here and I would repeat it again because I believe it is worth repeating, I saw it on, "Yes, Mr. Prime Minister" the other night when the Head of the Civil Service said it could be done overnight. I said so in here before that. You can create full employment overnight. Any politician as Minister of Finance who is foolish enough to carry out certain policies could do it probably in six months or a day. That is known. That is

nothing big. But you pay for it down the road, it is -never lasting and it has tremendous effects on the living standards of the people. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central knows that. There are a few things I picked up from him over a long history in politics. I chaired the same Young Democrats meetings. He just talked about the Young Dems, the first one he spoke at after the by-election....

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON:...in 1978, I chaired it. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I listened carefully to him. I cannot turn everything you have said to me on you, but I am going to turn some.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: And when it comes to economics, you are not in my view going to pull any fast one on me. Because if there is one thing you can say about me, I listen. I may not have talked a lot but I did listen to you, and I listen to all of you in here. And that was my duty as a young person. Some of the flaws you see in me, perhaps you might have created them.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is why I am seeing through this particular Resolution, as a resolution of trivia that is brought at a time when there are other monumental difficulties in this country that have to be addressed. And here you come with a Resolution of trivia firing up the press with stupid press releases, week after week, with a lot of rubbish about agriculture in this country. And then coming in here with a resolution telling somebody to come up with a policy in 7 days. How long did you take to write the Manifesto you said you wrote, 7 days? Now let us be reasonable. I did not write any Manifesto, but if I wrote one in 7 days, it should be ripped up and thrown in a stuff bin.

These kinds of policy positions have to be the result of careful analysis. There is a lot of stuff here that I have been reading, okay, not because of this debate. As I said the Honourable Member for Christ Church East can tell you I have demonstrated an interest in it. And I do not believe that he wanted to take the course that has been taken. He must know that there are other options to our political development than to try to lay the woes of agriculture for centuries on the plate of one man and to try to discredit him in the manner in which people have attempted to discredit him.

There is a 1981 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party which deals with agriculture comprehensively. I do

not know who wrote that. Perhaps that person will own up one of these days.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have a suspicion. There is the 1986 Manifesto which I am told somebody wrote. I was not here. I was in Trinidad. Page 10 deals with agriculture, perhaps it omitted land reform and that was my only major concern but it deals with it as Manifestoes deal with anything. It deals with it Of course the Labour Party's Manifesto run a poor second in both of those contests, so we would not bother to deal with that at all.

There is the Sectoral Plan for 1988-93, the Barbados Development Plan 1988-93. All of these documents are there. The answers are provided. Yet you say the Minister has no plan, come up with a plan. If you had said, take one of these, take any of them, lend the fishermen more money, I give you 7 days to do it.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well then I can say you are being reasonable. But not come up with a plan in 7 days when all of the documentation is here. We have all read it over and over. It relates back to 20 years from now, back to 50 years from now. The solutions are not new. And you tell him come up with a plan for agriculture in 7 days.

In my constituency we have been discussing agriculture consistently. We have been looking at the question of land reform. A false impression is being given in here and on the streets by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. You would believe that Ashford Plantation, Clifton Hall, Hothersal and Wakefield are four separate plantations. There is one application made by the owners of all four relating to, as far as I know, two pieces of land. Most of it was denied. One is for housing development for low income people in my constituency. The first time....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Is Ashford not in different ownership from Wakefield?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Ashford is in St. George South. Check the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Ownership, not constituency. Rosy Allan owns Ashford. Kinch owns the other three.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Hothersal and Wakefield.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I represent a constituency....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time is about one minute more.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir. You re-aligned the constituency. I know what I represent. And I am interested in those that fall....

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ... within St. John. For the first time in 10 years or more we are now about to get some house spots for low income housing. And that is the reason why a piece of land which, as I understand it was traditionally agricultural, but is in between the cemetery and the playing field of about 8 or 6 acres is being used because it is near to the centre of communication. And yet people would walk around here and tell you that we are fragmenting land willy nilly and give you the impression wanton subdivision, and list plantations for the sake of listing them.

Now there is a reason for this. We could always talk about Kendall Plantation and the 63 acres. We can talk about a whole number of things of which you have peculiar knowledge. And if you want to debate land use and land reform, I will debate it in here and I would say that as far as I am concerned, we cannot be schizophrenic. Either you have a concept of how Barbados should develop and it must carry over to any relationship you have in life, whether it is professional or otherwise or you do not. If I am not in favour of land use as a Member of Parliament, I am not in favour of it as a lawyer or anything else, because I am concerned about Barbados. Let us not get into land use and have all of these statements being bandied around as though this Government is carrying out an active destruction on this country.

I am sorry that my time has run out, Sir. I will not be supporting this Resolution.

Applause.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have been in this Chamber since 10.00 o'clock this morning and I think, Sir, it is time that we should all have a break, especially, Sir, the Hansard Reporters who have been working ever since that time with only a break for lunch, not even for dinner. And I want to thank them, Sir, even though the Debate is not yet ended....

Applause.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: ... for the devotion to duty. But, Sir, I do not think we can push it any further. This Debate is not ended. So therefore we should have to return here at the earliest possible opportunity.

I therefore move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday the 19th July, 1989.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

The question that this sitting be suspended until Wednesday, 19th July, 1989 at 10.00 a.m. was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 8.10p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. It has been drawn to my attention that on page 12A of today's NATION and I quote the relevant section where it said that:

"He quoted from a letter to former Barbados National Bank (BNB) Chairman Wendell McClean and signed by these two officials showing the 1987 output which stated that production for the contractual markets was viable"

et cetera. And the two officials referred to were a Mr. Ian Walker and a Mr. Errie Deane.

I have never read from any such letter, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to bring this to your attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are just drawing it to my attention or do you want the matter to be dealt with?

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I want it referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before the House begins, on a point of privilege too, Sir. Last night I had some very strong words with the Prime Minister and in the course of that exchange, I think I was less than respectful to the Deputy Speaker who was then presiding.

I wish to apologize for any offence that I may have given to the Chair last night, because I would never have intended any affront to the Deputy Speaker.

In regard to the matter with the Prime Minister, I wish to say that he spoke with me after and gave me certain assurances which I accepted. That matter is now at an end.

Applause.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to add that we in this Parliament accept sometimes the circumstances that give rise to certain types of attitudes and probably responses.

I want to say that for my time as Presiding Officer all Members, I would almost think, on the majority of occasions have paid that kind of respect to the Chair. And I am sure that I as Presiding Officer have very little difficulty in accepting the sincere remarks you have just made, and I am sure that the House itself will accept them in the way you have just explained.

Does any other Member want to speak on this Resolution?

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as this debate has proceeded so far, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has failed miserably in his reply to the charges made by the introducer of this Motion, my distinguished colleague, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

What we are doing here is recording for history the fact that the people of this country, whether they be in the industry, whether they be small or large farmers, whether they be workers, whether they be people in the distributive sector or the industry, today they have absolutely no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture. And I think that whatever the outcome of this debate, what we on this side would like to achieve is to walk out of here with the votes of the other side who support him in whatever infelicities we shall bring to this House.

It has been said, Sir, that in the 1981-83 period, I took a position in relation to the sugar industry. That is correct. The cash crisis caused in 1981-83 was a direct result of the use of revenues from 1980 for the building of Portvale and inadequate timing in relation to the receipts from the Caribbean Development Bank for long-term financing. That, coupled with the late negotiations for sugar workers which finished in March of that year and heavy compaction of the soil had serious effects on later crops.

I believe that the sugar industry was at fault at that time to a large extent and I came in here and said so. I am not paid by anyone in the sugar industry. Two years later, after sugar bills were introduced in this House their performance improved and short of certain informational requirements I was in a position, in the interest of Barbados, in the interest of the workers and in the interest of this country as a whole economically to support a price support in Barbados.

At any time, if tomorrow the sugar industry should take any position which I consider not in the interest of Barbados, I would also oppose it because I am a free man. I am free from the bondages of prejudice. And I particularly resent any suggestion that this Resolution was brought out

of malice or being manipulated by any particular group in this society.

It was brought here, Sir, because we were concerned about what was happening with licences for the import of cash crops into Barbados. Licences, Sir, that were sold. That people got those licences and sold those licences for cash up front. People not in any way connected either with the importation or distribution of vegetables normally. I was concerned about the volume of imports of cabbages and other items into Barbados at a time when our farmers were ploughing back their produce in the fields.

Moreso, Sir, yesterday my colleague submitted a list of names of persons that he intended to call in this debate. That permission was not granted. Fortunately, there is still a document before the House which has one of the names on it. Nevertheless, Sir, I would abide by your ruling. And despite the fact that that document is before the House and I can call the name, I will not call it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Precisely, exactly the reason why I did not give permission because the Standing Orders of this House are clear. I am prepared to be guided by what those Standing Orders lay down. Any names that are to be called, I submit must be submitted with documents.

You have made the point. A name has been submitted, the document is there and that name is subject to what I will consider discussion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But can I call....

Mr. SPEAKER: Any other names that are not substantiated by such documents will not be permitted to be called in this House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Once I can call that name. But even that, Sir, I would not even call that name. All I would say is this, that that was the very person that went and collected a licence from the Barbados Marketing Corporation for cabbages that were held up - at 4.00 p.m. - at Grantley Adams Airport and who subsequently bought the cabbages from a relative of the Minister of Agriculture. That person....

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker,....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ... is a personal friend of the Minister.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would deal with this specifically when I speak. But no relative of mine ever sold any cabbage to any person. And that is my word to this House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is the kind of thing, Sir, that has succeeded in undermining the confidence of this

country in the Ministry of Agriculture and in particular in the Minister of Agriculture.

Many persons who are involved in the business of vegetables cannot obtain licences. And when I go through this list that has been made a document of the House I see a whole lot of names on here, people who have never, to the best of my knowledge, prior to 1987 been involved in this kind of activity. Moreover, we have a list here with respect to one of the big areas of allocations, and instead of having names on it, all you have is a number of importers. What has happened to those names?

Another reason, Sir, is that - and I am glad that these documents were laid before the House - a big song and dance was made in here yesterday about the guaranteed prices offered for sugar and non-sugar crops. Would you believe it, Sir, that the guaranteed price offered for yams, the minimum guaranteed price of 65 cents is offered in a situation where people can get \$1.00 a pound for yams out of the ground. And this is a big deal that is being offered to the small farmers of Barbados. Sweet potatoes, a guaranteed price of 29 cents and the farmers can get 50 cents for it out of the ground. I will get on to cotton later because I am not satisfied with a whole range of infelicitous matters relating either to the pricing of cotton offered to the farmers of this country and certain corporate and interlocking relationships involved with the establishment of certain matters in relation to the cotton industry. 10.15a.m.

I do not wish to talk about matters relating to the NCC, because I was a Minister of Finance at the time and I knew the caveats and cautions which were suggested at that time. It would be improper for me to do that I would think. So I will go pass that, but I will come back.

Yesterday the Honourable Member for Christ Church East raised the question of a company called Summit Construction Management Company, a company incorporated in Barbados on December 9, 1988 by one director in St. Philip. I cannot call his name, but he will not get away scot-free nor will this get away scot-free. I also want to know as well about certain relationships in relation to a company called Sky Block Barbados Limited and its relationships with Government organisations and why a certain vessel went back to Trinidad. That is information that I would want to get on this here. I am quite sure that certain people understand exactly what I am saying without calling names. I know that there is a managing director from St. Philip and I also know that there is a secretary from St. Philip involved in that company as well. Most surprising, Sir, that when you go through St. Philip, you see the worse evidence of devastation of our agricultural lands in Barbados throughout the parish of St. Philip. In terms, Sir, of the question of licenses pertaining to fish, this gives fair and clear evidence that the very people who got behind the Trinidad authorities to arrest our fishing vessels in Trinidad

and stop our fishermen from bringing in fish to Barbados to sell at 10 cents, the same people in collusion with others, "Sir, were given licenses to bring in fish to sell to Barbadians

Asides.

Horn E. E. GREAVES: £>n \$ point of or^er, Sir. The Honourable Member is making a very seripus accusation. I indicated yesterday that the Ministry which has the executive responsibility for issuing licenses is the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member is making the point that there is collusion between the issuing of licenses and the arrest of fishing boats in Trinidad and Tobago of the sale of fish in Barbados at \$1.00 each as against 10 cents which, therefore, is imputing - well, he said it is collusion which is improper motives on the part of the Minister, the person who has the ultimate responsibility forissaiag liaensos. TheiHipmcMju^bleMember is indicating that I know nothing about it. The fact of the matter is that I cannot accept that because I have the responsibility, for it. Even if kii» an^ffic\$ in my Nfinistry who issues something and I do not know anything about it, I have got to take the responsibility for it Therefore, I am asking the Honourable Member, since that .has absolutely no connection with what goes on in the Ministry, and there " '• is no collusion, to withdraw that remark. I am asking the Honourable Member to withdraw the remark— the remark about collusion between the issuing of licenses, die sale of the fish, and the arresting of fishing boats in Trinidad. It is improper. . * , , *,. • • , ^ .? . , , , , ;> ?/ . ^ , 4

"•- Mr. SPEAKER; I do not thinje that I haveto inquire of: the speaker whether .he wants to withdraw the remark or not It is deat that it does impute* in my view, the reflection on the Minister which cannot be substantiated and* for that %iQattet;.> }iii» are also,bringing,into playlet cojwi«c| of^ »f officers. Lpn sure that the Honour^le Member fygwst die? • rule very well that you cannot make thai kind of imputation ^ to Public ftficers aad tten sfcteiid it to ^ini^in niy t^view, I think that the Honourable Member woul&^r&jnly" want to correct that, , , - . r t

Dr. R. C. HAYNES; I withdraw.tty? ?£mark, Sir, and rephrase it in this way. Our fishermen were bringing in fish; from Tobago waters and selling here at 10 cents. Problems arose in Trinidad....

u P. M.: GREAVES; £ji>,a poipt of .order, Sir. I further suggest that those remarks be struck feorn the.record, Sin >v , ,

* *Asides.* ' , * .

- ' DrjR.CHAYNES:JfImaycpntijue,Sir..4. ,

Mr^SPEAKER: Continue., ;, . , ,

, Dr. R. C. HA VINES: If I,may cqritinue, Sir^I am saying that it is a fact that our fishemen were fishing in the Trinidad and Tobago waters and they were selling ftsh here fof IQffljfypL piec^ . I.^m saying it is alsP a fact thSt they w^e Stopped, f^ ^^!- fishing^ ,and" there/ was a Jobby in ^Tiiqida^ ftat brqugfit piessurp on ttie^Triniakd authorities^ to take thQ,actipo whiph^ttiey ifodfc. I. am msb sayipg that it is a naitfor p^act that jho^e 3arne^^ persons (in Trih^clad Were the peijsp^ >yhp vxere^beriir^l tjie organisation fof exporting fish ^tp3arb^dps, Jjarn, also saying that it is a matter of fact that persons in Barbados obtained Ifceris^s to import^di6s6; ^ish. I am saying that it is a matter of fact triat die fash w& sold at \$1.00 a piece. This is a record of facts.

' . ' * * . J ' . ' . ' . K I , , , . ' . , , , . , . , . > . / 1 »

It is npt surprising therefore, Mr. Sj^ealfer, that tl)is .R^solutipn porn^s against trie back^purii of chaos in the ^ entire po>v,errii?i^ht whether it \$e the Caribbean , Bro\$dcas4ii£ Corpoitt^on,^ bankrupt T&afbadps Development , Panjk,,the f^ctjbat,the Police "cannot deal, wifli the question pf jppd^,laix\$^9pa assist fh^ farmers, the problems in the area of defence and security in fearbadbs,^ problems at the Transport Board where the substantive Minister is being cpnst^nUy undermined ^y various other persons in his own party, problems at the cement plant, problems with law and , orclq;v|>rob,lems at thp)Sarba<lps Marketing Corporation, problems at the Agricultural Development (Corrjoration, problems at thp Barbados Natiobal Bank, problems at the .Central Bank....

Mr. SPEAKER: Yesterday....

'Apjfs..

. \v \Mfr SPEAKER: There i^s no way^that this sitting is going %be suspended fpr disonJerVl wifh h6j: suspertd this \$tjjng £c>r disorder. I wifh.\$ce the appropriate action one by one. Yesterday, I macfe the plea that I gave each ,Honpur^ble Member the opportunity to speak with very few interruptions. I want to afford the same Nfe&bef who is speaking the same opportunity. I will, tferefore, ask Honourable Members to desist from interruptions which will in ,Sorhe way make it difficult for the Reporters to record and for myself to be al?le to make rulings 6n points of order, etcetera So I am appealing to Members to desist from the interruptions 'that are not necessary 'at this stage. Will the Honourable Member continue? "*) *x<-

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: M-. Speaker, I am most grateful to you for your protection in a ^situation where fully 10 minutes of my time have already be&i eroded by these interruptions ... problems in relation to the National Conservation Commission, problems in relation to the National Assistance Board, and the most effete leadership in the history of this country, problems in rdlatibh to drug j abuse - a situation, Sir, where the. Honourable Minister of Agriculture Has now imported*" by his negligence a

completely new dimension of poverty into the rural areas of this country.

In 1966, Mr. Speaker, collectively we proclaimed to the world the realisation of our claim to our patrimony. The fields that we claimed were now our very own. Today those fields, uncultured, unmanicured, overrun by bush and grass, abandoned by small and large farmers in despair, buried under the weight of excessive debt - Mr. Speaker, they are but clear testimony to the negligence and incompetence of the Minister of Agriculture. 10.25 a.m.

Today, Sir, by this Resolution we seek to reclaim those fields for future generations, we seek to give expression to a feeling universally recognised that if one is to succeed we must be capable of exploiting our God-given resources, our land and our sea. By expressing a lack of confidence in the Minister we are simply reflecting the feelings of the widest section of the community of Barbados.

This Resolution, Sir, speaks to the question of a production crisis. That has been admitted. Whether it be in cash crops, whether it be in sugar - 66,000 tonnes, the lowest production in 48 years - that is a production crisis. A financial crisis, no question about this, the bankrupt situation that the industry was presented with was partially or significantly, rescued in the intervening years, and now it is back in a worse state than it was then in the days of chancery or in the early 1980's.

We are talking of the Minister's incompetence compromising the lives of hundreds of small people in this country. Fifty percent of the small farmers who earned a living in this country today have abandoned their plots. Fifty percent of the workers directly and indirectly involved in the sugar industry today cannot get a cent out of their traditional employment, and you tell me that this is not a significant matter that should be brought to the House? Or that we are here defending a few sugar barons?

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I understand clearly the significance of the Immunities and Privileges Act. Sometimes I do not react to certain imputations of us being manipulated, or bribed or otherwise, by persons to bring Resolutions inside here.

Mr. SPEAKER: By us who?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But I know....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has used the word "bribed". Are you referring to us in here?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, you were not in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to be very careful....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You were not in the Chair. You would have heard the word "manipulated". There was a charge that we were manipulated and I am saying it is highly improper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not dealing with what has gone before me, I am dealing with what is before me. The question is whether you are suggesting that the members in here are involved in bribes. That is what I am asking.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir. Mr.

SPEAKER: You have not answered the question. Dr.

R. C. HAYNES: What was the question, Sir? Mr.

SPEAKER: You said us in here bribed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, I did not say so, I said I did not react to a suggestion that we on this side were manipulated or bribed to bring a Resolution here. That is what I said. Anyhow, let it be clear, Sir, no one can manipulate anybody on this side to bring anything before this Honourable House. If that was done that would be a serious breach of the privileges of this House, and indeed if such a charge could be substantiated it could be just cause for a Member being expelled from this Honourable House. Let that be clear. Read the Privileges and Immunities Act when you start making charges against other members.

If I may continue, Sir. There is no question that sugar production is at its lowest level in 48 years. Non-sugar production continues to be on the decline and we are not accepting any bogus, half year figures. We have got those half year figures again and again, and at the end of the year it has always turned out to be something completely different. We know what is happening to the livestock industry in Barbados. At the financial level the plantations are now for the first time *de facto* and *de jure* bankrupt. Barbados Sugar Industries Limited is *de facto* bankrupt but not *de jure* bankrupt because of the mechanism of revaluation of its assets at market value.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, I heard the ridiculous claim yesterday that it is inappropriate and improper to bring a motion of no confidence against a Minister of Agriculture. For the past hundred years since the days of chancery one of the outstanding things about agriculture is that public policy has impinged more and more on the survival of that industry, and rightly so. Today, Sir, the Minister and his colleagues control critical elements in relation to sugar, critical elements in relation to marketing through the BMC, through price guarantees, through the provision of abattoir facilities, through financing and the

conditions of financing, through the use of licences or the non-use of licences, through the provision of law and order to prevent praedial larceny, through traditional taxation policies, through price support mechanisms, through land use policies and possible reform. Make no mistake about it. They are all in the hands of the Government and it is a responsibility of the Minister to properly advise the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to co-ordinate that particular activity.

The question of debt management, transport costs and the taxation involved in those matters, these are all within the realms of public policy and there is no private sector activity in Barbados which is as critically dependent on enlightened non-corrupt public policy as in the area of agriculture. Let us be fair about this. No sector of agriculture in Barbados can survive without enlightened public policy. I go further and say this, Sir. Even in the matter of the wages and conditions of workers in the sugar industry, public policy has an important input there, and in fact on several occasions Government has had to intervene in order to secure an appropriate settlement for the workers in the industry, as is well known.

It is right and proper and correct that the Resolution in here should be brought against the Minister of Agriculture, unless the only other argument is that it should have been brought against the whole Cabinet. That is the only alternative.

Make no mistake, Sir, we are faced with a situation where what has happened in the past three years has done more damage to agriculture than all the cane fires in the past 50 years. The Minister of Agriculture can be properly designated a disaster area for the country.

The Barbados National Bank, make no mistake, with the lock ups and increasing indebtedness, that money may well have to be paid by the taxpayers of this country, and we cannot renege as a House from our responsibility in making sure that schemes are devised for the industry in order to obviate the necessity for the taxpayers assuming that debt.

Now we have the situation again where the Central Bank of Barbados is financing the sugar industry with high powered money, with consequential problems for the balance of payments of Barbados.

We go further, Sir, and say this. Apart from the existing bankruptcy the sugar industry in fact has to meet over \$52 million in price support loans made in the past, and one of the ways in which they got around this was the fact that they were allowed to import special sugars to put \$2 million into the Sinking Fund and the remainder to offer another three to four dollars for the primary planters. The Minister has now deprived the industry of that money.

As far as the Barbados Marketing Corporation is concerned, it plays no role whatsoever in the development of agriculture. It is more concerned with all kinds of shady practices. Its whole emphasis is importing and the merchants in Bridgetown will tell you sorry tales of what goes on from day to day as to who gets this item and does not get that item.

I am calling on the Prime Minister of Barbados to review the role of the Barbados Marketing Corporation if you wish to do anything for the small farmers of this country like yourself. It is true that your maximum production has always been four cane holes and two sheep, but never mind, you have designated yourself as a small farmer and the BMC should be there to serve you and serve me and serve others as well.

Laughter.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Honourable Minister of Health confirms that I am telling the truth in relation to the levels of production.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I was referring specifically to his very accurate description of the Prime Minister as a small farmer and his further accurate description of the Prime Minister's endeavours in that regard. I said, Sir, that that was the first time I had heard him speak the truth for the morning. That is what I said. 10.35 a.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have heard too, Sir, that there is an acknowledgement of the truthfulness of what I am saying, generally speaking, coming from the other side. Because I know that you must all be sharing certain concerns. You must be. Remember, we were not always strangers. I know you are sharing certain concerns. I do not mind your words. But I know you have certain concerns and it is in your interest to recognize what is happening out there and what people are perceiving and the truthfulness of the charges made in this House.

We would not come in here, Mr. Speaker - let me tell you something. It is easy to bring a no confidence motion in a Government. It is one of the most difficult things to do to focus a no confidence motion against a colleague in this Parliament. And you would only do it if you have just cause. And you would go further, you would not even surprise him with a no confidence motion. You would give him at least 7 days to state what his policies are.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the sugar industry has cut back its costs in real terms, cost of production, by 30%. We are now

faced with a situation, Sir, where we have a most damning report of the Government showing clearly that if the sugar industry continues to slide, all agriculture will slide, and that this country will just be a barren land in the future.

Steps must be taken now. Your first step is to remove the Minister and put someone there in whom the people of Barbados would have some confidence. I go further and say this, Sir, that whatever is necessary within reason and after objective analysis to get sugar production back up to about 110 000 tonnes, that that would be highly desirable. And I go further and say that it is ridiculous to say that it was due to rainfall. I have checked, not the absolute rainfall, but I have checked effective rainfall in millimetres per thousand litres in relation to the sugar industry. And there can be no doubt that the effective rainfall which takes consideration into its impact on sugar has been better in 1986, 1987 and 1988 than in previous years. You will find it in the appropriate published documents from the Ministry of Finance, one of the agencies of the Ministry of Finance. You will find it there. I say that you have a responsibility to take steps to refinance the existing debt of the sugar industry, probably by capitalizing the industry, convert it to long-term loans somewhere in 20 to 25 years. But to ensure that you get an appropriate sugar plan. Because there is evidence that those estates which have had the resources to lift their debt, for example, Barbados Shipping and Trading who were able to take out \$2 million of the debt and write off the debt elsewhere, do not forget it is written off elsewhere, that they have been able to survive in the present circumstances.

What is important is that we must not allow the alienation of our agricultural land. We cannot allow our lands to become like another Antigua. We have to make sure that these lands are preserved. We are now faced with a situation that there is consideration being given to mothballing another factory. Have you considered what would be the cost of having, down the road, to rehabilitate agriculture in Barbados and put in two or three new factories? Do you know what would be the cost? You are talking now of hundreds of millions of dollars at today's prices, if you had to mothball those factories.

I believe, Sir, that agriculture is a fundamental and critical part of the economy of Barbados with tremendous potential. We have to get all those variables right. It is now rock bottom. If it is not turned around now, it would be headed for a disaster. It is not like a hotel that you can close and open next year. There is continuity in terms of field management and production. And therefore the steps have got to be taken now.

What wise man would plant one hole of cane today, unless he has an assurance of a reasonable price for his canes? Which wise man would do that? I have a small land holding. I have no lock ups. I have no debts. And the reason for that is I was smart enough to lease it out for a few cents

a year. Just two or three cents a year. So I do not have any. The person is doing some kind of agriculture. But I have to keep leasing it all the time. Every year I need a new lessee.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I finally want to deal with this matter of cotton. The Minister must tell this country what is the cotton policy. Why he is taking between 1 000 and 1 500 acres of agricultural land to put into cotton. Why he has authorized the taking up of hundreds of acres of second crop canes to put land in cotton. Why it is, knowing that cotton is a fertile breeding ground for the white fly that was brought in in the cabbages that I referred to earlier on, why is he going to concentrate on his people in St. Philip. What is going to happen to their cash crops if the white fly should take over and concentrate in that area?

I want him to tell us why it is that he offered the farmers only \$1.90 per pound? Why is it that he went back to them and offered them \$2.15? Why is it? It is \$1.90 you offered him, he came back to \$2.15 and we know that if you are to pay the workers in the cotton industry a decent wage you really need to pay about at least \$2.50 a pound.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To pay the workers a decent wage and a competitive wage. I go further, Sir, and I say this. I want to know who the shareholders are in the series of interlocking companies being established for this cotton thing here in Barbados. I want to know. Names have been cropping up that have occupied the attention of this Parliament on many occasions before. Certain names have been jizzopping up and we want to know who the people are at all levels.

I also want to know whether the person who should not get off scot-free in relation to Summit Incorporation Ltd. incorporated at Franklin House in Wildey, whether that person travelled to Canada with the Minister and participated in certain negotiations in relation to the work being done now on ADC estates? I want to know these things because he will not get off scot-free. I stress scot-free, double "t" scott. He will not get off scot-free.

If I may continue, Sir. Let the Minister tell this country why it is that he has been unable to establish an abattoir in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Two minutes. That is enough, Sir, more than enough. Why is it that you have not been able to establish an abattoir in Barbados? This can be

established certainly at a cost of between \$1.5 million and \$3 million depending on the scale of building. Tell us why. Tell us why you can do nothing for the small farmers. Tell us why you have allowed half of the small farmers of this country to go out of business. And then we hear the claptrap being talked about the barons that are still in business but half the small farmers have gone out of business. That is why we are here because we are concerned about workers and small people and not about ecological claptrap.

If I may continue, Sir. To wind up, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the Government has to respect the fact that they can only have a successful agricultural policy if the people of Barbados have confidence in your Minister of Agriculture. You have to recognize the fact that the small farmers have lost confidence, that the large farmers have lost confidence.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They just would not co-operate. That the workers have lost confidence. That there is no confidence - you cannot accuse me of sabotaging anybody.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have your problems with the NUPW. That is your problem.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time is very close to the end. So make the point. Wind up quickly.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have three minutes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave you.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Those gentlemen are taking up two of my minutes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to go into that. But since we need to explain, you started at ten past ten

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:.... and I gave you an additional five minute's and two minutes to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But of that two minutes, Sir, they eroded one.

Aside.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am only asking.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Wind up quickly. One minute more.
10.45 a.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you and I would like to conclude by saying and urging on my colleagues on the other side to recognize the fact that the people of Barbados have lost confidence in the Minister, that the industry has lost confidence in the Minister, that the small and large farmers have lost confidence in the Minister, that the workers have no confidence in the Minister and that there are 2 political parties in this Parliament who have no confidence in the Minister. Recognize and search your hearts and see if you could honestly give your full support to a Minister in this situation. I know you are under a lot of pressure over there, ' but put the interest of Barbados first. You are capable of doing it. Think about that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what the formation of a new party can do to some people. If the Honourable Member for St. Philip North had come into this House of Assembly and told this House that the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Finance called him from Japan, after midnight as usual, and told him that he had just agreed with Suzuki to drop the price of cotton knowing full well that the Barbados Government was subsidizing and had agreed with Suzuki that no way could he drop the price of cotton, if he had come into this Honourable House and told the House that is what he did after midnight calling from Japan, that would not have happened.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House. I was asked by the Minister of Agriculture to meet with a Mr. Suzuki in Japan. I was never part of those negotiations. Mr. Suzuki told me what he was offering and, obviously, I contacted the Minister of Agriculture and asked him whether it was acceptable. I know nothing about cotton prices. A Minister of Finance does not settle cotton prices. It is a bunch of foolishness and a naked lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Is the Honourable Member saying that he did not call this Honourable Member from Japan after midnight and told him that he had agreed with

Suzuki to drop the price paid to Barbados for cotton? Is the Honourable Member saying that?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I had no authority or power as the Minister of Finance to do that. Whatever price was negotiated was first checked with the Minister of Agriculture. There is no way that I could do that. I had no authority. That is foolishness.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking if he did not call the Honourable Member and say that he had just agreed with Mr. Suzuki to lower the price. Okay. The evidence will come shortly. Okay, you win.

Asides

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have to understand as well that the second person the Honourable Member called to break with the Democratic Labour Party and to join his party was the Honourable Member's brother.

Asides

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He is sitting there. He was the second person that he called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Minister take his seat? Take your seat. There will be no more requests to keep quiet. I am apprising you of the Order that I intend to use against you one by one.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 40 (2): "The Speaker shall order any Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of the day's sitting." I have no difficulty. I have been pleading with Members to give Honourable Members every opportunity to speak without interruptions. I have been doing that for the past day. I will not hesitate to enforce this Standing Order. Will the Minister speak without any interruptions.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the second person he called before he called any of those was the Minister's twin brother to break with the Democratic Labour Party and join him in the NDP. He could not call 3 of you all before he called him because 3 are more than 1. He called him the second. He called you all after when he was scrambling. He talked with you all after. He called his twin brother to break with the Democratic Labour Party and join him and the twin brother put him in his place. He told him that I have nothing against the Democratic Labour Party. That is what this is all about.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order taken.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I just want to make it clear for the record that that statement

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member take his seat?

The Honourable Member is on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just for the record, I would like to say that that statement is incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the 1987 Budget Debates and the Estimates, you would never believe the same Honourable Member praised this Honourable Member for the work he was doing in agriculture....praised him in 1987 in the Budget Debates. I cannot read all of it because I have a lot to read that he said.

Asides

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: A lot of what he said otherwise. He said what a good job the Minister of Agriculture was doing.

Asides

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution that has been brought to this House today has to be seen for what it is. It is a Resolution first and foremost to try to keep the NDP in the public's eye. That party is the only party that has peaked at its inauguration. You have to understand this Resolution. When they are keeping meetings on Sundays and trotting up and down Barbados with 200 people or ISO people with them and getting 6 people from the constituency to go, they had 11 people from St. Philip at Kings Park. He sent 2 and I sent 1-11 people from St. Philip. I am telling you that he had 2 there and I had one there. You had 11 people from St Philip.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record, I will say that that is not a truthful statement 10.55 a.m.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Did you not have to cut short the meeting in the Pine on Sunday? You are the only party I know that peaked on an inauguration and that was the end of that, so you have to keep yourself in the public's eye, and these are the things you are doing.

You mentioned just now trouble in the Transport Board, trouble in the PoKce Force, trouble in this place. Mr.

Speaker, we had better check to see where all of this trouble started, because I am seeing things happening in Barbados since the NDP has started that I have never seen before. I have seen trouble and sabotage in organisations that I have never seen before in Barbados, I am telling you, so you had better look carefully and see what is happening.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move on. I have spent enough time with that for the time being.

Let me demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, why I feel that this Resolution is a Resolution to bolster their image and a Resolution of vengeance. Let us look at non-sugar agriculture. In 1984 the production of every single vegetable listed fell. Every one. The Honourable Member never thought it fit to bring a vote of no confidence against the then Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Johnnie Cheltenham. Every single vegetable listed in this book - beans down, beets down, cabbage down, carrots down - even in the write up in here, Mr. Speaker, it says: "In 1984 all vegetables recorded declines in production levels when compared to 1983." No vote of no confidence in the Minister.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I will go further, but there should be a vote this time.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking members not to cross talk.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the production of sugar reached a level of 130,000 tonnes. Would you believe in 1981 it was down to 97? An almost 40,000 tonne drop in sugar. Did he not think that he should have called a vote of no confidence against the Minister of Agriculture then? Why now? Why do you think you should bring it now? The point I am getting at is that everyone knows that the production of agriculture fluctuates, but I am telling you that this Resolution today is self-serving.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can move on unless I touch the question of subdivision. The question of subdivision has come up over the past number of months in Barbados and I think the point has to be made as to what takes place with permission for subdivision.

The Opposition in its effort to discredit the Minister of Agriculture continually puts it out to the public and gives the impression that the Minister of Agriculture is responsible for giving permission to subdivide land. Let me set the record straight, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture cannot give permission to subdivide land. For the time being it is your humble servant, so to go in the public domain and give the public the impression that once

an application comes in from a certain person, and to give the impression that because his brother is a Minister therefore he will get permission is nonsensical. It is not true, because the permission has to come from the Minister of Housing and Lands.

There are applications for subdivision from agricultural land to agriculture. It is just that the person who owns the land wants to do it in a smaller way. You may have 80 acres, you want to do it in 2 forties. That is not a difficult decision, it is a decision where the Chief Agricultural Officer may have one view, that 40 acres may be adequate, or no less than 30. The Chief Town Planner may have another view and I may have another view, but there is not a great difficulty there.

You can have an application to change land from agriculture to agriculture and residential, which means you are putting some in agriculture and the rest in residential. The difficulty comes when the person wants to take the land out of agriculture and put it into residential.

Yesterday there was mention in here of certain plots of land. I do not really want to bring in the other Honourable Members and that party into this debate, but I have to, because when certain questions are asked trying to give a certain impression, one has to defend oneself and one's Government and one has to point out some of the things that took place previously.

They asked about Ashford. This was a subdivision, Mr. Speaker, where the person had already had permission to subdivide into lots of 81 acres and 82 acres. Many people have called from St. John especially and have asked me why it is that we are not giving permission for places like Wakefield to subdivide lower down so that they can get some land to work. The applicant wanted to keep 90 acres in vegetables. Some of it is in like trees and so forth, and the other bit they wanted to subdivide into acreage between five acres and 15 and a half acres.

The argument here was whether you should allow the subdivision that low or whether you should leave it at 30 or 25 and I made a conscious decision, because of the number of requests I have had from people, especially in St. John, and it is very important that there are lots of people in St. John who are willing to work land providing they have it in reasonable amounts. There is good land in St. John. I made the decision to allow the subdivision and I said that it should not go below seven acres. That was the question of Ashford.

The other one they asked about was Cottage and Groves. There was no argument about that, that was recommended by every person and I allowed the subdivision. It was also an agricultural subdivision.

The only file I can find on Congo Road was where an application was made and permission was given that they could subdivide Lot 10, a small lot of seven or eight acres, and all the rest has to remain in agriculture, because Lot 10 was adjoining a tenantry and we felt that it was a continuation of the tenantry.

The other one they asked about was Cane Garden. Cane Garden was allowed because the Government obviously wanted to put a school in St. Thomas and that actually eased the problem in St. Thomas because you could put the school on one side and the Venezuelan houses would be put on the other side. That is why permission was given there.

I do not think there are any more, but Mr. Speaker, they keep asking about the Government's land use policy. The land use policy of the Government and of this Minister is simple. Good agricultural land should be kept in agriculture, but other land should always be put in what is more economical or the best use to which it could be put. It is as simple as that. You do not keep land in agriculture which is useless in agriculture, so you make a decision that in your honest opinion this land would be better used for such and such a thing, and that is how it is done. 11.05a.m.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about the previous administration. Mr. Speaker, I have looked through these files, not all, and I have seen where they have released land, 73 acres at Kendal, where a refusal was given one week and by the next week permission was given. At Bannatyne to accommodate certain people who live there, and you know what took place at Bannatyne. At Lion Castle, the same thing, refusal and immediately after permission given within one week, and I mean refusals by the Prime Minister Tom Adams. And within one week, permission given! Drax Hall, the same thing to accommodate a Colonel some person. Lower Estate to accommodate a Mr. Clyde Barrow whoever he is. Lowland - and I want the Leader of the minority Opposition who kept asking these questions to tell us the role he played in getting rid of Lower Estate, Lowland. And one other thing....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: One other thing. I always pull out the files. You do not have to tell me pull out the files.

Aside.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: And the point has to be made, Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for St. John made it that Hothersal, Wakefield and Clifton Hall won application. And let me give you the facts here, Mr. Speaker.

The Chief Town Planner made recommendations to recommended permission for this subdivision. -And this is what I wrote:

n

"I agree substantially with the Chief Town Planner's recommendation at section 5 of minute 4. However since I do not consider 20 acre lots workable and since 5 acre lots are not used for the purposes intended, as a compromise I would settle for 10 or 12 acre lots. All other recommendations of the Chief Town Planner agreed."

That is the role I played in it. I wrote that.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Your humble servant, the Honourable Minister for Housing and Lands. That is the role I played in it.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Let me hear what you want <* to say. That is the role I played in it.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: And getting to one other point....

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: ...of this subject.

*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: One other subdivision matter which I have to get to. You heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: ... saying yesterday, calling about these subdivisions. And I told him, I said if I were you I would not get involved in these subdivisions. Because I have looked through certain papers, Mr. Speaker,...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: This is subdivision that he is still dealing with.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: And would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St Thomas - let me explain it to you because people may not understand. If there is a difficulty with allowing a subdivision, you refer the matter to a panel. The person who applied for the subdivision will bring people to represent him, the Town Planner will send people to represent him or come himself - would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that in getting rid of 110 acres at River Plantation giving it to the Barbados Shipping and Trading Co. Ltd., do you know who represented the Barbados Shipping and Trading? The Honourable Member for St. Thomas. He represented the Barbados Shipping and Trading....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN:... to get rid of 110 acres of agricultural land at River! This is the file. In fact...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Just in time to hear him, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The land that was - at least eight or nine years ago in my professional capacity, in my professional capacity I am not supposed to work for anybody - when Shipping and Trading wanted to develop the lands by Bayley's School by the swamp going back across all rab land where there are several outcroppings of rock. Check the plans carefully.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It was then rab, Sir. Anybody who knows....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point has been made.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad he said if he were not to work in his profession.

Would you believe that it is being spread abroad by the Opposition in Barbados that because - because this is the impression I get - the Member's brother, because he is his brother he should not get any work at all.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: In the field that he is very competent and efficient in?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Surveying. Land Surveying.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: And listen, I heard the former Prime Minister....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: - Mr. St. John - said when the Barbados Labour Party was in office that Franklin and Franklin that firm was getting all the work under the Barbados Labour Party. I heard him saying that.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The reason for it is that the person is well qualified and efficient in what he is doing. And I do not believe that because anybody is a brother of any Minister he should not get any work in Barbados. That is stupid. I do not believe that. That is the impression being given. That is the impression that is being given in here. We have to understand that that cannot work. You cannot tell a person that because his brother is a Minister he is not to find work. He can find the work because he is efficient

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Did he have Ministers in your Government as well?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I do not mean you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister was pointing at me....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ... as though I had made allegation of that nature yesterday.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a breach of the Rules of the House?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want it clearly understood because late last night I made no such allegation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a breach of the Rules? Mr.

D. A. C. SIMMONS: Of a professional...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member saying that pointing at a person is a breach of the Rules?

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying pointing at a person is a breach of the Rules of this House?

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He was addressing me pointing at me and saying "you" meaning me, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me turn now to sugar. What is developing in Barbados today is that whenever any person says anything about inefficiency at a plantation someone is bound to say you are getting at white people. It has got to the stage in Barbados today that whenever anyone says they are going to do anything for black people, other people come up and say, you are trying to get rid of the white people. So you cannot do anything for black people, unless you interfere with the white. That is the sort of mentality that is cropping up in Barbados today.

Now, I am going to read, before it slips me, because this Resolution is also about integrity, morality and principle. That is what it is all about. We will see where the principle and the morality and all of that is. 11.15a.m.

Now Mr. Speaker, this is the House of Assembly Debates 1983 and he skipped over it very quickly, but he is not going to skip it with me. Page 229, House of Assembly Debates 1983 - he was speaking about the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He was speaking about the sugar industry at that time and this is what he said among other things:

"The facts are as follows, Sir. The sugar industry was never bankrupt under the Democratic Labour Party. It is bankrupt today."

This is 1983 that he said the sugar industry was bankrupt. He said it here. That is not all. I am going to continue, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to skip over. Now do not mine how we skipped over it just now. I am going to read it for you to let you hear the proof.

Mr. SPEAKER: You only have 2 more minutes.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Two? Mr. Speaker, that is very quick.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the interruptions, I will give an additional minute - 3 minutes more.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central speaking and I am going to read it quickly:

"Now the only reason why I would not vote against this Resolution," and he is saying the only reason he would not vote against the price support, "is because the industry is owned by the Barbados National Bank and by the people of Barbados." Okay, he goes on telling the previous Administration, "They do not have to worry about where the money is, because if you were to look at the escalation in credit to the sugar industry between 1979 and 1983, you will see that the \$66 million that we have been putting back in over the past few years is about the same \$66 million that found its way but of the industry. You will find some in South Africa." Now you nor me would not put money in South Africa, so you know what he was saying: "You will find some in Swiss banks, you will find some in the Channel Islands, you will find some in Canadian banks, you will find some supporting various commercial organisations in Barbados and in other areas."

This is the same Honourable Member who is telling this Administration that if they ask you for \$100 million, give them. Okay, he went on:

"I would like an explanation, Mr. Speaker. I want to know where the money went," and he goes on. "I want to know where the earnings from the 135 000 tonnes of sugar in 1980 went that could result in the crisis that occurred in the industry in 1981."

He is saying that they produced a lot of sugar and had a lot of money in 1980 and by 1981 they wanted a price support. He is asking where has that money gone and he went on to explain:

"If you check your figures very carefully, you will see that you are filtering back through a price support system money that was filtered out of the sugar industry during that period."

Mr. Speaker, this is a question of principle now. If he was right then and if those statements were right then, they are right now because there has been no change in the ownership or the management of the sugar industry. In fact, for the past number of years the sugar producers have promised religiously to supply information as to how they would make the management more efficient and up to this present day they have not supplied it. Up to this present day, they have not supplied it. It cannot be right then where the same situation existed as is existing today. It has to be right today as well.

As I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to close because my time is running out. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central wants the Democratic Labour Party to change everything now. Tell the people in Barbados why you want the Democratic Labour Party to change its position on McDonald's. Tell them who owns

the land all around McDonald's and whose land did McDonald take up to get an entrance to where they operate. On whose land has the value gone up? That is what you should tell the people. Tell the people the reason. Come out and tell the people in Barbados that the late Honourable Prime Minister of this country was one of the strongest opponents of McDonald's coming into this country and that you were the only person that came out and said anything - the only one that was in agreement for it. You are the only person who knew about speaking with Heale and the McDonald people. Therefore, you would have been the person who told them and explained to them how they can beat the system to get here. You would have to be the person because you sat down at the Hilton Hotel with them.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never told anybody whether it be McDonald's or anybody how to beat any system to get into Barbados. What properties I own in Barbados anywhere near McDonald's, I have been in ownership of those properties since somewhere in the early 1970's. I have not leased any land to McDonald's to get any entrance into McDonald's. That is an appalling and abysmal untruth. If the suggestion is that I did it, I am just saying it is a total untruth. As a matter of fact, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, when he was in Opposition, was the last person who worked on those properties legally for me way back in 1978 and he knows that those properties were back there I believe in the late 1960's or 1970's. It has nothing to do with it in the first instance and in the second instance, Sir, my properties have no entrance as far as I know to McDonald's and I have leased no lands to McDonald's.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I said that the Honourable Member owns the property right next to McDonald's and that McDonald's had to use a piece of that property for entrance. I do not know if the land belongs to you or not.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not own, as far as I know, any property right next to McDonald's. As far as I know, they are intervening properties.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has made the point.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, finally because there are some people who are wanning up for me. I would like to say that I would like the....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Member for....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sit, sit, sit!

Mr. SPEAKER: Sit! Will the Honourable Member sit?

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member I gave a few minutes. No one should break the Standing Orders in this House. Therefore, the question of calling a person a liar in my view is lowering the dignity of this House. It will not uplift the Chamber and I am very seriously considering if either the 2 Members disrespect this Chair any further that I will ask them:

- (1) to discontinue his speech
- (2) that both leave the Chamber immediately.

I am asking for no further behaviour of that sort. Will the Honourable Minister wind up his contribution?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the outburst, but I was provoked and I am very sorry about that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one final point before we get any further and I am going to wind up. I want the Leader of the minority Opposition, who is swelling out and ready, to be prepared

(Laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. What is the point of order? The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order. I want to hear the point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will assure the Honourable Member that I weighed on my scale this morning and I am not as heavy as I was before.

(Laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I would like the Honourable Leader of the minority Opposition to start preparing to explain to this

Honourable House the role he played in the sale of Buttals to a businessman in Barbados. Let us know the role you played when the Resolution comes here in another week or two. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Applause.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other Members who desire to make a contribution? If that is so, I shall now call on....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked twice if there are other Members who want to make a contribution - the Honourable Member for Christ Church West. 11.25a.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Obviously the Government does not want to have its other members debate until they have got all of the members of the opposition talking.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member was not here yesterday and this debate went and Honourable Members got up and spoke. If he does not wish to speak, that is his business. He is in a minority, there is a majority, but he was not here yesterday and I think he cannot cast that kind of aspersion on the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not taken it in that light.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member can protest as much as he likes. That is my interpretation of the fact, that I am absolutely sure that other members on the Government side intend to speak before the Honourable Member for Christ Church East winds up, and they wish it to be a position in the debate where all of the opposition members have spoken and cannot reply to them. That is my interpretation of their manoeuvres.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have 30 minutes to speak in this debate. It is an important debate. When I spoke in the Budget earlier this year I made a point of focussing on the Ministry of Agriculture and I used language then to describe the performance of the Minister in his role. Nothing that has happened since has changed my opinion of the fact that he remains one of the most, if not the most, unspectacular Ministers and a spectacular failure. This debate rightly concerns his remarkable incompetence in his office, and there are many issues which can serve to illustrate, in my view, his unsuitability for the post of Minister of Agriculture.

I want to demonstrate by attending to a few of these issues. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South has just spoken about a land use policy and I repeat that there is an absence of a land use policy by this Government, as will be demonstrated a little later in this debate by myself. The issues range as well, Sir, to the woes of the sugar industry, the failure of non-sugar agriculture, the abomination that represents itself as the Barbados Marketing-Corporation, which continues to be an abysmal failure. It is not performing its developmental role but dabbling in all other roles to the detriment of the taxpayers of this country and the small farmers.

The abuse of the licensing system. Yesterday the Minister produced a list of persons whom he says he has given licences to. I want to find out why, despite that, there are some persons who are importing vegetables, particularly from Guyana and elsewhere, without getting the proper permission. I happened to have been at the airport to see cabbages and cucumbers coming in from the United States when people in St. Lucy did not have markets for the same commodities here, and I want to know why the Minister does not understand that there are persons, like a gentleman in my Constituency, Mr. Bhana, who is importing vegetables, I want to know if he has a licence as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled on the question of names being called in this debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I did not hear your ruling; Sir. I withdraw the name.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am saying is this. People who want to call names must give documental evidence. Saying in the Chamber that this is so does not, and therefore I have asked members to desist from the names unless they have then documented for the Chamber.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. To give some assistance to the Honourable Member and to the debate, if you will just permit me.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: You are asking questions of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I have explained already that the granting of licences to import things into Barbados is the responsibility of the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce. I stated yesterday that until recently

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Let him get up and say it. I do not miss anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just make your point.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I indicated yesterday that until June, which was last month, there were a number of vegetables, even during the administration of the Barbados Labour Party, which were not on licence from CARICOM sources. This Cabinet has taken a decision that we will put all vegetables coming into Barbados - because from extra-regional sources they were on licence - on licence and that the Barbados Marketing Corporation would become the sole agency for the importation of these vegetables if and when necessary.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will take that into account when allotting my time, Sir. The point I am making, despite the intervention of the Honourable Minister of Trade, is that over the past 18 months there has been a tremendous importation of vegetables into Barbados when the farmers of Barbados were in a position to supply those vegetables.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is making an allegation that there has been a tremendous importation of vegetables into Barbados over the last 18 months when the farmers of Barbados were able to supply. The policy which we outlined yesterday was that when an application is made for the importation of vegetables the application comes to the Ministry of Trade, it is sent to the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Agriculture then advises yea or nay depending on the availability and bearing in mind, of course, the demand which there is in the country for the particular vegetable at the particular time. The Barbados Agricultural Society is consulted before a decision is made.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, it is just the bad advice given by the Minister of Agriculture to the Ministry of Trade, and I am surprised that the Minister of Trade falls for that bad advice, because we have it from Mr. Haynesley Benn himself, of the BAS, that the Government was allowing the importation of ten tonnes of vegetables per week in circumstances where the crop farmers of Barbados were in a position to provide that. That is what I am saying is one of the woes, and the other is the total failure of the Agricultural Development Corporation to give any lead to the agricultural sector.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is the third time that this statement has been made and I think it has to be checked and the record has to be put straight. The Honourable Member is relying on a statement which was made by a Mr. Benn from the BAS where he estimates that about ten tonnes of vegetables come into Barbados from Guyana illegally on a weekly basis, but is trying to give the impression that licences are given by the Government of Barbados for them. That is not true and the Honourable Member should desist from going down that line.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the Member has now underscored the point I am making about the incompetence of this Government. Could you believe that a Minister would get up and now confirm the fact that those vegetables were coming in here, whether legally or illegally, when the Government has control at the airport and the sea port where the vegetables are coming in? 11.35a.m.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, ...

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

Hon. E. E. GREAVES:.....on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I said that the information which he is using, which he is relying on is information when Mr. Benn said, when Mr. Benn is reported to have said that 10 tonnes of vegetables came into Barbados. I have not responded to Mr. Benn's statement. That is all I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to intervene at this point. It is precisely the very reason why I said in my ruling, in bringing the evidence or trying to involve people in a debate, that we should have documented evidence. What we are having in the debate is an allegation which can go to no end. And I am tempted to rule that that particular issue should come to an end.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, another area in which the Minister has failed and the Government has failed is the failure to do anything about praedial larceny in the agricultural sector, and also in the area of the sugar industry, the total rejection of the legitimate interest of the sugar industry. It is these issues that have concerned people who look at the future of Barbados and recognize that agriculture is too important for this economy to let this state of affairs continue. And it is because of that that we have joined in this Resolution with the Official opposition, because we consider that what is needed now is urgent and remedial action on the part of the Government.

The Minister, by his conduct, has demonstrated quite clearly that he can do nothing to change the present situation. And if he has not got that ability, he ought to go and let somebody else who has the ability perform it for him. That is what this debate is about.

Because I would wish, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the words of one of the principal advisers to the Government, and I speak of Dr. DeLisle Worrell of the Central Bank and his words given particularly in his address to the Rotary Club on the 22nd March this year. And if necessary, Sir, I will make it a document of the House. And this is what he says:

"Notwithstanding anything you might have heard to the contrary, agriculture in Barbados is in decline and we must take urgent action to arrest and reverse the decline. The potential for foreign exchange earning per Barbados dollar spent is still very high in agriculture, compared with other activity. Moreover, sound commercial agriculture is essential to the preservation of the environment - to ensure that drainage systems are maintained, that the land is properly managed, that erosion is prevented and that litter and filth are not indiscriminately dispersed around the countryside. Barbados has accumulated tremendous expertise in agriculture and we would be squandering that investment in ourselves if we were not to put it to productive use."

And he goes on to say, Sir, that we should devote more time to the sugar industry and resources and recognize that it still will continue to have an important role to play.

And finally, as regards crops support, he states, Sir:

"We should devote resources of finance, research and marketing".....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:....." over the long haul"

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am on a point of order, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:....." to ensure that we deal with all the problems that may arise."

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member is repeating a speech which was made yesterday.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is the point. He does not know the Rules. He is repeating, repeating is the word, a speech that was made here yesterday, word for word.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order. I have not taken my seat.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: How do you mean sit down. Who do you think you belong to?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable Member to leave the Chamber.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member continue.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: My point, Sir, is that, according to the Rules, he is repeating and making a speech which was made yesterday, Sir. And I am suggesting that he is out of order for that, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

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

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no way you can have that. Will the Honourable Member take his seat. I do not need any guidance. I will give what I understand is the interpretation of the Rule.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, you are not rising at all.

Aside.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are only special Orders on which you can rise.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Rule will be the next one. The Honourable Member is complaining of repetition. My understanding is that the same Member needs to repeat the same thing twice. I do not think, in that sense, that I will take it as a repetition of any speech.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the quotation which I have given from Dr. Worrell, what he is saying, in my view, constitutes a strong indictment of the Minister's performance. For he seems to be asking for the precise reverse of what this Minister has been doing.

But it is not only Dr. Worrell, Sir. Since February this year the Government has had, in its possession, the Report of Landell Mills Associates referred to as the Landell Mills Report. This Report was commissioned by the Government. I do not know whether the Ministry has read it yet, but maybe the Report will obviously suffer from the same problems that the Task Force Report has suffered from. But the Report warns of the folly of the Government in setting a target for sugar of 90 000 tonnes reversing the target which

was set by the Barbados Labour Party of 120 000 tonnes, and obviously leaving ours in the position where Barbados is likely to become a waste land, as we see, as we drive through the country with fields overgrown with weed and bushes and the obvious public health dangers that will result from such a situation. Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, the loss of very vital foreign exchange and the consequential loss of jobs to this country and to people of the country.

And therefore this debate is a vital debate because it is not about Ministers closing ranks. It is not about that. Nor is it about any waterwash apology from CBC. In my 30 years as a lawyer, I have never seen anybody run so quickly, give an apology to a would-be plaintiff when a writ has not yet been filed.

And the debate is neither about sugar planters in that sense, or cotton farmers, as individuals.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The debate is about the fact that the Minister is responsible for a crucial area of the economy and he does not know how to exercise his responsibility properly.

So the Minister must recognize that his constituency comprises not the constituency of St. Philip North, his constituency as a Minister comprises a large number of private sector people. And he has to have the ability to intermix with them and to motivate them. He must be able to establish a good working relationship with them, because unless he is so able to do, the necessary motivation for them will not be there.

This Minister has seen every subsector of the agricultural private interest persons criticize him. It is not only the politicians now. It is the people out there with whom he has to work, whether it be the pig farmers, whether it be the chicken producers, whether it be the beef owners, whether it be the sugar people, this Minister has been subjected to criticism, and I submit to this Honourable House, valid criticism by the very constituency that he should be motivating. 11.45a.m.

The most significant thing is that this motion is now before the House and not one single such group has come out and expressed any confidence whatsoever in the Minister in the Press and otherwise.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am talking about the Prime Minister saying that we are blaming the Minister for rain not falling. That has been the level of the Prime Minister's support. I am talking about the groups outside, Sir. Instead

of having a litany of woes, one would expect that you would have had some defense of the Minister from the private sector groups whom he should motivate.

Sir, what really we get is that when serious questions are posed about areas of concern to the public of Barbados, we get a position of what I call fudging. The Prime Minister for instance, Mr. Speaker, at his Press Conference in June was asked some and I consider one of the most important questions about the Government's land use policy and the area of conflict of interest. The Prime Minister did not answer that question. I have had an opportunity to study the questions and I believe that those questions are important and of the greatest national importance to this country and ought to be answered. In this debate, despite the efforts of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, they do not seem to be the answers which one would expect.

The Honourable Member for St. Philip South is telling us nothing new when he says that decisions relating to the 'cutting up of land eventually, according to the law, will come to him. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Town Planner under the law has the responsibility except in very limited areas where the statutory instrument or the failure of the Town Planner to perform within a certain time compels the decision to be brought before the Ministry.

Sir, one must recognise, as he has just said, he does not act unless he has consulted with the Minister of Agriculture. I ask here - how come? I still have not got the answer that the Government had one application, as he said, for the cutting up of three of the most important plantations within the agricultural area, very good agricultural land, as he said, in St. John - Clifton Hall, Hothersal, Wakefield all on one application. He read out everything. He must tell us who were the surveyors and who were the firms involved.

This debate is not about whether anybody works in their professional capacity. That is not the argument. You can appear as a doctor, you can appear as a lawyer, or you can appear as a surveyor for who you like. The perception is that the Minister has not broken his relationship with the firm. That is the perception and the Minister must say if it is correct. Nobody is asking him to deny his family, nor would I be so stupid as to suggest on the Floor of the House despite the Honourable Member for St. Philip South who wanted me to come in on some wild goose chase, that nobody should work at their profession. What we are saying is that there is a clear demarcation that if you continue an association with for instance your law firm, your surveyor; firm or what not, then that is where the danger is.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat. I have one job. I am at Graeme Hall from 7:30 a.m. in the morning to 6 o'clock in the evening everyday of the week. The Prime Minister can verify that with my secretary. If the

Leader of the minority Opposition wants to check that, he can check that as well and that is where I am 7 days a week. I want to repeat. I have one post at the moment and that is at the Ministry of Agriculture from 7:30 a.m. in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening every single day, and I do not work at Franklin and Franklin. I think that he should know that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I am not asking the Minister whether he works at Franklin and Franklin. He misunderstands the argument. I am asking what is his association with the firm? That is what he is being asked.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. When the Honourable Member was the Attorney General, the Honourable Member himself said that in the question of his dissociating from his professional practice it was entirely difficult and it was understood and he, Sir, maintained an interest in clients while he was Attorney General. He knows that. I have not finished.

Asides.

Certain remarks made by Hon. H. deB. FORDE and Hon. B. M. TAITT were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to get on with the debate, Sir. I am not going to let the Honourable Member use his usual technique of a series of interventions on absolute vexatious points.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members just cool it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to get on with the debate, Sir. What I am saying is that people are asking to find out from the Minister if there is a continuation of association, whether it is a dormant association, or any association that exists with the firm. This is the position, Sir, and it has to be made quite clear. If there is such an association, as I understand the rules that were laid down certainly in Cabinet when I was in Cabinet and I hope that they have been repeated, because from time immemorial they have been repeated at the beginning of every Cabinet or to a Minister when he comes in, that that association must be discontinued. You cannot remain as a sleeping partner, but if you are then in circumstances where an application comes before you in which the firm is involved you must disqualify yourself. You cannot even offer advice on it. That application must be sent, as is the proper thing to do, to the Cabinet or the Prime Minister to deal with. They can search the file, Sir. They can go back and see on a file, when I had responsibility for Town Planning, that a matter relating to the estate of Elise Ifill Barrow, my late adopted mother, came before me. I admitted to the then Prime Minister to make it clear to him that I would not act in the matter and I said to him to do otherwise. Now that has been the practice that I follow. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker,

that when it comes to these matters and, as the Honourable Member said, the debate is about....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, skilled as he is in the art of oratorical presentation, has laid a foundation. He started off by indicating that the Honourable Member has not dissociated himself and that there is a perception that the Honourable Member is associated with his firm. The Honourable Member gave the House an assurance. The Honourable Member now continues by indicating what he did and is leaving an inference, which is a reasonable inference for ordinary people, that the Honourable Member has not done in his practice what he did when he was Attorney General. I submit that that submission is unreasonable, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.
11.55a.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that in the prime agricultural belt, and in St. John in particular, one has found that wherever the applications have been filed there is one surveyors' firm dealing with the matter, and I want to know if in those circumstances the Minister disqualified himself from tendering advice to his Cabinet colleagues. That is the point of the debate, no matter how much the Honourable Member may object. That is really what should happen and what should be quite clear, and that is why this motion is important in the context of the land use and the fragmentation of land in Barbados.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, land subdivision is undertaken to allow speculators to make large profits through selling agricultural land at inflated prices. We know of that, Sir. I can go back and cite Sanfofd', Rowans, Neils, a whole host of areas under the Democratic Labour Party Government in which this has happened. In fact, in the case of Neils, the late Tom McKenzie's family own Neils. They had an application in during the Democratic Labour Party's time for subdivision and it was refused. A leading member of the Democratic Labour Party, who was working for him as a solicitor, came and asked if he would sell the place and he sold him. What the solicitor did not disclose was that he also had a group of people in the wings buying it, all members of the Democratic Labour Party, and within a short time permission was given for them to subdivide Neils and a tremendous profit was made. I remember very well Mr. St. John having to work and advise the McKenzie family on how to get back that money.

Subdivision is always an attractive area for the land speculators and therefore in my view what happens is that good agricultural land continues to come out of production because the persons buying are really not *bonafide* farmers who can offer to buy agricultural land at the prices which would allow them to farm properly.

I believe that this debate must be used for at least one purpose, and if the Government wants to listen, to tell the Government that they are under a duty to stipulate a policy in relation to land for which approval to subdivide has already been secured, and they must make sure that if land is subdivided for agricultural purposes, that the price at which that land is being sold on the market does not result in a penalty to the genuine small farmers who want to own land in this country and to develop it

The Honourable Member made the point about Ashford in St. John and a few other plantations, but the Government itself through the BNB is now the principal lender in St. John to a plantation right next to me, Haynes Hill, which has not been worked for years, good agricultural land. I have spoken before in this House on the necessity for the Government not to confiscate anybody's property, but if there is a case, as the Honourable Member for St. Philip South says, for people wanting land in St. John, the Government had it within its grasp to have done something about it.

Furthermore, I am not really convinced by the argument of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, because the Agricultural Development Corporation has agricultural land still lying fallow all over this country, and you tell me that there are people out there who want the land to work and cannot get it, despite the fact that the Government itself controls most of the agricultural land in this country.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: A significant proportion then, if you want the figure, in terms of individual ownership. I want to put it that way. I am much indebted to the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member must know that. I say that in those circumstances unless the Government is prepared to tell the country what is its clear land use policy no one is going to believe some of the statements made by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South.

He does not know what is happening to Congo Road. It is in their constituencies. It is lying fallow and it has been said that permission has been given for the subdivision of the Congo Road area. The Honourable Member says no. He had better search the files. He says the Minister has nothing to do with it.

I have just been reminded of the land at Shaw Hill in St. Philip. Will the Minister not confirm that the officials recommended against Shaw Hill? I understand that the Minister of Lands at first as well was not in favour of it, but he had from the Minister of Agriculture "I approve". After he turned it down, the Minister got in touch with him again,

despite the fact that all the best advice on Shaw Hill came from the Ministry officials not to allow Shaw Hill to come out of agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given you extended time due to the number of interruptions. I am giving you two minutes now to conclude your speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to say this to the Minister, Sir. How come now that the Chief Agricultural Officer, who should have an important role to play in these matters, has been downgraded in playing any such role in relation to the subdivision of agricultural land? It is my information that he has had to complain at the highest level of Government about the role that has been denied him as an officer with responsibilities in such a matter, and I say to the Government it is about time that politicians start getting out of subdivision of land area. We have to devise a proper policy for the country where subdivision of agricultural land comes under maximum public scrutiny at all times.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reply quickly on one point made by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South. He said that in 1984 the production of every single vegetable fell and that as a result of that fall, according to him, there was no counter motion brought against us. What he did not tell us was that 1983 was a record year, look at the figures, a bumper year for vegetables, and the 1984 crop looked by comparison to be less that year, but production recovered very quickly. 12.05 p.m.

The figures will show that non-sugar agriculture continued to climb. What has happened here is that present production levels are very, very low and are at a catastrophic level, particularly in the case of peanuts which has been totally destroyed under this Government.

And I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that what has happened further is that people are no longer genuine farmers seeing agriculture as an investment area, and that spells doom for the future of this country.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain sense of disappointment that I join in this discussion. Disappointment because I think that we who were appointed by the people of this country to do the people's business are wasting a lot of the people's time attacking each other, instead of doing the people's business.

I entirely agree with the contribution made by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South when he said that this motion has little to do with the performance of the Minister of Agriculture, but it is really an attempt to focus interest on the NDP. There is an unwritten rule in American football that when you do not know what to do, kick the

ball, give it to the other side. But the observers of football, those who understand, know that when the team is punting they know that the team is under pressure. Proper political observers will understand the reason for the no confidence motion. It has no basis.

And I am surprised to find that the Members of the minority Opposition Barbados Labour Party can seriously get involved in a discussion about agriculture. For the ten years when they ran agriculture in this country, they ran it to ruins.

I hear a lot about land use and land going out of agriculture, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to place some figures on the record of this House today. In 1961, there were 84 000 acres of land under cultivation, and by 1986 it had fallen to 54 000 acres. A fall of some 30 acres of arable land coming out of production. Thirty thousand acres between 1961 and 1986 because they are trying to give the impression that it was only since 1986 that agricultural land was coming out of production.

Barbados is becoming an industrialized country and people are tending to use the land less and less. And moreover, proper use of the land, because of the upgrading of facilities, proper scientific techniques, better production from smaller parcels of land are contributing to this.

In the sugar industry, the arable land fell from 61 000 acres to 28 000 acres from 1961 to 1987. So that there has been a constant diminution of land going into sugar production over those years. That is despite the fact that in 1976 when the Barbados Labour Party won the Government, they went to the Government stating that they would bring agricultural land back under sugar production. And during those years the amount of land under sugar production fell steadily.

It is interesting to note that while we make a song and dance about one year's production of sugar which is last year's production of sugar being 66 000 tonnes of sugar; it is interesting to note that in 1980 we had produced 137 000 tonnes of sugar and the sugar industry had made \$109 million in sugar. The year following that is the year in which the Barbados Labour Party, after the sugar industry made \$109 million out of a bumper crop gave price support to the sugar industry. And that is a time in which the sugar industry owed the banks of this country only \$1 million in debt. And despite the fact that from 1980 when they had that bumper crop the production of sugar has been reasonably good, despite the fact that by 1983 the sugar production, the tonnes of sugar fell from 137 000 tonnes to 86 000 tonnes which is a fall-off of 51 000 in a four year period, showing again the point that the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands was making, that there is seasonality of crops in Barbados which has a lot to do with rainfall, despite what the Opposition people on that side may say. So that is part of the situation that exists in the

sugar industry where, when you had the sugar industry making one of the biggest sets of money in this country, the Barbados Labour Party was putting money to support them. That is only part of the situation that existed in the whole field of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972 the Democratic Labour Party set up a ginnery at Spencers to start a cotton industry and by 1975 this country had produced 350 000 pounds of cotton. But by 1981 there was no cotton at all produced in this country. I notice that the Honourable Members on that side, the minority Opposition have left their seats because they cannot sit in here and hear the story that happened to agriculture during their time. They know it was a dismal picture. They destroyed agriculture in this country. And I am not only talking about agriculture in terms of land agriculture.

If you look at fishing/the shrimp industry brought in 515 000 pounds of shrimp in 1976 earning valuable foreign exchange for this country. The shrimp boats were outfitted with guns and were sent to St. Vincent when Bumba and his crowd started the invasion down in the Grenadines. That is what happened to the shrimp industry. And if they had not dismantled the shrimp boats, the project with Guyana that the Minister of Agriculture is now talking about, we* would have those very same shrimp boats to go down to Guyana and assist in the fishing.

So when we are talking about what has happened to agriculture - yes the 80 foot boats. The shrimp boats used to fish off Guyana. That is where they used to fish; That is where they got their shrimp, off Suriname and Guyana. So it would be no big thing. We would have had those boats. But those boats were now destroyed as money earners and outfitted with guns. And they are the people who should be the last to talk about what has happened to agriculture in this country.

The 4H Movement was destroyed in this country under the Barbados Labour Party. In 1972 we had 80 4H outfits in this country, eighty of them, and by 1985, there were only 18 in existence. The 4H Movement was almost totally destroyed.

But the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Who has his own fishing boats, which I understand spend more time on the beach than they spend in the sea, is aware of the fact that fishermen in this country - he is close to the fishing industry and he knows what I am saying is true - the fishermen are boasting that the best year they ever had in fishing in the history of Barbados is this year. He says he is interested in fishermen. And if he is interested in fishermen, he must know what I am saying is true.

I do not want to send any signals to the Minister of Finance, but one fisherman boasted to me that when his boat came in, that the first time he earned \$8 000 was this

year. It never happened before in the history and he was a fisherman from the time he started.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: No, the ice boat came in. It earned \$8 000 from that ice boat that came in.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: In catch.
12.15p.m.

Despite what they are saying, the fishermen are doing reasonably well. I do not want to signal to the fishermen where to go to fish. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East, who knows the sea very well, knows that if he takes a south easterly coast he can find the flying fish. What I am saying is that it is not that we do not have flying fish within our waters, but it is easy to go down to Trinidad. The point is that if we are prepared to work for our living there are still flying fish around Barbados and the fishermen who are making the money can tell the others where to go off the coast of Barbados and catch their fish. The Member for Christ Church East knows what I am saying is correct - absolutely correct. We do not have to go into too many wars with Trinidad. We need to fish in our own waters, exploit our own waters, and we will catch the fish that are necessary to catch.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have to talk about is the concept on the minority side about the BMC and I want to remind the Members of the Barbados Labour Party that prior to 1976 the BMC was an outfit which took the produce from small farmers in this country and then distributed it to the supermarkets, et cetera. It was only with the Barbados Labour Party, when a man by the name of Vic Johnson was Chairman of the BMC, that the BMC embarked on a policy of importing produce from the United States, Hyde Park products from the United States, and reselling them to the supermarkets, et cetera in this country. Now I am hearing the Members from the minority party calling for a policy on the BMC, the same BMC that they destroyed, stopping the small farmers from having an outlet for their produce. I am confident that this party to which I belong, the Democratic Labour Party, will put back the BMC into its right role. It is always very easy

Asides

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am going to get to that. It is always very easy to destroy anything. Destruction can come very easy. To build up is often much more difficult. I want to place on record some of the statistics of the BMC with respect to export over the last 2 years.

It is a fact that the BMC has been going around to small farmers collecting their produce and selling it in the

markets overseas in England, Canada, and the United States. In 1987, the BMC was able to export 23,852 kilograms of yams and by 1988 it had gone up to 174,636 kilograms. Sweet potatoes - in 1987, they exported 431,000 kilograms and by 1988 they exported 676,000 kilograms. Hot peppers that they were talking about - they exported 26,000 kilograms in 1987 and by 1988 had exported 99,000 kilograms of peppers. The BMC is now getting back on the rightful role that it should have had and which was destroyed under the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has made me very sad and one of the reasons why I said that it was with great disappointment that I make this contribution is that I notice that there has been a personal attack on the Minister of Agriculture. I think this is unfortunate. I think that we can do the people's business without becoming personal. The Leader of the minority Opposition got up and tried to point accusing fingers at the family of the Minister of Agriculture, and I find that that is very, very unfortunate, in trying to say that they were involved in some deal with the Government, etcetera.

I remember when the committee for the St. Joseph Hospital was set up and I was the chairman. When the Barbados Labour Party was in Government and closed down the St. Joseph Hospital - the Member is not in his seat and I am sorry that he is not in his seat - he was the lawyer for the St. Joseph Hospital while they were the Government of the day closing the hospital down which was against the interest of the people of this country. He represented them. We in the committee could not find out who were the legal owners and it took us months to find out who the legal owners were. He did finally show up as their lawyer. He would have to know who they really were and we were at our wits end to find out who the owners were. Therefore, he was part of the Government and accusing the Government of not opening the hospital when he had information that would have made it easy for us to open the hospital. When we point our fingers at people, we have to be very, very careful. I want to say something now about the Official Leader of the Opposition who went into St. Philip, according to the Advocate Newspaper of Monday, July 10, 1989, who said that

Asides

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: "I can say that he was referring to the Minister of Agriculture. I can say that he has become ten times richer"

Mr. SPEAKER: What is true is that you cannot use the paper to support your argument and, therefore, if you read it to support your argument then it is wrong.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir.

Asides

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I can say that he has become ten times richer while the people in St. Philip have become ten times poorer. I raised that because that is a fundamental point in this whole thing. We have to be very, very careful. One of the richest black people in this country is the Leader of the Opposition. You just got up in the discussion and talked about all the parcels of land. You cannot remember when you got them or when they were sold. You cannot remember. There are so many.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think sometimes we, tend to get carried away with the heat of our argument and forget that we are Honourable Members as well and accord the Honourable Members that kind of respect.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. All my assets are in Barbados. None are in Bequia, St. Vincent, or sequestered anywhere else.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would not reply to that. The point I am making is that we as a people have to be careful how we attack each other. The Honourable Member keeps talking about where your assets are and where they are not. When you were driving around in a Mercedes Benz air conditioned, people were still accustomed to donkey carts. I am not saying that to be derogatory. All I am asking is: what is wrong with people in this country becoming prosperous. The Honourable Member should know and be the last to talk about his affiliation to poor people. You ought not to get me off on this. You better sit down.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of order. I have allowed the Honourable Member to go ahead and build a case on a misquotation. What I said was that I had no difficulty whatsoever with the Minister or anybody else becoming ten times richer. All I would want to see is that all the people of St. Philip becoming ten times richer. That is what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.
12.25 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what I said. If you want to build a case....

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:..... please go ahead, but if you will follow the rules of the House properly, you would know you should not do that.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member in his contribution tried to tie up the Honourable Minister of Agriculture with certain companies, trying to impute that he had involvement. Now he wants me to back off.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am not going to back off. When you carried on your practice your fee structure excluded poor people in this country from getting your services. That is a fact. So how come now you are for poor people? Was it not a time when you had certain days for certain kinds of people and other days for other kinds of people in this country?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House. One of the features of my practice from the very beginning, along with Dr. Bertie Graham, Mr. Denis Bailey and Mr. Duff, is that we have never even had a separate waiting room in the history of our practice here. We have never had separate days for people. Our fee structure started in the 1960's at \$15 for a first visit, \$10 for a second and today it is at \$45 after 22 years and has never been above that. We have always maintained the lowest fee structure as Specialists in this country. It started in 1967 at \$15 and in 1989 at \$45 after 22 years..

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that we in this country have to be careful how we go about in the country sensitising people to a whole lot of nonsense. I am not saying that you should not have your fee structure where you have it. That is not the point I am making. The point I am making is that you should be the ** last person to go about the country making these kinds of irresponsible statements. That is the point I am making.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: We have a responsibility to the people of this country. That comment that you made is part of your whole personality. When you are in a corner you will make irresponsible and stupid statements, and that is why your quest to become Prime Minister of this country ** will always be defeated. That is the problem you have, because you are demonstrating that your behaviour is far below what is required of a statesman in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Honourable Member will regret what he has done in this Chamber today, because he has demonstrated that he is absolutely irresponsible and that when he is under pressure he will do anything at all to try to extricate himself. He knows that I understand him and he knows that we understand psychology, and any aside he * makes will not deter me from exposing him as he is.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: When the real time comes we will say the things that you said to me and the things I said to you, the things that Errol Barrow said about you and to you, but the time is not right yet. Your attack on the Minister of Agriculture! You will have to come with

further ploys, but there is a day coming when the whole story will be told, and none of your mimicry, gimmickry or asides will stop that day from coming. You will be exposed for what you are.

Mr. Speaker, I will end by what I said, that this vote of no confidence has nothing to do with agriculture, it has to do with a gimmick of trying to keep the NDP, who went into the Pine on Sunday and had to run out, before the eyes of the people. You will find in the final analysis that your gimmickry will not work. You can jump in that corner and talk about who has land in Bequia and who has money in Swiss banks.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: He will not come into the Pine! He was afraid to come.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: You will have to come with better tricks and try something more substantial in order to fool the people of this country.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not usually get into debates on agriculture, but the way how this debate has developed has prompted me to participate in it

I would like, first of all, to look at the Resolution as it stands and try to deal with the subject as it appears before the House. Look at the first preamble:

"WHEREAS the agricultural sector of Barbados is faced with a deep financial and production crisis" Take the first sentence and look at it. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East and the National Democratic Party opposition are seeking to indict the Minister based on the first preambular statement that the agricultural sector of Barbados is faced with a deep financial and production crisis. If you start with that, you are saying that the Minister of Agriculture is responsible for the deep financial and production crisis in which the agricultural sector of this country is at this time.

I*am saying that when the members of the NDP opposition examine the objective facts, on their own admission they will see and recognise and admit that the Minister of Agriculture could not be so responsible. This morning the Honourable Minister of Housing quoted what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had said as far back as 1983, that the agricultural sector in Barbados was then faced with a deep financial and production crisis. Has anything happened since 1983 to remove the agricultural

sector from that deep financial and production crisis in which it was? I am saying that if you examine all the objective evidence all over the place you have to come to the inevitable conclusion that nothing has happened as a result of anything done by the present Minister of Agriculture which has put the industry in that situation of which you speak. What has the Minister done?

We came into office in 1986. When we were in Opposition we recognised the crisis the industry was in, and what did the Minister do? There was commissioned this study, and the report is here, and you are telling me that this is the action of a Minister who is incompetent and who does not know what he is doing? He gets a study commissioned because he recognised the problems which the industry has, he has got the experts to do a study on the sector and he has the benefit of a report which has done a good analysis of the agricultural industry. When did this report become available? In April 1989.

12.35 p.m.

*

And what did the Report do? As a result of the work which has been done on it, the work which has been done in reviewing the problems of the industry - because the only rationale for having a Report in the first place was a clear recognition by the Minister of Agriculture that something needs to be done and that something has to be done.

So that one would go out there and lick loose wildly. Rather than go out there and lick loose and do all sorts of nonsense which.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: What he did do was to try to get the facts, get the basis of the problem, get an analysis of the whole situation, get recommendations which would form the basis of action which he, the Ministry and the Government needs to take in order to deal with the problems of the agricultural sector.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: I have said a whole lot. I have destroyed all you have set up.

Mr. SPEAKER: No cross talking. I am asking for no cross talking.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, leave the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know - I am sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of the House are very clear. I do not think you need to stress that. I have already spoken. It is only for action to be taken. That is all. I hope it would not come before the end of the session. Continue.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Agriculture has done in this regard in identifying and having the problems of the industry identified in the way in which they have been dealt with in this Report is fundamental to good and effective administration. So that, rather than moving a motion of no confidence in the Minister, you should be moving a motion complimenting him on the way in which he is dealing with the problems.

Applause.

Aside. .

Laughter.

Hon. M. A. KING: Are you asking that I move an amended motion? You should be complimenting the Minister on the work which has been done and on the steps which are being taken to deal with the problems of an industry which admittedly has a whole lot of problems in it. You admit that, we admit that and all the country admits that.

And what you have to recognize is that the agricultural sector in all countries that I know of always has problems. They depend largely on Government subsidies, a lot of them. There are always problems throughout the world. In the big United States, throughout Europe, in the United Kingdom, you have all the issues relating to subsidies in relation to agriculture and the recognition that agriculture of itself is always a problem industry, but yet which has to be supported and given succour. So do not try to create the impression, it is important from the political point of view that you need to create the impression that the Minister is incompetent and that this whole Government is incompetent. That is part of your mission. But recognize that it is a political position which you are taking and treat it in that context.

You charge that the livelihood of hundreds of persons has been seriously compromised by this person. Well that would follow if the agricultural sector fails and falls through and the industry falls apart. Then of course, the livelihood of hundreds of persons would be affected.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Yes. But I am saying that is precisely the problem which is being addressed by the Minister. He is trying to prevent that very problem from arising.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: How do you mean how? We got the Report done and the steps are being taken. He will outline in detail the steps which have been taken and which will be taken to address the problems of the industry. He is

trying to ensure that the livelihood of these hundreds of persons you are talking about is not seriously compromised.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: As regards to instituting policies to prevent, alleviate, arrest and reverse the serious decline in agricultural output, whatever decline there has been in agricultural output and we do not deny that there has been some decline has to be addressed and will be addressed in the context of the recommendations which have been made and in the context of the plans and proposals which the Ministry of Agriculture eventually pursues, as a result of a studied analysis of the Report which they have at their disposal.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: So that it is fallacious, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the incompetence of the Minister of Agriculture placing the future of an entire sector of the economy of Barbados in jeopardy. Because he has nothing to do with that. He is now taking the steps now that we have the chaise to do it, to prevent all the problems which the agricultural sector has created for us. You say, you charge, both that opposition and the Opposition that Government has no land use policy. Nonsense! A typical type of political statement which you are inclined to make. I hear that statement so often in relation to Government. You have no land use policy, no policy on this, no policy on that, no policy on the other. The NDP is famous for saying that there is no policy on this, there is no policy on that, there is no policy on the other.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: But our policy is quite clear. We recognize that agriculture has a place in the economy of this country. We recognize that good arable land has to be protected wherever it exists. But the Minister of Housing has made the point, you know, it is not all land in Barbados which is good arable land. And in relation to land which is not good arable land, that land has to be utilized for the purposes for which it is best suited. What is wrong with that kind of policy? What is wrong with that?

But you have a problem. The problem arises where, in relation to land that is good arable land, you have owners of that land who are not farming it properly or who are allowing it to fall into disuse and to become run down because they have ulterior motives in wanting to use the land for other purposes, making more financial gain out of it, by selling it off as house spots and things of that kind. And those are the areas of course where a Government has to be cautious and has to watch the disposition of land where it is being sought to alter its use.

And on the odd occasion when I speak about agriculture, I express the view and it is a view which I do not pronounce too far and wide but which I hold nevertheless, that where plantation owners or where owners of land, large areas of land which is good arable land and where they do not want to farm it and they want to dispose of it, I have no problem in those kinds of situations with Government acquiring those lands and making them, if necessary, available for persons on lease, if necessary, to persons.....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: or co-operatives. I have no problem with that.

I am not advocating Government acquiring lands and just alienating it just like that because it can go out of agriculture. But all I am saying is that in order to keep a controlling interest in the land remaining in agriculture, I see no problem with Government acquiring those lands leasing it out to persons for farming, setting, obviously, production targets to ensure that people use the land for the purpose for which it is intended and which is desired. And if they are not living up to the standards which are set and not performing acts of good husbandry, then you take the land from them. 12.45 p.m.

Now a policy can also in that kind of context involve effective use by the Government itself or by one of its agencies of good agricultural land. We have a habit in this country whereby we set institutions in place for dealing with the problems of the country. The Agricultural Development Corporation has certainly been set up to deal with the problems of developing agriculture in Barbados - the Agricultural Development Corporation and the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We have a whole host of infrastructural works which have been set up in Barbados to deal with the problems of Barbados. The whole concept of setting up statutory corporations to deal with the problems of development and management of sectors of the economy is something obviously which is a good structure, but the important thing is to get them to work effectively. I suppose one of the problems with some of the statutory corporations is that they tend to become too much the instruments of politicking.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: What do you mean that 3 minutes have gone? They tend to become much too often the instruments of politicking and they become kicked around left, right, and centre.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: You can heckle me as much as you like. I am going to say what I intend to say. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have made the suggestion that there can be 2 alternative methods of dealing with the problem where land owners have good acreage and good agricultural land which for whatever reason they do not want to continue in agriculture. I have no problem with Government acquiring it and dealing with it in one or two ways. I started by saying that you can deal with it either by leasing it out to persons who really want to farm land insisting on target or through the instrument of one of its development agencies, ensuring that those agencies are so organised, structured, financed, and managed to deal effectively with the problem and the commission which you have given it to do.

So that if the problem is approached from that point of view, the whole area of concern about good arable land going out of production can be effectively addressed. When owners come and say that we want permission to dispose of this land by sale, we say, "No, you are not doing that to agricultural land. There are other considerations which can apply and, if you are not going to use it for agriculture, somebody else can use it for agriculture." So that there are clearly areas of land in Barbados which are available for other types of use. I am sure that the Ministry of Lands and the Ministry of Agriculture have a view of the acreage of land in Barbados which is good agricultural land and which must remain for that purpose and of areas of land which are otherwise suitable for alternative types of development. We have to get out of this idea that we have to give blind allegiance to "King Sugar" because there is opportunity for development of other types of industry. I say sugar is important - yes. Sugar cane planting is important, but there are other types of development as well. We have to sit down and analyze these areas. Our mission has to be to look to see what can be the most effective use which can be put to any area of land. You cannot rely on a generalized statement that any land which is being taken out of agriculture is doing a disservice to the country. If we were to accept that as an unerring truth, how would you explain for instance certain areas which have been developed as hotels which were once plantations going down the West Coast, for instance, Paradise, the Sandy Lane area - areas which were thriving plantations but which if they were still in plantations today could not produce the employment which they produce, could not produce the foreign exchange, could not produce the kind of social development which has taken place in those areas. So that there are no absolutes. This is a changing world. We have to be continually re-examining the situations and to see what is the best solution.

Now there are a number of other issues which Honourable Members have raised which I call "red-herrings". They have addressed a number of problems which are essentially bureaucratic problems where they point the finger at the Ministry of Agriculture, but there are areas which perhaps all you need is a bit of administrative

direction to get the results that are required. The problems, for instance, of the Oistins Fishing Complex are not really problems of any lack of policy considerations. It is a bureaucratic problem. You identify what the problems are. You need to tell people and to get people to go and do the work which is required to be done.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: I know. Yes, I went with him. I know what the problems are. Of course, I went and saw what the problems were and they are problems which I know instructions have been given to remedy. That is why I am saying that is a bureaucratic problem and that it is not a problem of policy.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Anyhow, let me press on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, because I am having a lack of manners to the Chair too and I think in the circumstances Members must start to recognize that this is a dignified place. The Presiding Officer gives direction and I would expect Members to follow. Lack of courtesy is disrespect for the Chair. I have asked that Members speak in silence according to Standing Orders.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal at any length with the misleading impressions which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Labour Party Opposition have tried to create in the course of this debate. I do not have time to deal with them, but I just need to refer to just one or two to make the point

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, for instance, in making a point - I do not remember if it was in relation to the Minister of Trade or the Minister of Agriculture - listed a number of facts in relation to the fishing agreement with Trinidad.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: It was Trade. The suggestion being made that the Minister of Trade - suggestion, I said - and the impression being created was that the Minister of Trade was perhaps somewhere in collusion with somebody else. He rose and protested and the matter was dealt with.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: No, I think it may have been agriculture. Then the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, recited a number of facts which taken independently are probably unimpeachable. Taken independently it is a fact that in Trinidad there was a lobby, for instance, against the

Barbadian fishermen, a fact that in Trinidad, for instance, there was a lobby in relation to selling fish to Barbados. You see the dangerous thing about it all was that before he was stopped he had created the impression certainly that there was this collusion and that there was some irregular thing being done by the Ministers. You see those are the kinds of things which I am saying we have to be cautious in a debate of this kind. The Leader of the Opposition himself got into full debate in relation to that when he began to catalogue a number of things as well and again the Minister had to interrupt him. I am not going to waste time on that because there are one or two substantive issues I want to deal with. Questions were raised....

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: No, time has not gone. I am subject to the jurisdiction of the Speaker and not you. Questions were raised about praedial larceny and the Leader of the Opposition, in his usual style, made the point that all the problems in agriculture are the result of the fact that there is no law and order to prevent praedial larceny.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will remember that he was over here when we were in the Opposition when the Barbados Labour Party brought to this House a Bill intending to deal with this issue of praedial larceny. He participated in the debate. It was a Bill which clearly, Mr. Speaker, would have presented a whole lot of problems for all sorts of people. 12.55 p.m.

We recognise that the issue of praedial larceny is a problem, but the type of legislation which had come down created all sorts of constitutional problems. You provided, for instance, that if anybody was seen on the street with agricultural produce and the police accosted them they had to give an explanation of where they got it from, what they were doing with the produce and that sort of thing. In other words, you were saying to the people of this country we are taking away your constitutional rights which you have enjoyed from the beginning of time, where you were under no obligation to make any statement that would incriminate you, but we were seeking to pass legislation which would say that any person - you or me or anybody else - if the police saw us with a package of something on the street could say "you have to tell me where you got that from". That is a breach of people's constitutional rights.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central joined with us in laughing that legislation out of court and blasting the Government over it. The Labour Party Government, to their credit at that time, recognised how they were infringing on the rights of the people of Barbados and decided they would withdraw the legislation.

That legislation has been looked at again. When I saw it I saw that the same kinds of problems existed, and with

the Minister of Agriculture and other interested Departments we are looking at a way of dealing with the issue without affecting the constitutional rights of Barbadians. New legislation will deal with it, because one of the things which I will insist on is that this Government will not do anything which will take away the civil liberties of Barbadians far and wide.

The other area which I should like a few minutes to deal with is in relation to the fishing problems which exist.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would say, he has taken ten minutes out of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the fishing problems which our fishermen have with Trinidad, I do not quite understand the approach of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East. He said "go down there and demand that Trinidad let you fish in their waters." We must go down with a gunboat, I suppose, and say we are coming to fish here and you cannot stop us. That is not the way in which international relations with countries which have a long tradition of friendship are conducted.

We know that there are problems. If we are sensible, we recognise that all issues cannot be settled overnight, we recognise that other people may have political problems. We are politicians. We must remember that other people may have political problems the same way we do and that those political problems have to be recognised and attempts provided to deal with them.

I believe that there is a lot of goodwill between ourselves and the Trinidad Government with a view to trying to find a solution to the problems which we both have. We have been in discussions about it I myself have participated in some discussions recently with the Minister of Agriculture. I do not propose to make any details of those discussions public at this time, because we are in a very sensitive area of negotiations, but the certain impression which I have is that there is a keen desire on the part of the Government of Trinidad to find a solution to the problem which would be acceptable to both Trinidad and Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should allow the processes to work and not try to deal with issues from the point of view of confrontation and to say to Trinidad "if you cannot let us fish we will not let you fly BWIA into Barbados." Those kinds of statements do not do any good for the development of relations and they have a whole lot of subsequent consequences. I am saying that we have to deal with these issues in a mature and rational way, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that solutions will eventually be found to the problems that confront us.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by making the point that this Resolution which is now before us is a political device to attack the Government, a political device which has no substance in it, and it has no substance because the members of the Opposition who have moved it have themselves recognised and admitted that the whole basis and the foundation for this Resolution is fallacious.

Mr. Speaker, I will unhesitatingly have no difficulty in voting against it

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you wish to give the Honourable Member an additional minute to speak?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member in winding up his speech said that the Honourable Members for the Opposition recognised that the basis for the Resolution was fallacious. It is my submission, Sir, that that terminology is unparliamentary and I will ask the Honourable Member to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other Honourable Member who wishes to speak?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it is being indicated to me by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East that he thinks he needs to eat. Therefore, I think I will oblige. I therefore move that this House be suspended until 2.35 p.m. this day.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of privilege.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well it is about the press. When I was on my way in, a member of the press raised the question with me which we have discussed before, the question of their having to wait to be in their places until after the bell has rung and Your Honour has sat. That question has been raised before and they are not able to raise it. We discussed it.

It seems to me that, with all due respects to security, that members of the press who are here on sufferance of Your Honour, members of the press who are coming to the Gallery ought to be permitted to take their places before the House resumes. Because....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, no. This is a serious matter which has been raised before and I draw it to Your Honour's attention because it may not have been drawn to your attention before.

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter has been brought to my attention before and I do not see any good reason why the press cannot be in their places a few moments before the sitting resumes.

I have suggested that it is possible that they may be in their places before the sitting starts. I am not so sure what has happened after that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I think, Sir, what I was seeking is to have Your Honour indicate, it has not been so directed.

Sir, let me put it another way. It is being suggested that the Government has somehow issued instructions to the Police. And the Government has no jurisdiction over what happens in Parliament.

And therefore I think Your Honour should make an announcement on what the position is because Government has no jurisdiction whatsoever over who comes in or does not come into Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unfortunate that that is perceived as the case, but as I just pointed out, I have already suggested that the press could be accommodated as such.

I would probably investigate the matter a bit more to find out what is the real reason for such delay in the press on such occasions.

I would certainly investigate it again and probably give instructions as well, as to what is to be done.

Are there any other Members wanting to contribute to the Debate? The Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had nearly two days now of debate on this motion. And to be honest with you, Sir, this could have been one of the most enlightening Debates, perhaps in the history of Parliament or perhaps, in the last 30 or 40 years. Sadly, I must say that there has been a lot of rhetoric. And to my mind, at least, I feel that justice was not done in terms of the content.

Agriculture which has been the backbone of our economy for nearly 300 years or so, that we must view it not in light of a Democratic Labour Party problem or a Barbados Labour Party problem, or indeed a National Democratic Party problem but it is a Barbadian problem. And what I would have liked to see in the debate, Sir, would have been some constructive criticisms so that all and sundry would understand where things are and where the Opposition would like them to be.

All I have heard for some time, as I said, was a lot of rhetoric. Under privilege, Honourable Members have been able to get up and say some of the most alarming things. And obviously, those who were counter punching were doing so with great alacrity, Sir. The debate was punctuated with all sorts of parliamentary remarks which you yourself, Sir, had to intervene regrettably, on many occasions. And therefore, Sir, the content that is important seemed to have been lost. And what that tells me is that the motion is of little substance, in terms of a vote of no confidence against the Minister of Agriculture.

We hear talk that he is incompetent. Let me say, Sir, that I have known the Minister for a long time, since we sat down next to each other in Combermere for five years. Always a bright lad, Sir. And since then his professional qualifications have all been attained quite easily. He has also done well and at his workplaces. We have been able to observe the progress; moreso, Sir, as Minister of Agriculture. And, Sir, that is where I stand this evening, not to join the queue and say that I must get up and defend something that other people believe that the Government Benches would of necessity do, but because I have not seen anything coming really from the Opposition Benches that would make me feel that there is this great alarming case. And I will demonstrate that later.

~

I want everyone to understand, Sir, that the Oxford Concise Dictionary describes "competent" - to be competent is to be adequately qualified to do a task. For instance, to be a judge, you have to be legally qualified. I see nothing in the Minister's response yesterday, as he went about his job in a very cool, collected and knowledgeable way, not flamboyant, Sir, but cool knowingly and in a calm way he went about and showed all and sundry that he is on top of his job.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I often say that when things are going well in a Ministry, the Minister is lucky, he has good officers, he has good Boards, but when things go wrong, no one remembers. I have not heard any officer's name being called in here, just a little fellow that works at the ADC, nothing to do with their competence. And I know that in Graeme Hall there are people up there with so many initials behind their names, it would take two columns to fill it. And they are making me believe that the man who is

responsible for any wrongdoing or anything in Barbados as far as agriculture is concerned is the Minister of Agriculture.

I feel, Sir, that in order to assess the competence of any individual, the assessor must himself be competent in that field.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Shadow Minister, what are your claims to fame in this respect?

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: How dare you - Mr. Shadow, yes, Shadow - come in here in this august Chamber and tell the whole world about the competence of a man of whom you know very little? I think it is ridiculous, Sir. And that goes for the other Members of the Opposition! Those who are Barbados Scholars too. I am not convinced that they know more about agriculture than the Minister of Agriculture. I am not convinced about that.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am not convinced about that. Other subjects, yes. But they are not the repository of all knowledge, as they make people believe.

And so, Sir, I think it is important that we look at it in its true perspective. 2.45 p.m.

I would like to try to describe it in a half hour if I had that time. I would like to think, Sir, that people attach great importance to being a Minister. They feel that to be a Minister it is important, because, perhaps of their life styles, or perhaps their importance as they go in that office. I will tell you something, Sir. I have never been so scared in my life as to go in an office and they say, "Well, Minister come, Minister, Minister..." as if the Minister is a God. Well, that is to say if the Minister had in some cases a God-like existence, then it does not really worry him. But to those who have really just ascended to the throne, it could make them get very, very swell-headed, Sir. I say, Sir, that all you need to do is to make sure that you motivate the people around you and your officers who are very competent, as indeed the officers in the Ministry of Agriculture are very competent people. If you can enrich their jobs, if you can delegate some sort of authority and not only authority but certainly responsibility, then I think you would have the makings of a good Minister. You will also have to know your team and you should have some loyalty from them, Sir. Loyalty is a bad word to some politicians, Sir. I am saying, Sir, that it is the greatest of all social graces and, therefore, I feel that we must have a team that is loyal.

Only in the last 4 weeks, Sir, a farmer of great repute told me that the Minister is the greatest Minister of Agriculture this country has ever known. I feel, Sir, that these people....

Hon. W. W. HALL: Well, you are laughing. That is jocular. Do you feel that I am joking? Sir, I am not joking. He said so in all honesty. He said so from a backdrop. Sir, where people were criticising him. The point is that if people criticize you as a Minister you have to take it. You are the sacrificial lamb. If you criticize any section of people in a Ministry that is under your purview, then you are the worst person in the world. That is the way I see it, Sir. Therefore, I am not going to go ahead with all of this lot of rhetoric in here yesterday and today about the Minister of Agriculture being the worst Minister ever. I will say this, Sir. The mistake that some people make is that they judge agriculture by the state of the sugar industry. I think that is what happens. People sometimes just isolate it and then they come with a global thinking and they criticize you. I feel that to say that the Minister is responsible for the "white fly" and his incompetence is a white lie. It cannot be true. He has not got control over everything, Sir. I heard someone say that he is an obstructionist - listen to the word, Sir, an obstructionist - to good administration.

What is the qualification of the Honourable Member in terms of deciding what is good administration? What am I talking about? The Honourable Member for Christ Church East said that the Minister is an obstructionist to good administration. You know that he said that. I would not say that that is the quintessence of ignorance. I will say that is foolishness. No Sir, you said that you cannot use that word "foolishness". Sir, to say that is akin to walking across a highway.

Sir, I know that we would get a lot of asides about making sport and all of that. It will be better to make sport....

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: No, no, I will not say that. The Minister said yesterday "his friends". I do not know how he could get up and talk about his friends after people talk all of this sort of thing. Anybody in here that would say the things about me that he did will meet me eye to eye and toe to toe. There is no doubt about that. Friends what? When anybody can call me all sort of foolish names and tell me that you are my friend, that is the whole problem. We do not mind blows. We do not mind legitimate blows. You were not here. The Member for Christ Church West was not here. Therefore, he does not know of what I am talking.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, we had a situation where the Member for St. George South said that it was foolishness to

talk about, and wondered if it is sabotage at night He said it is foolishness. Sabotage is not foolishness. Sabotage is wickedness. If the Minister is speaking to the point that any individual having said that you would get sabotaged and he informs the police, and he tells the Members on the floor of the House of his problems over there at the Fishing Complex, I think that we should take it for what it is worth. One cannot just get up and dismiss it as nonsense. It cannot be foolishness.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I hope that I will be able to get the extra 5 minutes because I can hardly hear myself and I think, Sir, that you alluded to the fact earlier that Members should be allowed to speak in silence. Well, I had no doubt that when I began to speak that we would get these rumblings.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will soon get silence. I will start at the top....

Mr. SPEAKER: ... and every additional intervention will earn you one minute more.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes, you are the first to go. You are very badly behaved. Sir, even the Member for Christ Church West got into the act today. I had read in yesterday's paper, Sir, that he had said that the Minister was the spectacular failure of any Minister of Agriculture in the House of Assembly. I had hoped, Sir, that he would come in here today and dissociate himself from those remarks. He went on to repeat them today, Sir. But Sir, the Member for Christ Church West would have to be suffering from encephalitis for him to say that. Yes Sir, if he wants to know where the worst Minister in the history of this country in Agriculture is, he only has to go back from 1976 to 1986. One of them said that this industry is dead and he knows that it is dead. He is the most qualified man in the world to talk about dead things. He left it, Sir, in a terminal state. If it is dead now 3 years after, it is like cancer. Cancer does not always come. Some diseases take 10 years, Sir. I am saying that, if he is saying that it is dead, he knew at that time when he was speaking that there was a terminal illness when he presided over that Ministry. Sir, these are the things that are important. You must not go about saying these things about decent people, Sir.

The Minister of Agriculture yesterday replied to every question that the Member for Christ Church East put to him. He did it, Sir, with ease. Sir, he did it as if he had seen them the night before. I know he did not see them because the Member had them close to his chest. The Minister replied to him in such a manner, Sir, that it was obvious to everyone in here and those who read the newspaper that he knows his business. This is not surprising, Sir, because only a week or so ago the Minister appeared on television. Now television frightens a lot of people, Sir. It does. There he

was as cool as ever and he articulated, Sir, the views of the Ministry. He told everyone exactly what is happening. He did not duck. He did not really bob and weave. He told them as it is. Eye ball to eye ball, shoulder to shoulder. That is what he did. Sir, as an honest man, I have a problem with him. Sir, he believes the Biblical quotation. Do you want to know what I am going to quote now? He believes, Sir, that the meek shall inherit the earth. The threshold question is that when all those meek people inherit this earth, are they still going to remain meek? What are they going to do? 2.55 p.m.

One wonders, because of that disposition, why is the Minister so quiet? I wondered if those fellows out there had something. I listened to every one of them. I spoke after them and I did not hear anything. I heard of an allegation of U.S. \$20,000. I have not seen U.S. \$20,000 since I stopped playing.

Aside

Hon. W. W. HALL: The sum of money then, Sir, alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition is chicken feed to him. To me that is an enormous sum, but that is the sum that some Minister apparently had in an account. That is the depth to which this debate really went. All that happened was that whenever an attack was made, there was a counter attack punctuated with unparliamentary mouthings, where you had to intervene every time. I am saying that politics in this country is the loser. The Opposition will not lose, neither will the Government in this issue. There are politicians and there are statesmen; there is a difference.

Aside

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I do not know who is Rambo. I am not involved in that, I am not a Rambo. If you look at me you will see this is not a man that looks like a Rambo. I am speaking about my colleague against whom you have brought a vote of no confidence, and I do not think it is justified. Anyone with a modicum of commonsense will know that when rain falls in a year it is important, but as far as agriculture is concerned the importance is when that rain fell. You can get a flood one month and nothing for the balance of the year, and at the end of the year you can say so many inches fell. That is not the point, the point is when the rain fell and how it was distributed.

We need not be reminded of the diversification programme that the Minister initiated in 1986. We need not be reminded also of the policy of the Democratic Labour Party so ably demonstrated by the now Leader of the opposition on the case of price support. They went back to 1983, but I remember 1986, I remember price support, I remember the Democratic Labour Party as a matter of policy was saying "we do not know where the money is going" and the Minister of Finance got up and articulated very well the policy of his Government. So how come all of*

a sudden this Minister, in carrying out a policy of his Government, is totally and singularly to blame? Sir, that is political foolishness.

We talk about sugar, but let us look at some food crops. I am not getting up and just speaking, Sir, I know like any other member on this side that I will be at the sharp end of the Member for Christ Church East's vituperative tongue, but it does not bother me. I feel that we have to come with facts.

Aside

Hon. W. W. HALL: Begging off, what? You can only talk about lights at St Christopher, and you will get them next month.

Sir, we need to look at the Minister's performance. Would you believe that all this old talk is because of one bad year in three? You would not believe that, Sir, but it is. I shall demonstrate to you.

Let us look at the food crops and the acreage planted. In 1986, 92 acres of beans were planted; in 1987, 104; in 1988, 94. The Minister might not have enough time to go through all of these, so I will help him. Cabbages:- In 1986, 55 acres were planted, in 1987, 56 and in 1988, a reduction, 38.1 admit that. Carrots, Sir:- In 1986, 248 acres, in 1987, 390 and in 1988, 380. Cucumbers, Sir:- In 1986, 63 acres, in 1987, 94 acres and in 1988, 68 acres. Let us have a look at yams:- In 1986, 404 acres, in 1987, 470 acres and in 1988, 585 acres.

Sir, the list is long but not exhaustive, so I shall continue. Corn:- 128 acres in 1986, 305 acres in 1987 and 226 acres in 1988. Tomatoes:- 110 acres in 1986, 153 acres in 1987 and 154 acres in 1988. We get to some bad patches, Sir. Let us take onions:- In 1986, 213 acres, 1987, 172 acres and 1988, 145 acres. I will call the good, the bad and the ugly. I am not going to look good by calling figures where we look good, we will call the ones where we were a little down.

Let me get to the ground provisions, what poor people eat. Eddoes, which are good for meningitis:- 110 acres in 1986, 184 acres in 1987 and 92 acres in 1988. Worse now, let me tell you about peanuts. This was bad, I know. Peanuts were mentioned yesterday and one would get the impression that I am only talking about good things, but let us talk about the one that was negative. Let us go back to 1984 when there were 39 acres of peanuts, 342 acres in 1985. I have to say it, because if I did not say it they would say that in 1985 when there was a boom the Minister did not talk about it, we hid it. In 1986, 73 acres, in 1987, 94 acres and 1988 four acres. That is it.

Let us look at the reason why, as I understand it, the peanuts fell off. First of all, we had no facilities for drying

and storing and apparently they were still being imported. That was the reason, I am told, not by the Minister, because I have to do my own research. The Leader of the Opposition said he thought the Minister was doing a great job in 1987 because he told him so. The Minister has not told me a thing. I want him to tell you, Sir, I want him to tell the people of Barbados the way he had been telling them; no rancour, no belligerence, not getting on like a naughty boy, Sir, but doing it with all the decorum befitting a Minister of this Chamber. That is what I want to see.

The total acreage planted in 1986 was 2,456.2. By 1987 it had risen to 3,436.9 and in 1988 it was down to 2,674. It is noteworthy that in 1988 it was more than it was in 1986. 3.05 p.m.

So as I said at the beginning, Sir, he has had one bad year out of three. Not the worst. It was not the worst. Nineteen eighty-eight by a far shot was not the worst year ever. But still we are led to believe that this Minister is so inept that his ineptitude is a danger to the people of Barbados and therefore, everybody is hankering for his demise. The only thing they have not said about him is that he should be dead. If I were in his shoes I would think that you believe that.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: They said it? Well I did not hear it, Sir, I just want to say, Sir,.....

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: that all of this talk about sugar, the price on the world market now - only a while ago, the price was US\$9 per tonne. It is now, to the best of my knowledge, about US\$14 per tonne. And it is estimated that the peak will be around US\$21 per tonne, that is \$42 per tonne.

Sir, the Minister yesterday explained the reason why the tonnage was in the sixties, 65 000, 69 000 tonnes. He was very clear on what was happening. I am not going to get into all of that. The Minister has to speak again and I think that everyone knows very well the position on sugar.

Sugar, as I said before, is a serious commodity. It is very important to our very existence and we must not take it lightly. It is not a nebulous issue. And therefore, we cannot just throw it through the window. We cannot throw the bathtub out of the house and also let it include the baby, Sir. That is what they are doing.

There was a time, Sir, when Barbados used to produce a tonne of canes to every inhabitant of this land. We went as far as two hundred and forty odd thousand tonnes. That is a fact. There was a time too when there were no

problems, no monetary problems in the sugar industry. My colleague alluded to the fact yesterday that in the sixties and seventies, there were no financial problems. They paid their way. And in the 1980s I think he said that they only owed \$1.5 million. Now it is astronomical.

What bothers me very much, Sir, is this. How do they really compute all of these expenditures? I am not too clear. I was supposed to ask the Minister, but I was a little busy and could not speak to him. The whole question is, how do they do it? If I had a 5 acre lot and I planted it in canes and then reaped them, I want to know when I plough that land, take out the rocks, I want to know all the labour costs, Sir. That seems to me to be a sugar cost. I want to know if you interplant, in other words, if you put yams in by canes - they go together quite well - when that money comes in for the yams, where does it go? Does it go towards sugar or does it go in a separate account? Those are the things that I wonder about, I think those are the things that bother me. And I want the people to let me know.

I see something happening on estates, Sir. There is now an easy way of getting around it. Now, estates are being sold throughout this country. You cannot get the house. You cannot get the yard. Separate conveyance. Separate conveyance, if you please. The lawyers over there would know how it is done. I am not privy to that knowledge, but I am saying that you would buy a plantation and you do not seem to get the house and the yard. That seems to me, Sir, to be a little funny. I think those are the little things you should go into.

I do not think that you should really criticize the Minister of Agriculture for that.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: How do you mean that I do not have any more? Sir, I am sure that I have quite another 15 minutes with all those interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only two more minutes.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only two more minutes.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Two? Let me go down the road then, Sir.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I went into the other House in 1971 and since then I have only known of one other vote of no confidence. The Democratic Labour Party brought it against the former Minister of Transport and Works. That was on the question of a road. And I believe that if we go down to Trents, we can now determine, four or five years

later, whether we were right or wrong. It is there. Has it enriched anybody or not? It is there. So we need not dwell on that.

I want to say that there have been many cases where I would have thought that a vote of no confidence could have come is here, Sir. We have had the Pele case, we have had canefield cases with our young people. The Minister responsible for law and justice was not dragged before this House on a vote of no confidence. I have seen a Minister of Health call the lawyers vagabonds in the Other Place, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Call who?

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I would never call a lawyer a vagabond, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. W. W. HALL: You know, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: You should not also reflect on the conduct of another.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You should not do that, according to the Rules. The Other Place also is protected by the Rules of the House.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes, Sir. Thank you very much for that. I wanted to say, Sir, that we have seen those sorts of things happening and no vote of confidence.

I have seen the NAB. We have talked about the vagaries of the weather. It means that they cluttered all the work in three months and blame the vagaries of the weather. Nonsense that was. Political foolishness, because you have to be made accountable for your action. And what you should do is come out and say, yes we did it. Full stop! Punto! Finito! That is what they should have said after that. Bam! Finish!

Sir, we want to say.....

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: - Not yet. - ... the NTS, the NCC, the MTW, we have seen all of these Ministries coming under fire in the last 20 years. Every one of them has come under fire, Sir. Tourism. The Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Director saying that he was more devastating than a Hurricane Janet. And by extension, it had to be the Minister too!

blamed for every single aspect of agriculture in this country, the first time in the history of this country that anyone has attempted to blame a single Minister for problems that have been existing in the sugar industry, that come up from time to time - the nature of the problem changes from time to time, and they are blaming it on one Minister who has been in office for three years.

Is it that these problems have suddenly occurred? Is it that there is so much bureaucratic - I do not remember what is the term they used - anarchy that he is able to create these problems in the past three years? That is why I have turned to him and I have told him that he cannot cause the rain to fall, and that is a fact. The report which came out in 1978, The Barbados Sugar Industry Report - Problems and Perspectives - the McGregor Report - placed considerable emphasis on the patterns of rainfall in this country and it is still a very important aspect. I am satisfied that if we get a suitable rainfall pattern over the next few years, that we will see increased production in sugar and if we get a guaranteed price or a price for the sugar that is remunerative and that is above production costs, we will see increased production of sugar as well.

The problems in the sugar industry particularly have been in the main problems over which we have no control. One is the weather, and you had better believe it, and the other one is the price that is received either on the world market or in the guaranteed market. Barbados produces too little sugar in order to influence the price that comes from those sources. We have to take the price that is provided.

While at one time Barbados was considered to be a country that is the gem of sugar producing countries, that position was taken over very early, first by Jamaica, then by the French Sainte Domingue as it was called at that time, and later by Cuba in terms of volume and quantities of production and things like that. Let us not try to import blame and to charge unnecessarily and without foundation a particular individual for factors over which he does not have full control or nearly full control. No Minister of Agriculture has that kind of responsibility.

Now, if you ask if there are certain things that can be done in order to help to alleviate the situation, or to try to guide the situation, yes, and it was this Democratic Labour Party Government that commissioned the study entitled "Barbados - An Agricultural Sector Study", part of a series prepared by the Landell Mills Commodities Studies Group. It is this Government that commissioned that group to carry out the study. The problems were inherent in the administration of the Barbados Labour Party. They recognised that there were problems and under the second World Bank project started to think about this question of a study of the sugar industry, but it was this Democratic Labour Party Government and my Government in 1988 that identified these experts to carry out the study. There was no other Minister then, it is the same Minister of Agriculture

who would have been at the centre of the arrangements for the study of the system, and I am going to point out the cynicism behind this particular motion that is before us, because all that is happening is that the study which this Government commissioned, and with which the Minister of Agriculture is closely associated, that particular study has come to hand. It came to hand about four months or so ago. 3.35p.m.

A copy has got into the hands of the Leader of the Opposition.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:..... and all that he has done is to go into this study, pick some of the comments, recommendations and criticisms that are in the study, put them into a motion and brought them before this House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I have not got a copy of that study.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You get copies of all things - I wonder how come you did not get this one - even Central Bank Reports before they come out I know you do not have a copy of it. Not of this one. I have this one here close to me. But you had another one.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have that one. All right. That is all that has happened. Let me see that. He says he has that one.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Is this an old one?

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: This study refers to a crisis in the industry. It refers to a crisis in production. It refers to a financial crisis, as far as the estates are concerned. And those are the very words that are in the Resolution.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Aside.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is exactly why it is not in your name. That is why it is in his name. And that is why we are talking about manipulation.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Because I do not understand your words in 1982 or 1983 about bankruptcy of the sugar industry. And now you set up the Member for Christ Church East to come in here to read out a Resolution and then come to talk about Tendering all kinds of trivialities.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, let me remain....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:..... very, very calm and quiet on this.

I have already pointed out how that minority Opposition is being manipulated into a position that they are becoming very effete, very weak and playing second fiddle to this Opposition here. That is the position that they find themselves in today. And the Member for Christ Church East in a similar position, set up to introduce a Resolution. He is Shadow Minister of Agriculture and I note the movements. We have to take our politics seriously.

Do you see where he is sitting down today?

Aside. .

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He is number two today. Boosting his own importance. But I notice the Deputy Leader back down the road in dark glasses.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Back down the road. That is where he is, being manipulated. That is what is happening in this particular Resolution. It has nothing at all to do with anything that is worthwhile, or proper, or beneficial for the development of agriculture in this country. Because this is the study which we commissioned, as a Government.

I believe that it is only some weeks ago that Members of the Cabinet actually obtained copies of the Report.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: What do you want me to tell you? I am saying it as it is.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And the Report, as I understand it, has been circulated to interested parties. The

Ministry of Agriculture is awaiting the comments of those interested parties. In other words, we commissioned the Report; the persons who carried out the study came and had discussions, wide ranging discussions with a variety of persons. A report is sent in, the report is sent to the interested parties for their comments, their comments have not yet come in, but the Leader of the Opposition is coming in to bring a Resolution, based on this particular study. That is exactly what the position is. That is exactly what you have done. .

You have brought a Resolution in here on agriculture, full well knowing that the Government has this Report, that we are studying it, that we have not yet come to conclusions on it because we have not held the ongoing discussions on the Report. That is the position on this. And that is why you have brought it in here.

Let me say this. Agriculture is very important to this country. If an Opposition wanted seriously to discuss agriculture and reforms in agriculture, if as they said they wanted questions answered, they are other well-known techniques and devices for the debate and discussion within Parliament of any matter of public interest.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: A no confidence motion is an extreme motion introduced when there is some very grave sin of omission or commission on the part of a Minister or on the part of a Government.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You said he has not done anything. And the first act, as the Member for Christ Church West Central pointed out was that we commissioned a study to examine matters in agriculture. We now have that study before us. And we are consulting with the people in the industry. What else do you want the Minister of Agriculture to do? To rush headlong and like some dictator say, the rain should fall on this particular day; it should not fall on that particular day; this land should be available for peanuts and that area for tomatoes or something like that. He is doing the right thing, that is, he has received the study, the study has gone out to the interest groups; we are awaiting those particular responses and then, as a Cabinet, we will take decisions. We will look at the recommendations made by the Minister of Agriculture and they bring those proposals to the, House of Assembly, if this is the correct forum for dealing with those particular problems. What is appropriate for the House of Assembly will come before the House of Assembly. What is appropriate for implementation otherwise will be so implemented.

There is absolutely nothing that the Minister of Agriculture has done that is not in keeping with the

proposals of Cabinet or Government policy. He is the agent of the Government in these particular matters. And if we are accused of not having a policy for agriculture - that is the first thing that was said - it is the Minister of Agriculture who produced a sectoral plan that is part of the Development Plan for Barbados 1988-93 entitled "A Share For All". And they are saying that there is no policy for agriculture. 3.45 p.m.

The Member for St. Thomas even before the plan was out was asking, "Why is the plan so late? It has not come out yet." I had to point out to him that the plan was not late and pointed out the times when his Government laid their plan. Our memories tend to be short and in here there is a policy set out for agriculture. In respect of sugar, we have a position that is in advance of that of the sugar industry itself because they were saying that they believe we should be producing 80,000 tonnes of sugar or something like that. This plan calls for a target of between 90,000 to 100,000 tonnes of sugar.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: This is before Landell Mills. We are not dealing with Landell Mills on this. That is what they recommend. We will examine that and it is obvious that we have to get back up to that level in stages. If we get up to that level, we have to do it in stages because we can look back. There was a time, I believe, in 1966 or 1967 that we produced 200,000 tonnes of sugar in this country. I believe it was so in 1967. We have to know these things when we are talking about agriculture.

Agriculture is not sugar. Sugar is part of agriculture and the proposals of this Government are set out in the Development Plan. We have sent an extract of it to the Press, because I wanted to know how you can have this big concern now about agriculture and we are not enlightened through the media, public or private, when you have this major issue. It is said the Government has no policy. What about the public documents that are available to give the lie to those kinds of comments?

Mr. Speaker, you have to understand why I am so skeptical about the purposes or the reasons why this particular motion of censure or no confidence motion has been brought. We are very skeptical about it. We believe it is brought for political purposes and nothing at all to do with the development of agriculture in this country. We are going to follow the progress that you seek to make on this particular matter and, whenever you hold your whatever you call them, we will examine your words very carefully. We will examine them very carefully.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minutes more.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want this country to be fully aware that there is no charge to be answered in respect of the Minister of Agriculture. He has been carrying out the policies of the Government and all of these dark insinuations are coming from the demolition experts. They can only come from demolition experts - dark insinuations about wrong doing. You hint here and you suggest there without any basis at all in order to vilify an individual and I believe that part of the reason is that when you tried to get him to come and join your group he and his brother refused to do that. He and his brother refused to do it. This is just a perpetuation and a continuation of the warfare being launched against the Democratic Labour Party.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have not asked him or his brother to join me in anything.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: This is at the root of it. People will not believe that this motion is brought from a national perspective. It has nothing to do with any national perspective. This is the personal politics of a new group coming into being to displace the older group and in the long run hopeful. That is the background to it, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to defeat this motion solidly and give the National Democratic Party another whipping so that they will go and learn something about parliamentary politics and politics in this country. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any other Member, otherwise.....

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to all the speakers in this debate and almost all on the Government side seem to think that sugar is agriculture. It goes further than that, Sir.

First, before I go down the wicket, I want to deal with a few of the Honourable Members who spoke and I am going to start with the Minister of Trade. The Honourable Minister of Trade, representative for St. Lucy, seems to be ignorant of what is going on in agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow that.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: He should listen carefully to the cries of the farmers both great and small. He should go down to Half Moon Fort and listen to the cries of his people who are fishermen there.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: No, I am not done yet. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East rightly states that my boats spend more time on the beach than in

the sea. You are correct, Sir. If a boat cannot find fish to catch, the best place for it is the beach. The best place for a boat that cannot fish is the beach.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I thought the Honourable Member understood that I knew that the boats were leaking and that is why they could not go out to sea.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I will not take you on about this boat leaking because you know as well as I do that I can handle all kinds of leaks in anything about boats. I will not bother to take you on about leaks.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, in his speech, reminds me, as does a friend of mine of his first case as a young lawyer. All the evidence showed clearly on the first day that his client would be convicted for murder and he tried desperately all day and he impressed the jury that his client was a madman. Well, I am prepared to say here now that there is no way that will you impress me or Members on this side of the House that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is mad. We know he is incompetent. If he is unable, we are demanding that he does not sit at the table. 3.55 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not sure what the Honourable Member is saying. Is he suggesting for a single moment that I am saying that the Minister of Agriculture is mad? Choice of words is important. If the Honourable Member is suggesting that, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he should be asked to withdraw it.

Mr. E. BOURNE: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, my friend again.....

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I have raised a matter.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have taken the point, but I prefer to let it rest at the moment.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want to explain my claim to fame in agriculture to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central. He has given us a long tirade from some sheet about acreage and he does not even understand that production and acreage do not always go together. You can plant a field of potatoes, all kinds of acres of potatoes and you end up with all slips. Acreage, my friend, has nothing to do with production. Our quarrel today, Sir, is agricultural production. My point was agricultural production.

Hon. W. W. HALL: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I was demonstrating to all and sundry that the acreage of

food crops planted had increased, and if the people in the Ministry of Agriculture increased the acreage, if they plant all slips that is not my fault.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. W. W. HALL: If you plant slips, you get slips.

Mr. E. BOURNE: And now I get to the Honourable Prime Minister.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: There was not much. You other fellows talked a lot of you know what. He said I am quarrelling about ice on a particular day. My friend, the fishing industry at Oistins needs ice every day, not on a particular day. You visited Oistins with me, you and the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central - my good friend again - and the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, and my brother the Honourable Member for St. Andrew. We visited Oistins, and it is an established fact that they need ice every day, Sir, so do not pull that fast one on me.

Now you are talking about old tyres on the jetty. I asked a question about old tyres on the new jetty down town at \$20 apiece. We want some \$20 tyres at Oistins to save our boats.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: You have not started yet, Sir. My boat got damaged because of the Minister's neglect, and he has fooled you again that he has started the work? It is not true, Sir. I know that the Democratic Labour Party will have a lot of explaining to do to the people in Oistins about ice on a particular day, old tyres on the jetty and broken pipe cocks, because they had to fork out the money, with blood in their eyes, to pay for the long length of pipe and the plumber. When they argue that they paid the toll charges, which are very high, and they would like some value for the money, you will have a lot of answering to do, and I know that they are not going to take these things lightly when the time comes.

I will tell you what is required to save agriculture, because you went on saying that we brought the Resolution and we never said anything about what we will do. All agriculture needs is a series of commonsense practical reforms, but I have found in the past few years' association with you on the other side that commonsense there happens to be a rare gift of God. For instance, marketing should be left to one agency whether it be ADC or BMC, or some

I want to warn the minority Opposition Leader, as I have warned him on previous occasions, that this particular motion is as much directed against him as it is purported to be directed against the Government. They do not wish to see and they do not wish to hear. Let them join with this Opposition against this Government and they will soon understand what is the real purpose behind this motion. Let me explain, Sir, because....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not have to look to the left or to the right. If anybody moves to the left and somebody else moves to the right, we will do our own dance and I will take care of him. I know him very well. He told me that I am a small farmer. I recognize that.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have no problem. Let us understand, Sir, the real reasons behind this motion. I warned the then Leader of the Opposition already, the Member for Christ Church West. Do not worry about my position. Worry about yours. I was looking at him straight across at that time. Now I have to avert my eyes in order to see him. Let him understand that the introduction of this particular motion is to demonstrate that the Member for St. Michael Central is a true Leader of the Opposition whereas you did not have a true, true Leader of the Opposition before. That is what this is all about. It is directed against them as much as it is purported to be directed against us. I take the symbolism of these matters very seriously and I take my politics very seriously. They are out there making fun and they are going to join with you and vote against the Government on this particular measure. If they cannot see and see through what is really happening, then they will suffer from their own blindness. That is the first point I wish to make, Sir.

Now let me get on to this particular Resolution. Agriculture has been important in this country for a very, long time. Indeed, from the very settlement of the colony, the settlers were looking around for some means of livelihood or pursuit that would enable them to scratch a living from the surface of this country to find an export crop which they could send to the mother country, as it was then called, and also something that could come back in the ships as imports to maintain the kind of life that they wanted to live. Agriculture was a pursuit to which they turned.

In about at least 12 years after the settlement of the colony sugar was introduced and within almost 20 years of the establishment of the colony the first successful shipment of sugar was transported to Britain. Ever since then sugar has played an important part in agriculture in this country and in the exports of this country. It has never been an easy crop to produce and there have always been problems

associated with the production of that particular crop. At some periods of time it is up and at other periods of time it is down. There has been movement and change within that industry - periods of prosperity interspersed with periods of decline and periods of adversity. That has been the pattern throughout the years from the 1650's and onwards into the 1680's, a period of relative prosperity as far as sugar is concerned. Even then in the 1660's the planters were talking about the impact of the Navigation Acts, because they wanted to trade with everybody in competition. After that, they also wanted to talk about the 4 1/2% duty imposed on the sugar and the planters predicted then that it would spell ruin for them, for agriculture and for the prosperity of the island. 3.25 p.m.

We can move on to other periods in the history of the country and we will find that factors outside of the control of the producers in this country impacted upon the production of sugar and the export of sugar, and that ruinous times - sometimes they used the phrase rack and ruin, all kinds of phrases have been coined in this - prevailed.

We have had the period during the 1820's, we have had the period in the 1840's with the equalisation of the duties, we have had the period, in the 1880's I believe, when beet sugar came into competition and from the 1880's until the time of the First World War we had this problem of adjustments in the sugar industry and adverse times for it. During the 1920's and the 1930's, the periods of the depression, there were times of hardship for the sugar industry.

The point I am making here is that agriculture and the sugar subsector have always experienced difficult times throughout the history of this country, and during this very debate it has been pointed out that the Leader of the Official Opposition indicated that the sugar industry was bankrupt some time during the 1980's, according to his information. All that is happening now, he is coming with the same terms. He is sitting in a different place, but coming with the same words now about the same sugar industry to say that it is bankrupt, but now what is happening is that a reason is found for this, and the reason for the problems in the sugar industry, the reason for the problems in the agricultural sector is being blamed upon my Minister of Agriculture. That is the missing link. It has never had a local habitation and a name before, but now on this occasion it is being blamed on the Minister of Agriculture.

He is being blamed because there are problems not yet resolved in working out a fishing agreement with Trinidad and Tobago. He is being blamed for working out an agreement with the Government of Guyana. He is being blamed because there are no fenders, old tyres, on a jetty. He is being blamed because there is a broken stop cock and because ice is not delivered on a particular day. He is being

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Which Prime Minister? Not Prime Minister - God forbid - the Prime Minister of the Democratic Labour Party writing, talking - that would be foolishness.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, Prime Minister Adams wrote to the Director of the Tourist Board and said that his performance was more devastating than Hurricane Janet. Well a hurricane. I only know about Janet, so I say Janet. But I feel, that that by extension has to be a reflection on the Minister, and no vote of confidence.

We on this side took it in our stride. We felt that those things happen. Ministers go up and they go down. They have peaks and they have valleys.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: What?

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Are you the Speaker?

Hon. W. W. HALL: How do you mean time? Time what? Time is essential, Sir.

Hon. W. W. HALL: So at this point, I wish to close by saying, Sir -1 have just begun -1 just wish to appeal to the Members of this Honourable Chamber. Why is it that we should be the laughing stock of the entire world when we come in here to discuss a vote of no confidence which as I said is punctuated with a lot of irrelevancies which castigate Member after Member. And people, aspiring politicians up there and down there, Sir, in the Galleries cannot really feel that this is the vocation they want. They cannot feel so.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Are there only two? No, Sir, there are more than two.

I feel that we should have tackled this in a different manner. We should have looked very seriously at the ills that beset us in agriculture. If you feel that you can get political points, the Estimates is five long days, Sir. Do you know how long that is? Five long days. They need not discuss any other Head. They can go right down through the Heads until they get to Agriculture and they can talk for five days. Lambaste the Minister for three and a half and give them a half day to talk. Sir, that could have been done. But no, we must have political mileage by coming in here and letting the whole world believe that something is so wrong.

Sir, in the calypso tents this year, a great barometer when it comes to the pulse of the people, you will notice that the people are saying only good things about the Democratic Labour Party. You will notice that one calypsonian is saying he would rather stand on sandy ground than to dig six feet down with the doctor.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, having said that, I know you have given me some latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER: So I have. You are right.
3.15p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. There is another calypso which says, "The country ain't well and they are looking for a doctor". That is the other calypso, Sir...."The Country Ain't Well".

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other Member want to contribute? The Honourable Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, a vote of no confidence is a most important motion in this Honourable Chamber and it should never be brought frivolously, capriciously, and without any high seriousness behind it. A Government that is serious about the affairs of a country seeks to provide at a very early time opportunity to debate a motion of no confidence or a vote of censure. We of the Democratic Labour Party have made that arrangement and we have set aside a very early time to hear from the proposers of the Motion of No Confidence what is this very serious situation and what is this very grave matter which would merit the introduction into this Honourable Chamber of a Motion of No Confidence against the Minister of Agriculture.

After many hours of this debate, we are still waiting to understand and to hear and to learn from the Official Opposition what it is that this particular Minister has done at this particular time to merit the introduction of a Motion of No Confidence. We have not heard that, nor have we heard what it is that this particular Minister at this particular time has not done that would merit the introduction of a vote of no confidence. I can only say, therefore, in the absence of any supporting evidence that the reasons for the introduction of this motion is not anything that the Minister has done. It is not anything that the Minister has not done, but we have to seek further for the reasons. I wish to submit, Sir, I am not dealing with anything about agronomy and those kinds of things because I have come to the conclusion that this Resolution has nothing at all to do with those matters. It has nothing to do with agriculture. It is brought for other purposes and there is no one so blind as the person who will not see or deaf as the person who will not hear.

In a sense, it is said that this motion is directed against the Government. I am going to come to that particular part.

private agency. We have ADC and BMC in marketing. Let BMC stick to grading, quality control for export and things like that.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I have not seen that report. I cannot find time to read, I do not find time to read, like my good friend from Christ Church East Central who reminded me of what I read 40 years ago. That is quite true. You know I do not find much time to read, so do not tell me about the report.

Both sectors of agriculture, farming and fishing, are in a severe debt crisis. You listen to this one that you do not know about as Prime Minister. This will require a major restructuring and rescheduling of outstanding debts. Do you know what is happening to the fishing industry? The Barbados Development Bank is putting liens on poor people with the fishing boats and selling them off at auction. Let the Minister deny this. Yet there are people in this country who owe the same BDB and BNB, and all kinds of B's and D's for banks, all kinds of money and their properties have not been sold out, but the poor fishermen must suffer? Wait until the time comes, it will be murder.

I cannot understand. They talk about the soil in Barbados, that it is marginal and all kinds of fancy words. The Israelis have shown us that you can convert the soil to anything you want. They maze the desert produce. Are you telling me that the Minister of Agriculture, with all his technical staff - the Member for St. Michael West Central said that he has people up there with degrees that can fill up a boat - are all idlers? I do not believe that. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture is refusing to accept these people's advice. Under the last administration Johnny Cheltenham was Minister of Agriculture, and stupid me, ignorant me, left Toronto, Sir, picked up a newspaper before I left, saw the man down St Andrew eating a cherry, making a lot of fuss about what he was going to do and what he was not going to do, and I told a friend of mine that I was going back to take away that seat from him for Mr. Barrow and the Dems. I came back here and took away Mr. Cheltenham's seat. Mr. Cheltenham put irrigation at my back door for my small farmers, and that was the end of it. For three years nothing has been done by the Minister of Agriculture. 4.05 p.m.

My small farmers asked for a meeting with him. I arranged the meeting myself in February 1987 and up to today, the Minister has not showed. Up to today the Minister has not showed! This is nothing to do with the foolishness about NDP or any kind of P because you know, you on the other side know ever since that I have been complaining about these things. This is nothing new. This is nothing new at all.

What I am saying is that if you intend to Carry out the irrigation project, instead of wasting money and energy with electric pumps, go back to the old reliable wind pumps. They might be ugly but they can do the job efficiently. I remember as a boy seeing 26 wind pumps in Below Rock alone and all down there was green. Go back to them.

Soil erosion is a problem, Mr. Speaker, and I have realized that the Minister of Agriculture is loathe to tackle that problem. We have discussed this already. The Right Honourable Prime Minister joined the Debate and he said that he would be happy to see any kind of shrubbery planted that would save the soil. Do you remember that, Sir? We talked about khus khus and he even went further and said anything that would save it. Nothing has been done because I took it upon myself to check. Fairy Valley is next to me. Sayers Court - here the soil goes into the road and in the well, choking the well. What is he doing? And you tell me I should not bring a no confidence against this? I would have to do it. I cannot take it any more.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Run the country properly. Mr. Speaker, I have asked 15 questions of the Minister of Agriculture and he has answered 5 in his attempt, and that was with great ineptitude. I am prepared to ask the other questions, because time for me was limited.

I should like to know, from the Minister of Agriculture - write these down, Sir - why there is no co ordination between the Coast Guard and the fishermen in the navigation courses? Now when I ask questions, it is my people who ask me to ask these questions for them. Write them down. In the navigation courses, they complain that they get too much maths. I agree with them because

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mathematics.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: all they want in this day of sophistication - you do not know what I am talking about. You keep quiet. Look, in modern navigation, all you have to do is to have something named a plodder and an automatic direction finder. You just push a button and it tells you where you are.

Asides..

Mr. E. BOURNE: The Coast Guard themselves got lost in the Grenadines. Wait a minute. The Coast Guard with all their maths got lost in the Grenadines

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE:.....wrote off a boat for a couple of million dollars and they could not even tell us where they were. So you might as well forget the maths. The maths is useless.

Mr. E. BOURNE: All we need is coastal navigation. Forget it They do not even know where they are going.

Mr. E. BOURNE: You can write down this. I am trying to help you.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Number two is coming. That was one, I want to know why was a private person given two of the fishermen's lockers for his private use at the new complex? And I want to know why has the same person the fuel rights at the new complex, instead of the fishermen's co-operative?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: The Bridgetown Harbour. The new fishing complex. You know that is what I am talking about. And you talk all the time about co-operatives.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want to know from the Minister, why was the owner of PI31, the rented fishing boat, get his equipment free of duty and taxes when it was not the law. The fishing boat P131 that the Government rents for exploratory fishing? Why did he get his equipment free of duty and taxes when it was not the law? I would want mine free of duty and taxes. Can I get it?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: ! want to know why was Summit Construction Management Incorporated Company No 5157, Registered Office Franklin House, Wildey, St. Michael given a contract to build the vegetable processing plant at Fairy Valley, Christ Church and I did not see a tender bid?

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want to know why. I want that answered. I do not go at Fairy Valley. I want to know why Fairview Nurseries always gets the contract to landscape and beautify ADC? I should like to know, too, who is Fairview Nurseries? Who is the owner of Fairview Nurseries or who are the Directors of Fairview Nurseries?

Was a contract for the supply of cans for the vegetable processing plant given to the Secretary of Starblock without a tender? All these things are tendered. I was told, by you

Over there! I was told this already, all these things go out by tender. I want to know how come this individual can get this without a tender?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Yes. I must quarrel. I am a citizen of this country.

I want to know why a high powered member of your Administration.....

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: who is close to the Prime Minister, who is a member of the ADC Board is involved in well digging for the said ADC at Spring Hall in St. Lucy? Listen for it again. I want to know why a high powered member of the Democratic Labour Party Administration who is close to the Prime Minister, who is a member of the ADC Board is involved in well digging for the said ADC at Spring Hall in St. Lucy?

Aside

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want to know why a relative pretty close to the Minister, even closer than close, could get a contract for well digging at Spring Hall in St. Lucy from ADC? There are other people out there who want* some contracts.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, I was abused on Sunday morning by one of my constituents who is a well digger? This man is a well digger, was promised a contract but has not heard. He was promised a contract. He told me he has not heard from the people. But he has seen the wickedness of the wicked at work. He says, and woe betide you.....Not you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. BOURNE: This is what my constituent said to me. He said, woe betide you or any DLP or anybody coming at my house again. What this Government is doing is causing the people around the country to abuse politicians and put everybody in the same basket.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: The Democratic Labour Party.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: And that is why I am here today.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I had to let the gentleman know that we have long parted company, and I went my way in peace,

but in the near future, and I hope it is very near, they would not be any more peace, there would be war.

But I am saying this to you, woe unto you DLP-ites. You might laugh now, but the time will come shortly when you are going to mourn and weep. 4.15 p.m.

I want to know why is the response by the Coast Guard to fishing boats so slow when they are in distress. They are very quick when they are pleasure yachts especially foreign ones. I also want to know why is it that a hotline installed at the Ministry is for agriculture only and not for fisheries. Is fisheries too hot? I also want to know why the berthing fees at the new complex is at \$25.00 a month; whether it will apply to all boats or whether the bigger boats will pay more than \$25.00 or the smaller boats will pay less than \$25.00. I also want to know what legal authority does the existing staff have at the new complex. They are not authorized market supervisors but they are picking up tolls. I want to know what authority do they have. I want to know why is the new complex still being run by special assignment. That, Mr. Minister, is illegal. There is nothing in the market and slaughterhouse which says that these people can operate, but yet they are running it. This is at home at you, Mr. Minister.

I want to know what has become of the feasibility study for Conset Bay and Skeete Bay. I have got a lot of friends up there who catch fish. I want to know about that. Mr. Speaker, this one is the clincher. You are going to laugh your head off at this. I was told that they have a new invention down there. They have brought in a man. I do not know from where he has been handpicked. They call him the fish sampler and it is said that he logs off with 10 pound lumps of any fish that you bring in just to sample.

Laughter.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want the Minister to understand ... listen to me. I am a servant of the people. I have to do the people's bidding and, if they give me these questions to ask, I have to ask them.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, as a fisherman, does he really believe that any fisherman would allow anybody to log off 10 pounds of any fish and talk about he is a fish sampler? You making sport, man.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker. This warning was sent out to the goodly gentleman. They said that they could not care whether he is from St. Philip, St. Joseph or from Katmandu, but if he continues in this he will no longer be a sampler....

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minute more.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Two minutes already, Sir. This gentleman told me that he would be no longer logging off anything for samples because he would be made an example.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have come to the end of the day on this side. With all my questions which I have asked, with all these sins of commission, and all these sins of omission, I am saying, Sir, that it would be justified beyond the shadow of a doubt - that is how the lawyers say it - that we have no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture and he is not fit to hold office. I thank you, Sir.

(Applause.)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had a long debate and the debate has ended up around the Minister and his personal life and I intend to give the Official Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the minority Opposition all that they need to know.

I was born in Brereton Village on October 9, 1938. My mother's name is Matilda and she is sometimes called "Cilia". My first sister's name is Barbara and she works for the Government. I sat here today and I heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas make a very emotional plea because he thought someone had even attempted to speak something about his dear wife and I am in agreement with him. I have heard in this House by people who know otherwise an attempt to smear and defame my sister because she is a member of the working class. She does not belong to the middle class element of this country and I want to repeat that she has never sold any cabbage in this country. She was never issued any licence in this country and you can take it from there. You can examine her. I have a twin brother whose name is Vallan Franklin who runs the firm of Franklin and Franklin, who is a competent land surveyor, who employs Barbadians, who trains Barbadians, who has worked in Barbados from 1964 and the Member for St. Thomas can attest to that because he signed many cheques for him working at National Housing Corporation. He lives and works in this country and he pays his Income Tax. If you are to tell me now, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that because his brother is a Minister that he must starve or leave this country, I would have to hear and my Prime Minister will have to tell me that. He is entitled like any Barbadian to carry out a function that he is qualified and equipped to do.

My second brother, Mr. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Speaker, is Boswell Franklin and he works at Royal Bank. He came through the ranks from a Messenger Clerk to now he is a Bank Manager.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: My other brother by the name of M[^]xie Franklin who is extremely talented with his

hands has by his sweat and tears purchased a disused Colombian file block machine that he himself has restored and has placed on his premises in Brereton. He is trying to make a few concrete blocks to meet his daily needs for himself and his family.

Mr. Speaker, the other person is my sister and she is in America. Thank God that she is in America and she has been able to evade and get away from the wrath and the vilification of the Leader of the Opposition. There is this strange belief....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Did I hear the words "villainy" and "vilification"? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the term "villainy" certainly is unparliamentary and I will ask that it be withdrawn, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. B YER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last Member that spoke was on a point of order. Are you rising now on that point of order?

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I am rising on a point of order arising out of something that the Minister said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given you permission to rise.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I take very serious objection to the Minister saying that anything I said - I am a member of the National Democratic Party - vilified his family, or his sister or whatever. What I spoke about was directed to the Ministry of Agriculture and I said that in no uncertain terms. If he takes it personally, that I attacked him, as he attacked me in St. George last Sunday, it is a matter for him. I will deal with that when the time comes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "vilification".

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not called on you to withdraw anything. I understood the context in which it was said and I left it for what it is worth.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling in this country of ours that if you were born from a poor working class family and one has been able - and in my particular case, Mr. Speaker, I had the benefit of a mother who trusts in God and who has taught me all my life a few things, honesty and hard work - but it is believed in

this country that if you do not come from that privileged middle class element, if you are not of fairer colour than I am, if you are not a doctor or a lawyer, then anything you have achieved in this country is by one or two things. You are either stealing or, I cannot use the other one because it is associated with a term I heard the Leader of the Opposition use today *sotto voce* to the member for St. Michael South East, or you are running dope. .

I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, through my mother's and my father's hard work, to go to Combermere. After I left school I was fortunate in that I went down to Trinidad and I studied surveying. I came back to Barbados in 1963 when there was a tremendous boom in this country and the Government of Barbados allowed me private practice and I made good use of my time. I did not rest on my laurels, I got a Commonwealth scholarship and I went off to Australia and did Land Economics. I did not rest on my laurels any further, I went on to Florida and I became a * Loss Adjuster.

I worked in this country, Mr. Speaker, as Commissioner of Land Valuation. I fixed the value on every single property that was done in this country, and there were hundreds of them. I left the Service with a clean record. I know it is clean, because it was examined by my opponents when they came in and they found nothing wrong in this person. I would ask that all of them who have worked in the Public Service before be the subject of such a scrutiny and see if nothing will be found wrong.

I left the Public Service and I went into private enterprise and I was fortunate that I developed a good practice. Even at one time the Leader of the minority Opposition admitted that I functioned well. There was even a time the Barbados Labour Party took me to America to carry out a valuation on a property they wanted to buy.

I have no expensive habits to keep, my family is not extravagant, I have no expensive lifestyle I am prudent with my money, and I save my money.

I resigned and went into politics and I remember when I was going into politics I did an interview with the newspapers. I said in that interview that it is popularly believed that when people from poor working class families enter politics they do so for one thing, that is corruption. We, the politicians, are responsible for that, because when * we get into these Chambers and we walk through the country and make these snide remarks, like "he is ten times richer than he was", and we drop these hints and innuendos all about the country, what else can you expect them to believe of us?

Mr. Speaker, my political career is at the hands of the people in St. Philip and my ministerial career is in the hands of my Prime Minister. I believe that there should be integrity in public life, and if there is anything that is 4

demonstrated to prove otherwise my Prime Minister will take the action.

Let me take the questions that have been asked one by one.

1. No Coast Guard on the fishermen's course. I do not believe this is true because on all occasions I have been to the course the course has been coordinated.
2. Navigational course, too much maths. How can you do a navigational course if you do not know maths? How can you do that?
3. A private person has two lockers. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of that. I will enquire.
4. Fuel rights. They were given to the three companies that were operating. Before the harbour there was one in Bay Street, there was one in Cavans Lane, and as far as I remember those who had it in Cavans Lane were given the rights to do it.
5. P. 131. The equipment was priced duty free. As far as I know, the equipment was bought by the Fisheries Department. After we finished the experimentation the offer was made to purchase the equipment second hand and an agreement was drawn up between the P.S. and the person at a price that was deemed suitable for it, and the equipment was sold.
6. Summit Construction Management. Summit is not a construction company, Summit is a construction management company and there are only two of them in the country.

The Government every single day invites professional services - electrical engineers, mechanical engineers, architects - do you see them go out to tender? I have two Boards. I do not sit down behind my two Boards, I trust them, but I am Minister and will take the responsibility. In a case like this the Boards figured there were only two persons who were construction managers and they invited Summit Construction Management and Summit Construction Management in turn invited tenders for the building. It is a steel building and therefore there were only two companies that could do it. They invited York to tender for it and they invited Structural Systems in Barbados, and as far as I know Structural Systems was given the contract.

The other one they had was concrete and they similarly invited two or three of the concrete people, and I do not know who has it. The information is here, and that is how that was done. Summit Construction Company is owned by a Barbadian who by the sweat of his toil has been

able to qualify in a field that we need here in Barbados; and if it is a sin for people to return to Barbados and offer their services, well I am missing something.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have some order, please?

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Trade, can I have some order please?

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Fair View Nurseries, Mr. Speaker, I believe belongs to a Mrs. Garvey who runs it. I am not aware that Fair View Nurseries does the landscaping at ADC. I will find out. You might not believe, but I am too busy in the Ministry to mind these little bits of things. 4.35 p.m.

I get into the Ministry on morning at 7.30 and I am in that Minisuy until 6.00 o'clock on evenings. I do not have time like you believe to be doing two and three jobs. That was insinuated inside here. But as I said, we are our own worst enemies. And then we wonder why the people on the street do not have any regard for us. Because we get in here and we pull down each other for the short political gains that we believe we might gain. But I sleep at night, my conscience is clear. I am not certain all of you sleep at night.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Cans, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, the agro plant that we are putting up would not be canning anything, so I do not know how there can be an award given for cans to some secretary. The agro plant would not be canning anything.

High powered member of the Democratic Labour Party who is a member of the ADC Board who is digging wells down at Spring Hall, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of that.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The response to number twelve, Mr. Speaker, why the Coast Guard responds so slowly? Mr. Speaker, I would have to find this out. My understanding is that "Search and Rescue" is very expensive, and the Coast Guard, on most occasions, wait until they get some fairly good indication of where the boat is likely to be, before they go out.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Hotline for agriculture. Yes there is a hotline for agriculture and when we have evaluated* we will extend it to fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to intervene here to the Minister. I recognize you seem to be under some strain in answering your questions. And I want to suggest this. You are not obliged, under the circumstances, since Standing Orders provide for questions to be tabled to a Minister under the appropriate time and place.

I am therefore suggesting to the Minister, you need not extend yourself, since I would have considered the questions a breach of our Standing Orders. There is an appropriate place for questions to be placed where the Minister is demanded to reply.

So I just want to caution the Minister that he need not reply.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. But I would answer them. I have nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing to hide. If the Leader of the Opposition believes I have something to hide, I have nothing to hide. My conscience is clear and I sleep at night. I do not call people after midnight. I joined the Democratic Labour Party in 1959 and I have been loyal to it until now. And any time I stop being a member of the Democratic Labour Party, I am finished with that. You would never get an opportunity to be my leader. You would never get an opportunity to be my leader!

I say it is unfortunate that when you launched your party, you launched it with high ideals, integrity and morality, high public discussions, not getting down to personalities, discussing politics and the affairs. But I am afraid that very quickly, you have gotten into the gutter. You would not take me into the gutter with you. My mother would not allow me to go into the gutter with you all.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: You cannot get my brother in the gutter with you either, nor my family in the gutter with you. We are a united family, a loving family. Before politics, they were my family, in politics, they are my family and after politics, they will be my family.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, very quickly, let me have a quick look at non-sugar agriculture. Mr. Speaker, we had a problem with the dairymen. I believe that we have now settled that problem. They have produced more milk this year than has ever been produced in the past. And I believe that that is settled. The milk production for

1988 was 11 840 kilos of milk. Mr. Speaker, we had a problem in beef and, that is, that there was no market for beef. At my insistence, the Barbados Marketing Corporation has now put in the facilities to chill, age and cut beef properly and they have gone out there and made arrangements with the beef producers of this country to buy the cull cows at about \$1.98 per kilo and beef animals between \$2.26 per kilo and \$4.40 per kilo. They would cut, they would package, and in an arrangement made through the Ministry of Trade and my Ministry, the wholesalers of^{f**} this country would take that meat. And therefore there is now an open market for beef in this country.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: If they want to import, they would see that. The same thing is going to apply to mutton. If you want to import between the Ministry of Trade and myself, we decide the share of the market for our farmers.[^] And there is already production in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, on pork, I want to read Mr. Rayside's speech that he just made. I will read it very quickly:

"I have done an analysis and I believe that our pork industry could move to the stage to provide every single leg we need in this country for ham and for the fresh market. And on my estimation, the pork industry, can go 60% higher than it has ever peaked. The reason I have done that is that the constraint is to get rid of legs. If you can get rid of legs, all the shoulders can be used for picnics. They always have in bellies and the amount of bellies they are always ordering, they are always ordering ribs. So from my analysis of the carcass, I have concluded that we should move towards the situation of providing all of the legs required. There was one problem we had and that is because of the production cycle and most of the leg[^] are needed at Christmas. Therefore we have to see how we could store those legs during the time in order to release them on the market at Christmas."

BAS and our Ministry are looking at that and we will soon be putting that into place.

I want to read what Mr. Rayside just said in his Report on page 3, first of all:

^{**}

"It may interest you to take note that whereas in 1986 the quality of picnics and legs imported for the Christmas period was 848 000 lbs., the amount was reduced to 645 000 lbs. in 1987 and further reduced to 480 000 lbs. in 1988 to make room for the local pigs."

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: On page 5 of that Report, Mr. Rayside says: [→]

"Farmers, there is need for swift action to correct the great imbalance. We must not disappoint the Minister of Agriculture. He made a commitment to us to give the local industry the chance to supply 75% of the requirements for the processors."

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, the rabbit industry has been growing....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member will make it available to me.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: July 15, 1989.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The National Association of Pig Farmers Annual General Meeting, July 15, 1989, the President's Report. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we have been quietly building up our rabbit industry in Barbados. To enable to assist the farmers in Barbados we have provided and are providing some slaughtering facilities on that.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you the statistics for the meat before I go off; and it is of interest this year. Let me tell you about poultry, Mr. Speaker, and it is on record. I want to speak on record that for the first time in the history of this country in May 1989 Barbados produced 1 million kilograms of poultry meat. In May 1989, the first time in history, Barbados produced 1 million kilograms of poultry meat.

Applause.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: In 1988, Mr. Speaker, very quickly if you will examine the statistics, the statistics for the livestock section have been continuously growing. - Pork in thousands of kilograms - 1,175,000, Beef - 389,000, Mutton - 22,000, Poultry at that time 8,999,000, Milk - 11,840,000 kilograms.

Let me quickly move, Mr. Speaker, to fruit. Either the Leader of the minority Opposition or the Member for St. Thomas took a drive through St. Philip and saw nothing. I can take a drive too, Mr. Speaker. I have taken a drive pass Constant and I saw pawpaws.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Constant is in St. George and not in St. Philip.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I have taken a drive through Halton and I have seen one of the most beautiful set of plantains and bananas being grown on the drip from tissue culture. I drove through St. John and you see a remarkable expansion of the bananas.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House this. It is on my initiative after a visit to Martinique. I spoke to the French Ambassador and they arranged a seminar in Barbados and they sent down some experts in the production of bananas.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: From that time 18 months ago, there have been an expansion in that one. Mr. Speaker, it is at my request to the General Manager of the Pine Hill Dairy that they started perfecting the cherry drink. It is at my request and the cherry drink is now on the market. They have brought in some of the pulp from Brazil, but I am pleased to say that we have some local pulp now in the drinks being done at ADC. We have worked out that we can pay the farmers 75 cents a pound. Now that we have worked that out, we are encouraging the expansion of cherries in this country.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, as at the date in 1988 under the National Fruit Orchard Programme, the following quantities were planted: Cherries - 121 acres, Pineapples - 7 acres, Pawpaws - 170 acres, Grapefruits - 17 areas, Soursop - 3 acres, Avocados - 8 acres, Mangoes - 24 acres, Guavas - 7 acres, Breadfruit - 2 acres, making a total of 389 acres. We are continuing to encourage the production of fruit in this country because it is an area we believe that we can make some forward movement in and to tie in with the agro-processing of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a couple of minutes dealing once again with the innuendoes and talk a little bit about cotton. I want to talk a little bit about cotton, Mr. Speaker.

Asides

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, in 1986 the Manifesto stated the production of beef, mutton, and cotton will be specially encouraged. In June 1986 when I came to the Ministry, Mr. Speaker, we were growing cotton and it was being bought by a Japanese company. The man who interfaced with us was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Suzuki. The price was U.S. \$4.50 per pound. At that time I was of the opinion that we had a Letter of Intent signed by the Japanese people which said that the price of cotton could not have been changed from \$4.50 and, if there was any change in \$4.50 after review, it could only go upwards. Very soon after I took office a Mr. Suzuki, Mr. Knight, and a few others came to Barbados and, before I saw Mr. Suzuki, Mr. Suzuki had already gone to the farmers in this country. He had said to the farmers in this country that he

was only going to pay them U.S.\$2.20 a pound for their cotton. Mr. Suzuki then came to my office and I sat down and read to Mr. Suzuki the Letter of Intent. We had extremely long discussions and I ended up my meeting with Mr. Suzuki by stating to Mr. Suzuki that as far as this Minister was concerned that he would have to pay me U.S.\$4.50 a pound for that year's crop which was the 1987 crop and that I would be prepared to negotiate with him in the 1988 crop. Therefore, the case was closed as far as I was concerned.

I then went to the Cabinet of this country and I said to the Cabinet of this country that I am refusing to take anything less than U.S.\$4.50 for the lint and would they make a provision that would give me some money to pay the farmers. At that time I think we were paying \$1.90 a pound for the seed cotton. Now I am going to talk about the price of seed cotton later on. Mr. Suzuki left and he went on to Japan. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the then Minister of Finance, was going on to Japan to negotiate a loan on behalf of the Barbados Government. The last Minutes that I had on the file, which I am going to try and find, is when my technical people put a proposal to me. I said in the Minutes on the file that we would discuss this matter further on the return of the Minister of Finance who was going to negotiate and discuss it in Japan. Sometime between September 24th and September 29th - I believe the date is somewhere between September 24th and 29th. I think it is due to the time change, but I did get a call well after midnight and it was the Minister of Finance. The then Minister of Finance called and said that he had met with Mr. Suzuki and that Mr. Suzuki refused to move from U.S. \$3.00 a pound. I said to him that as far as I am concerned that I believe we have legal documents that have bound Mr. Suzuki to \$4.50 and I would advise not to move at the moment on this one. This was the first day. The second day he got back to me. It was at night time because of the time difference and he said that Mr. Suzuki had moved to \$3.05 a pound and what was my answer. 4.55 p.m.

I called him at that time Richie, but now I have to either call him Dr. Haynes or be very formal, because the relationship has now changed completely. The way he tried to pull my family and myself into the gutter, I do not think I can enjoy that type of cordial relationship like before. I said to him, "you are on the spot and you will make the decision on behalf of the Cabinet and let me know what it is." I believe he stood on a little longer, but then I got a letter from Mr. Suzuki, the outcome of which was that Mr. Suzuki said that the result of the discussions between himself and Dr. Haynes, it was agreed that he would pay U.S. \$3.05 per pound for cotton and he sent an agreement for us to sign.

I must admit he was asked to negotiate, I believe he did his best under the circumstances and he agreed to \$3.05 per pound.

We accepted U.S. \$3.05 per pound, but while that was going on numerous companies came down to discuss cotton with us and I made it very clear that after that year's crop I was not interested in selling raw cotton because it is the only crop we have in Barbados that we can have a completely integrated industry on. I told him I was not interested and we met the Italians, we met with Americans, we met with Japanese, we met with British people and all of them were only interested in buying the lint.

After a very long time Scothalls came and the first thing he did was to offer U.S.\$3.50 per pound. I said to him "I will sell you the lint for this year and next year on the understanding that we start discussion on a fully integrated cotton industry, and as a result we started wild discussions. We started discussions with almost everybody in the world who started to come to Barbados until eventually we came down to the fact that the Japanese were the people who had the technology to do it, and therefore we should start to look for the Japanese, and out of that CARSICOT came about

I am going to give the Leader of the Opposition the companies that I know. As I said, I have nothing to hide. Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company Limited, I am instructed as follows:

4% Government of Montserrat
4% Government of St. Kitts & Nevis
8% Government of Antigua and Barbuda
33% Government of Barbados
51 % Scothalls Limited

The reason for that is a very simple one. When we started to examine it, I had liked the Pine Hill Dairy model in which a private enterprise had the controlling share. From my experience, any time Government had the controlling share in joint companies you had a lack in management, and the decision was made on that ground alone that we should keep the controlling share in private hands, so that they would not have the pressures on them from Statutory Bodies of Government and they would run it as a good company, like BET.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The company is incorporated in Barbados. CARSICOT is the parent company. Scothalls is a Canadian company whose President is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Nitin Amersey, and on this file you will see that we took the precaution to send and get a credit check and a confidential check done on the company even before we got into anything with the company. As I said, Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company Limited is the holding company and was only intended to do two things, the marketing as well as take care of the licensing arrangements.

Let me speak about the patent. The West Indies Sea Island Cotton Company Limited was so lax that the patent was being threatened to be taken off the books in London and Mr. Suzuki hijacked it. As a result of that the Barbados Government had to pay large sums of money to fight it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some little time on a very important development in this country. A Mr. Suzuki and a Mr. Knight from England, who was the person who used to certify the mark, in collusion took it off.

Mr. Speaker, let me spend one minute on a very important development in this cotton industry. As I said before, the Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company Limited was only intended to be the marketers as well as to take care of the trade mark. The intention then was that the farmers in Barbados were to grow the cotton, but when we went to the Japanese they said they were not going to put their money in any mill unless they were assured of a minimal critical mass of 1500 acres of cotton, and I could not persuade the farmers of this country to show faith in the project.

Let me spend some time talking about the pricing of cotton. It takes three pounds of seed cotton to make a pound of lint. If we are only getting Bds. \$7.00 a pound for lint, and we are paying \$1.90 a pound for seed cotton, that is a cost of \$5.70, which does not even take into account ginning costs. How then can the farmers walk about and say they are being ripped off? There is a letter here which I wrote on the 28th of the fourth to a Mr. Deane, Chairman and Managing Director, Barbados Sugar Industry Limited, Private and Confidential:

"Dear Mr. Deane,

When I outlined my plans for the future development of the cotton industry in Barbados to you and other cotton growers during a meeting at Graeme Hall on 26th April, 1988 I was assured without exception of their total support. Accordingly, I have been proceeding with plans for the industry based on these assurances.

I am becoming increasingly concerned at reports reaching me which suggest that the cotton growers, composed predominantly as you know of the membership of the Barbados Sugar Industry Limited, are reluctant to plant the acreage which the Ministry in consultation with your organisation has targeted for the 1988-89 cotton crop.

I understand that this reluctance is born of a wish for an assurance beforehand of a cotton price in excess of that which the Ministry indicated it could guarantee." 5.05 p.m.

"From the time I assumed office as Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, I have been open and forthright in my discussions with you and your organization regarding my plans for the revitalization of the agricultural subsector of the economy. Moreover, I have on all occasions honoured my commitment within the Ministry's capabilities which I have made to farmers.

The Government has made comprehensive plans for the future development of a Sea Island Cotton industry in which all aspects of production from the growing of lint through to manufacturing and marketing of fine fabric as well as other allied products.

I have discussed these plans with you and with the growers as a means of emphasizing why it is necessary to improve and expand the production of cotton."

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker -I cannot read that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the Honourable Member two minutes to wind up.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: As a result of this, Mr. Speaker, I did not get the co-operation I was asking for. And I went to the Cabinet of this country and I told the Cabinet of this country the problems I was having. We decided that the only way we can beat it, to bring employment to the people of Barbados from spinning, down to weaving, down to the garment industry is to insist that lands belonging to ADC be put in cotton on lease.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the time. I want to thank the Members of the Cabinet for their support continuously. I want to thank the Members of the Back Bench. I want to thank my staff for their support. I want to thank all of the people in the public who called and offered moral support. And I want to thank my family for their support. And as I pledge, Mr. Speaker, I work in the interest of the people of Barbados and I will continue so to do.

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

The bell was rung.

NOES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. B. M. TAITT; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. E. E. GREAVES; Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN; Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN; Hon. N. K. SIMMONS; Hon. W. W. HALL; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. C. V.

WALKER; Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE; Mr. C. L. TROTMAN; His Honour J. J. PAYNE; Mr. R. L. MORRIS; Dr. E. A. SIMMONS; Mr. C. A. NEBLETT; Mrs. M. BARKER WELCH; and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON. 19 NOES.

AYES: Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. E. BOURNE; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER; Mr. R. P. BYER; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS. 6 AYES.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nineteen Honourable Members voted No, six Honourable Members voted Aye. This Resolution is therefore lost and defeated and therefore negatived.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not think they deserve any respite. I think they should be asked to come back tomorrow and yet tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Before I move the

Adjournment, Sir, let me thank all those persons who laboured long, were most patient, long suffering, had to endure all the tedium and tedious stuff that was emitted, Sir, from certain sections of this House. I know that it must have been quite a task for them, particularly the Reporters* those people in particular, and the Clerks as well, Sir, I should like to thank them for their forbearance. I am grateful to them, Sir, for their devotion to duty. •

I therefore now at this point, Sir, move that this House stand adjourned until the 1st August, 1989 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday, the 1st August, 1989 was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 5.14p.m.