

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1966 - 71

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9th June, 1970-

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C. F.Z.S. (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.:

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON. (Minister of Trade and Tourism); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES. JP.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P. Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P. (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS. (Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing) Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

Sir Grantley Adams, Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams and Mr. Hoppin entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are no Minutes available for confirmation.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING LEADER OF THE HOUSE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House that I have been appointed to act as Leader of the House in the absence of the Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, during his absence abroad, which will probably be for about four weeks. I should also like to ask for four weeks' leave of absence for the Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and Deputy Prime Minister, as from today.

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE FOR LEADER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Acting Leader of the House, whom I may, on behalf of the House, congratulate on his appointment, has asked for four weeks' leave of absence for the hon. junior member of St. Lucy who is the Leader of the House, and, unless there is objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy for four weeks from his duties as a member of this House,

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, I beg to lay -

The Consumption Tax Order, 1970; and

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf I beg to give notice that Oral. Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 102, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has a Resolution in connection with non-Communicants of the Anglican Church.

Mr. SMITH:

WHEREAS non-Cummuncants of the Anglican Church are called upon to pay the following exorbitant charges-

Weddings

Issuing Certificate of Banns \$ 1.00

Use of Church 25.00

Sexton 3.00

Funerals

Use of Church 25.00 Plus cost of Organ and Choir.

Opening of Grave 5.00 Plus cost of digging Grave.

Sexton 3.00

AND WHEREAS the said non-Communicants are still contributing to the cost of the Anglican Church by way of taxation and will be so contributing for several years besides giving donations to their own denominational Churches;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government through the appropriate Minister to investigate these charges which the proper authorities within the Barbados Diocesan Synod are making, with a view either to waiving such charges completely until the Government ceases its yearly grants to the Anglican Church or to granting such relief as the Minister might think fit.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and it is to resume Committee on a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am still awaiting Actuarial Reports from overseas, and I cannot proceed with this Bill any further at the moment.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a point I failed to raise when the Bill was being debated in Committee at an earlier stage. Unfortunately, I do not have a copy of the Bill in front of me to give me any assistance of any transitional provisions that there may be, but when the Bill comes into force it will, automatically, render out of date the great majority of insurance policies. Many of the Act policies will insure only for \$1,000 and will not insure for damage to property.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Well, may I point out that the hon. member is making a point, but as it is not.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister if he will also investigate the point I am making, so that when he comes to deal with this, he will be able to handle it. What is the position of people who insure their cars during the time that the present insurance policy still has to run?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the hon. members that it may be necessary to pay an extra amount on a premium to bring the insurance policy up to a certain standard.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think we have had enough on this for the time being. Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve "The Housing Authority (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970".

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE HOUSING AUTHORITY (PENSIONABLE OFFICES)
ORDER, 1970.**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Order was made on the 27th April, 1970, and it seeks to make the post which is set out in the Schedule to the Order a pensionable post. I think the policy decision was taken some seven or eight years ago that certain posts in the Housing Authority should be made pensionable in the same way as the established posts in the Civil Service are pensionable; therefore, I seek to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the position of the Housing Authority at the present time is such a sensitive one that perhaps this Resolution is not the most appropriate vehicle to carry a full-scale debate. I may mention that I understand that a member on this side of the House will soon be introducing a Private Members' Resolution calling for an investigation into allegations of Ministerial misbehaviour, to say the least, and other misbehaviour at the Housing Authority, and I therefore will not enter at any length into many accusations which are being made and which are causing grave public disquiet at the present time about the administration at the Housing Authority; but I will say that it would be a tragedy if, at a time when officials of the Housing Authority allow themselves to be used, and allow the business of the Housing

Authority to be carried on in a manner which they know to be contrary to the provisions of the Housing Act, contrary to good Ministerial practice, contrary even to honesty, yet should receive the benefit of a Resolution such as this setting out a list of pensionable offices. It may very well be that there are officers who, for their part in promoting the activities of the governing Party and paying more attention to doing that than to promoting the welfare of the people pursuant to the Housing Act, may fear that their jobs will somehow be forfeited under an administration of a different political colour. Let me assure them that they do not have that to fear. The Barbados Labour Party does not intend to carry out, should we be returned to power, any wholesale sackings of persons occupying such positions as this refers to. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we would not, should we be fortunate enough to enjoy the Government again, be firing all these officers -the Chief Executive Officer, a member of the D.L.P., the Manager, a member of the D. L. P., the Architects, all or nearly all members of the D. L. P., the Chief Works Overseer, the Estate Supervisor, the Housing Loan Inspector, all members of the D.L.P. - should not give them confidence and should not give them the feeling that they should authorise, for example, the use of the Housing Authority's heavy motorised equipment by political personages for their own private building projects. The Loans Supervisor should not feel that because a political personage is selling houses, he must automatically approve every loan for a house being sold by this political personage, and approve it in such a way that the money does not even go to the person who is buying the house; it is paid direct to the person concerned. All these allegations we intend to pursue in an appropriate debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

And that is why I would draw to the attention of the hon. member that this is not the appropriate debate to which he alludes.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

With great respect, if I had not said that a Resolution was going to be introduced, I am sure Your Honour would not have stopped me from saying that the Loans Supervisor is not doing his work properly, and he is lending money to people to buy houses from the Minister, because obviously the way these people carry out their duties will have a bearing as to whether hon. members feel they should be made into pensionable officers.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is a Resolution, though, seeking to give effect to an Order which has been made by His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

We can reject it, and we can say why we are rejecting it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Undoubtedly.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I see the Housing Loans Committee. We have no complaint with the Secretary, Public Officers Housing Loans Committee. We have the Loans Supervisor and Secretary, Housing Authority and so on. Obviously the Chief Works Overseer must know when the bulldozer goes to Black Rock; but still we are not against them being made pensionable officers. It was the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to bring the Housing Authority under greater Civil Service control, anyhow. This was a part of our Manifesto, and we cannot in honesty and consistency at this stage oppose these more or less permanent officers from being made pensionable. What we would like to see is Civil Service methods of selection of appointment to the offices used. And what we would like to see is an end to a system by which, for example, Mr. Howard Roberts is to get a job, and therefore you create a job at the Housing Authority for him, a point very admirably brought out in a question by the hon. senior member for St. Peter some years ago. That is what we want to see stopped. If Howard Roberts did not prove such an inconvenient person, perhaps we would see they were trying to make his office pensionable too. I am surprised that the office which was created for him was abolished when he left and does not appear in this list. Imagine a situation in which a Minister writes a letter and tells a member of the Housing Authority that he is no longer a member and gives instructions not to send out agenda to Mr. Norman Niles, to attend meetings of the Housing Authority.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that does not really come under this Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

The Secretary of the Housing Authority must be in some way responsible for that, and he is mentioned in this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As to whether the post should be pensionable or otherwise.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

He acted wrongly in doing it, and therefore should we make his post pensionable? Some years ago when Mr. M. E. Cox was Minister of Housing, he found out that loans were being made by one of the Loan Organisers here on the basis of friendship, that there was a lady in Two Mile Hill making houses

and she had an agreement with a certain public officer to lend anybody money who wanted to buy her houses. Mr. Cox had the man removed and the policy was ended, and now we have a Loans Supervisor who is prepared to go over all that once again and allow something which was recognised in the past as an abuse and was put to an end. It is all starting up again, the only difference being that it is a Minister involved this time in what Barbadians call the progue. Subject to those remarks, I support this Resolution.

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

THE AGRICULTURAL CREDIT BANK

(PENSIONABLE OFFICES)

ORDER, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve "The Agricultural Credit Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970".

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in this Order which was also made on the 27th April, 1970, there are eight posts under the Agricultural Credit Bank which this Resolution seeks to make pensionable posts. Nearly all the officers in the Agricultural Credit Bank have been seconded from the Public Service of this Island, and since there is a technical aspect to the work of this Bank, it means that you cannot really keep people there indefinitely because we do have a rule that secondments should only be for a limited time. By making these posts pensionable, it means that the officers can probably pursue technical training, as I hope to do at the Savings Bank, so that they can devote their attention to becoming more skilled in the offices which they hold. It is a very simple Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

12.35 p.m.

A BILL TO AMEND THE PETROLEUM ACT, 1882

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals I informed the House that the tax on petroleum products would be increased by approximately 8 per gallon, and the purpose of this Bill is to give the necessary statutory authority to the increases which I outlined in my Budget Statement. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister made his Budgetary Proposals with respect to the increase in the price of gasoline, he was at pains to state that he hoped that the public would no longer be inconvenienced by the restrictions in the service rendered by the Service Stations. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the price of gasoline has increased by 8, but the public is still inconvenienced to the same extent that it was inconvenienced immediately prior to the increase in the price of gasoline; so we are to wonder if something further must not be done. 2 1/2, I think it is, was to go to the trade; but from what we can gather, it does appear as if it has not gone directly to the retail end of the trade - hence the inconvenience suffered by the public.

Gasolene stations have been called upon to pay increased wages to their Attendants; it was felt that increasing the price of gasolene by 8 would have been the answer to the situation; but here it is, the price is increased and the public still remains inconvenienced. We would certainly like to know what Government intends doing in the circumstances, because if we have increased the price by 8 and it is not to bring any relief to the public, why was the price increased, apart from increasing the revenue? It is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs, and we feel that if Government has investigated the matter with some measure of seriousness, when the Prime Minister stated that when the price was increased he hoped that the public would no longer be inconvenienced, and we see up to the present that the public is still inconvenienced, we are to ask what Government intends to do in the matter with a view to bringing relief to the public.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think I can answer the hon. member who just sat down in very simple terms. Periodically, that is, every year, when I introduce a Budget, I get all kinds of letters and representations from all kinds of people, not from working-class people or from Civil Servants or from; people who have to pay the tax in the last analysis, whatever the tax may be, but from the people who see a certain amount of erosion into their profit margins. I will give you an example; the International Air Transport Association - I want to say this and get it on the record because I regard them as an international conspiracy in restraint of trade, and operating against the interest of the travelling public all over the world - but the International Air Transport Authority wrote and said they wanted to send a team down here to discuss my Budget Proposals. When a Minister of Finance makes Budget Proposals he does not discuss them with anybody, either before or after - the Cabinet about two hours before, and nobody after. You discuss it, maybe, in reply to the debate on the proposals; but it is time that some of these people get this straightened out and realise that we are not a colony, and even when Mr. Duncan Sandys six or seven years ago told me that we were spending too much money on Education in Barbados, I told him to mind his own business because it was none of the British taxpayers' money.

I mention this because I have heard rumours that the International Air Transport Authority, because I did not consult them, want to advise their airlines not to fly into Barbados; if they want to make that kind of decision not to fly into Barbados, they will have to make the decision not to fly into Barbados permanently, not for any period of time during which they think they can pressurize the Government or inveigle the Opposition, maybe, to support their stand, but I do not think this Opposition would be dishonourable and disloyal enough to do it. 12.45 p.m.

Similarly, as far as International Oil Companies are concerned, these people are thugs and assassins; they shoot Presidents in the Latin-American Republics; in the Middle East they start wars - I can prove this conclusively. They may have got rid of Mossadegh, but they are not going to get rid of me. Now, the quarrel that is going on here is between the distributors and the big Oil Companies. I just want to make one correction parenthetically. I said that the purpose of this Bill was to effect the increase of 8

and, when the hon. member was speaking, I remember that it was 5 1/2, as you will see in the Bill itself. The other 2 1/2 is the additional profit margin which we have decided to allow them; so that the total increase in the price of gasoline - instead of doing it in two stages. I did it all in my Budget Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no discussion with them, and I do not intend to have any discussion with them. They have written to the Ministry of Trade and to my office saying that they want to examine the Budgetary Proposals. You do not examine the Budgetary Proposals, once they become law, with the Minister of Finance. I will tell the Oil Companies that they can kill people in the Middle East, or in Latin America, but they need not try it here, so that they can carry away more profit out of Barbados. I have already informed the Cabinet that, if they do not respect the laws of this country, they cannot bring in any military junta, as the B.B.C. calls it now, to replace the Barbados Government. There are no Presidents here for them to shoot. If they persist in holding this community up to ransom, I will nationalise the oil industry in Barbados - the distribution and everything concerning oil in Barbados.

Furthermore, I think the House ought seriously to examine whether we should not pass legislation making it illegal for any group of persons like the Commission or Provision Merchants Association to boycott or refuse to sell goods to retailers if the retailers do not fall into line with their restrictive practice in keeping up high prices. I have first-hand experience of this as hon. members will know, because I had to appear in court for a gentleman called Mr. Gibbs, because the Commission Merchants Association decided that he was not playing ball with them and he was selling his goods too cheap. I know a lot of distributors who could be making a fortune, and I am going to advise them to open on a Sunday and to open after four o'clock. If any of the Oil Companies, particularly the Oil Company that this House gave a very strong, if not, monopolistic position to, the Barbados Union Oil Company - if they, who are the National Oil Refinery - when I say "national," I do not mean in the sense that we own it, but national in that we made it the national Company and there is no other Company, although they cannot prevent another Company from coming in if they wanted to come. If the national Company refuse to sell gasoline to any distributor, I will invite the House, as I know the House is as anxious as I am, to revoke their licence. All the promises they have made about employing more people have not materialised, and they are occupying a very valuable site to employ 59 workers that we could probably have another 600 hotel workers working on.

We have the weapon in our hands. Two more hotels up there will do us a lot more good than any Oil Refinery. The hon. members on the other side know how strongly I felt about that Bill, but I was strongly advised by a Civil Servant of very high integrity and for whom I have a great deal of respect. I asked him seven times whether we should come to the House with this legislation, and he said that if we discovered oil it would be beneficial to Barbados to have an Agreement like that. As far as I am concerned, I do not see what economic benefit it is to the community to have them up there at all. Right now they are nothing but a public and private nuisance.

Sir, I do not have any property in the area, but I like to talk straight. If I discover that the Barbados Union Oil Company are refusing to sell the little man at Eagle Hall Corner, Mr. Gibbs, or the gentleman at Bridge Cot, St. Helens, or the gentleman at St. Augustine, Mr. Headley, or Mrs. Rock in St. Andrew, or any of the small Barbadian people gasoline - I do not mean the people who are carrying the franchise for a large Oil Company - or even Fix-It-Right Garage, especially when they have the cash to pay for the gasoline when it is delivered, and they want to open 24 hours a day, I think that is the way to break them up. I think the problem a lot of people do not realise is that every time a gasoline station proprietor credits out one gallon of gasoline and he does not get paid for it for a month or two months, then he has to sell 10 gallons "of gasoline, not to make a profit, but to pay for the one gallon which he has credited out. Can any hon. member challenge that? I am dealing in round figures. He has to sell 10 gallons of gasoline to pay for the one gallon that has been credited out.

Sir, Suppose a man comes in and order 5 gallons of gasoline; he does not pay for it but he signs; another man comes along and orders 2 gallons and pays for the gasoline; the proprietor then has to sell 50 gallons of gasoline to carry the credit of the 5 gallons of gasoline he has credited to one of his customers. The problem is that most of the retailers are in the hands of the distributors. Now, I do not know what we need Esso, Texaco, Shell, Mobil and all of them in Barbados for at all, because all of the gasoline is coming out of the same tank. The only thing that is different is the lettering and the sign that they have outside. There is even a belief in some quarters - I do not say that I share it - that the 80 and 88 gasoline come out of the same tanks with two different pumps. I cannot prove that. I said that is a belief in some quarters. Whether it is the high octane or the low octane that they are selling for the same price I do not know. I know that during the war you had to put a colouring in it to differentiate.

When we talk about nationalism and that sort of thing, there are certain institutions - if we could only decide that: we are not going into so much credit and that sort of thing, something could be done in the matter. Do we really need four International Oil Companies operating in Barbados? We should have one Oil Company, and I believe that it should be owned by the people of Barbados as well. We do not need Mobil to run that and to give them that 6 rebate and so on. Socony Standard Oil in New York are the people who own the Barbados Union Oil Company.

I, personally, feel that if we give them a special dispensation as a refinery in Barbados purely for the employment factor, and also against the day that we may possibly discover more oil - we have four or five producing wells. We were discussing the matter last night with the Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas, and the Permanent Secretary, the now High Commissioner of Canada, told me that..... (Asides)

If they import gasoline they have to pay an extra 6. Everybody pays the 6 import duty, but it is

refunded to the Barbados Union Oil Company in order to encourage the other Companies to buy from them.

I think the House is with me in this. The small man who runs a gasoline station, because of his credit business, is invariably in debt to Standard Oil of New Jersey, or to Mobil, or to Texaco, or Shell. 12.55 p.m.

This is the real problem and this is the only weapon which they are holding over their heads. This is not a matter of coming back to the House and asking for another 2 1/2 cents. I am not doing that. As long as I am Minister of Finance, at least until next Budget because I cannot predict what will happen, you are not going to have any increase on the price of gasoline, so you can proclaim that on the rooftops; and if they start getting tight with me, we will have to get tight with them. I go further and say that if they are not going to open up and be reasonable, then I may have to come to the House with some measures to control the hours of opening; but I put my advice in the form which I had in the Budget because you do not want to start beating people over the head when a word to the wise should be sufficient. I am grateful to the hon. member first for the unusually high tone of his discussion here to day and for really bringing out a matter of public interest. Like me, he is a consumer and he is really interested. I believe there are a few subjects in which he has a genuine and not a malicious interest, and he has a genuine interest in this matter. I did not say he had a malicious interest in anything; I said there are some subjects in which he has a genuine interest, and I think we owe him a debt of gratitude for asking me to state what the Government's policy is on a matter like this, because I am glad for an opportunity to state it, and I hope that if I have to take measures, I will get the same kind support from the other side of the House.

As far as the workers are concerned, something has to give, and it is not going to be their wages because we have fixed their wages by a Shops Order. As far as the Budget is concerned, the price is not going to give. It is going to stay there until at least the next Budget, and if there is no moving and they decided to cut their pocket margin, they can still bring it down by 2 1/2 cents; but I have allowed the control price to go up by the extra 2 1/2 cents making a total of 8 cents, hoping that they will be smart enough to see the writing on the wall; but if they do not see the writing on the wall, we will go up there and remove the wall from wherever it is. It is as simple as that. I do not think I need say anything more on the subject.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on this motion I wonder if the Prime Minister would consider, instead of putting it at this stage, an expediency which we once sought in the House before of giving the second reading to a number of associated Bills as being a better idea so that they could all be considered together in Committee. We could give the second reading to all the budgetary Bills and deal with them in one Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But so far as this particular one is concerned, the motion is.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I have spoken. This is entirely up to the Acting Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would suggest that that might be considered in respect of all the others, but we are now at a stage apropos of this where the second reading has passed, and the motion is that I do now leave the Chair and that the House may go into Committee.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Perhaps Your Honour is anxious to leave the Chair, but I for example could move an amendment that the motion be not put now, and that will certainly allow us to deal with all of them at the same time, once the Clerk advises that no Standing Order would be infringed. The Standing Orders get infringed in here anyhow, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I agree with the hon. member's anxiety to expedite the proceedings of the House. This is a very noble turn and I am sure we all appreciate it, but there are certain complications that would arise. It is a fiscal measure and I think there are certain complications which would arise, but I strongly recommend that the Committee on the Standing Orders of the House might look into the procedure of referring short Bill seriatim to the Committee stage. My motion still stands.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the Bill is now passed, and may I say that we on this side have taken note of the Prime Minister's remarks may I suggest that a less drastic means of achieving the convenience of the public while we are awaiting the Oil Companies to be nationalised might possibly be to introduce under the shops Legislation particular opening hours for gasoline stations? If it is thought that it is necessary to force them to open, you can force them to open. If it is that the small owners must be persuaded by seeing it in black and white that they cannot be penalised by the Oil Companies if they do open, you can make the appropriate Shops Order and govern that; but I hope that whoever is responsible for worrying - I think it would be the Minister of Communications and Works -about the inconvenience to the public, will certainly consider this. Might I suggest that the real inconvenience, too, is not the impossibility of getting gasoline at closed times, but getting service, and that if you had a flat tyre you could not get it pumped up and matters such as that. You may have sudden emergencies that gasoline stations normally

deal with, and you find it impossible to get those emergencies satisfied on a Sunday. That is the real danger, and they are the things that could cause obstruction of highways and great inconvenience to the public as a whole when they occur.

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

1.05 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE PACKAGE TAX ACTS, 1941

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker this Bill also arises out of the Budgetary Proposals.

Quite apart from the revenue - raising aspect, we are moving away now in the Commonwealth from the old systems of measurement to the metric system, and in the Customs Department it would be much easier to calculate the weights of packages in decimal terms than in terms of half hundredweights, because a large proportion of our imports now come from areas other than the United Kingdom, areas which use the short ton, and this, of course, is another good and sufficient reason administratively quite apart from the revenue- raising aspect. I would go so far as to say that even if there was no need to raise revenue at all, this is one of the rationalisations of our procedures that I will introduce even independently of a Budget because it certainly helps to facilitate the work of the Customs Officers. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to find out from the Minister who introduced this Bill is what is the

amount of money yielded last year and what is the projected yield now that you have reduced the 50 lbs. The other point is I would also like to find what steps have been taken, if any, to ensure that this increased tax, or any of it, will not be passed on to the consumer. This is very important because this is of little value if the Minister of Finance in his Budgetary Proposals from time to time imposes a new tax and then to find that this entire tax is being passed on to the consumer. It is a very important matter because I believe that as regards the consumption tax which was also set out in the Budgetary Proposals, the first thing, I believe, happened was that although the consumption tax was placed on Banks Beer, that beer has now gone up to 30 and 35 per bottle to the consumer. When this increase is calculated with reference to a gallon, you would see that it bears absolutely no relation to the increase in the consumption tax. I believe the first thing that happened was that no sooner than the Prime Minister put on the increased consumption tax, a conspiracy of the Roebuck Street merchants decided that Banks beer will now be sold for so much money, and I would like to know from the Prime Minister what steps will be taken to ensure that the entire tax, whether it is the package tax or the consumption tax, will not be passed on to the consumer.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I know that no Government likes to tax the people's food and they do everything possible not to interfere with the food; but with this package tax there is the possibility that it will cause an increase in the food prices, especially on the salt meat. You have salt meat coming in in batches of 350 lbs. The hon. member was asking if this tax will not be passed on to the consumer, but as soon as you charge the merchant more, he is bound to put it on somewhere or the other, if not in the price in the weight; so the consumer must bear some of the increased tax. I am not talking about the beer because we can live without beer, but I am talking about the food for the poor people, especially the salt meat that the top notches do not buy. There is something called pig's head, neck bone and something of the sort; the only two people who eat them are the dogs and the very poorest class of people, and the dogs do not even eat it; so it is those people who have to buy that type of meat that are going to get hit with the price. I will ask the Prime Minister if it is any way he might be able to help keep the prices down at the present level. The price of salt meat can be a threat to the poor man's pocket.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

The hon. junior member for the City asked about tax being passed on to the consumer. The package tax must pass on; but I think he would like to know if when a package costs you, say, 5 more and you should carry up the item by 1/2 a pound, if that seems fair to the average consumer. This is the point. When the tax goes on, the way it is actually retailed per pound, the consumer has to pay that cent more and that cent more is a tremendous amount more than the 5 per package which the Government puts on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Package Tax Act was first imposed in 1941 shortly after the war began as a means of raising additional revenue; the package tax then was 12 per package, and in the Schedule to the Package Tax Act was set out what was a package, depending on the type of commodity; so that in the case of

asbestos sheets, for instance, ten asbestos sheets constituted a package; it had nothing to do with the value of the commodity. 100 lbs. of butter was a package; so 100 lbs. of butter paid the same thing as 10 asbestos sheets or 10 bars of copper or brass or 72 pints of beer or 125 lbs. of cattle feed. 400 lbs. of cement paid 120; then we increased the package tax to 25 and a couple of years ago - I do not remember exactly what year it was - I defined a package as 56 lbs. so that if you brought in a motor car and it weighed a ton, you divide that into 56 lbs. segments, which would be 40 package taxes; in other words, you would pay then \$10, package tax on a motor car and that was only equitable. 1.15 p.m.

If you go to the Post Office and take out a parcel of two shirts, you will have to pay the package tax on two shirts, because you do not split up the package tax. It is a flat rate of 25. The package tax is on 50 lbs. or a part of 50 lbs. On a motor car weighing a ton you will pay \$10. Previously the package tax was placed on an article if you had a bundle of shingles, or a bundle of galvanised sheets weighing some times half ton as a unit and that is what is set out in the tax. Now, I do not have the figures here; I gave them in my Budget Speech, but I do not have a copy of that Speech here. The main purpose of this tax, of course, is to make it administratively easier and, incidentally, it brings in about 10% more revenue from the package tax.

Now, a bag of flour weighs 196 lbs., I believe. (Mr. HINDS:

98 lbs.) Something is 196 lbs., and I will tell you what it is in a minute. Maize or Corn Meal is 98 lbs. per bag; the flour, of course, is in 196 lbs. packages and we used to go by that. Now, a 5% increase on 250 - let us say that this is now \$1. A 10% increase would be 10 on 196 lbs. of flour and it could only be - (Asides.) I am talking about the package which is roughly 200 lbs., and it would be four package taxes which would be \$1. If I reduced it from 56 lbs. to 50 lbs., it is roughly a 10% increase in the package tax, if the package is now 50 lbs; therefore, a bag of flour will be 196 lbs., and the package tax would be \$1.10, but that is 10 on nearly 200 lbs of flour. If you work it out, you will find that it is about 1/20 of a cent on each pound.

I will now answer the question which has been asked by the hon. member. Now, if a bag of Corn Meal only costs 50, it will be likely to go up by 10%. Of course, there is no bag of Corn Meal that we know of which will cost 1 a pound. The average increase on consumer goods, whether it be salted meat which people used to buy between 53 and 78 a pound, depending on whether you were buying neck-bone ribs, ect. - (Asides.) We have a control price, and we have not changed the control prices on the essential commodities which have been controlled as a result of the package tax; so, naturally, the importer will have to absorb the increase. (Asides.) People go in to the shops and buy things at all sorts of prices without challenging them. We send around Inspectors from time to time. The trouble in Barbados is that as long as the people say that it is the Government who put on the tax, the customer will say, "All right, if the Government put it on, we will have to do something about the Government." The sellers do not tell the customers that they are the people who are carrying up the prices.

As a matter of fact, before we come here with a Budget a lot of merchants start sharpening their pencils to try and make a little more money whether the Government puts on an increase or not. You will find that the morning after the Budget was presented, we said nothing about rice or the package tax on rice, but they put up the price of rice by 1 or 1 1/2. Some of them will get away with it until the Inspectors come around again. We all know about that. The trouble is today that people go into the supermarkets and they do not even look at the price on the commodities. When I was going to school, somebody at home had to go into Town with a list of what was needed: 1/2 lb. salt; 3 pints rice, etc., and everything was worked out to the last 1/2; so that if the maid overspent the amount given to her she would not even have busfare and would have to walk home, because the people with whom I lived - my aunt, grandmother, and so on - used to have everything worked out as if it were done by computer.

Nowadays, you will find people going into a supermarket; they talk to their friends and compete with each other in order to show who can take home the biggest pile of goods. As my friend the hon. member for St. Michael said one day at a meeting: "They are not even passing where the rum is stored; they go straight to the Whisky at \$10 and \$11 a bottle. They look around and decide to take up a few other items, and then they say that the cost of living has gone up." Everything is due to the fact that some people are not shopping with the care with which people used to shop before, and they do not challenge what the shopkeepers and the supermarkets do. You go from one supermarket to another supermarket, and you will find a big discrepancy in price for the same commodity, and frequently over the control price. This is all within the experience of all of us here.

Sir, I cannot guarantee that the price of a commodity will not go up because of the package tax, because the average increase on foodstuffs, as I can see it, varies between 1/10 and 1/20 of a 1 a pound as a result of the increase in the package tax. There is no reason why the consumer should pay anything more at all, but if the effect of that additional 1 is to send the price of the commodity over the control price, then the shopkeepers or the supermarket proprietors ought to be prosecuted.

If there is any unconscionable rise in the cost of living, then we will have to put more commodities under price control. Right now the essential commodities like Corned Beef, Salted Beef, Rice - there is no package tax on Sugar because that does not pass through the Customs, and last year was the only time when we had to import Sugar - a tierce of Salted Beef is about 560 lbs., and most of that is water. Now, this is here they will push up the price of Salted Beef. When they dry it down; they say that about 2/3 of it may be water and they have to pay the package tax on the water, too. In that case, you may find that the package tax has not increased it by 1/10 of a 1. As the hon. senior member for the City says, they are not going to accept 1; if they can get away with 3 or 4 for a few days following the Budget Speech until things clear up and the Inspectors start moving around, they will do so. They may even increase the price by 7 or 8 sometimes.

Now, the Commission Agents have to re-apply to the Ministry of Trade seasonally sometimes for an increase, and if there has been an increase of more than 1C on any of the salted meats that come into this Island short ribs and so on it may not be entirely due to the package tax, but due to seasonal fluctuations. I say that, because the last pigtailed that I bought were not fit for human consumption, but I would not like to tell hon. members where I bought them from. This is something we will have to check on. People are dumping things on us that we should not be buying. I understand that nowadays people are in the habit of rubbing something on pigtailed to give them a brighter colour when they have gone off to a whiter shade of pale. I have seen that with my own eyes, and this is what I have experienced. (Asides.) I will tell you about it privately; it is not my duty to tell you on the floor of the House, because it can be very embarrassing. I have had that experience myself. I think that we ought to inspect the fitness of the commodities to make sure that people are getting not only the quantity, but the quality at the control price. We should make sure that they get the quality and the quantity which they demand when they go into the shops and supermarkets. 1.25 p.m.

We need more Inspectors. We need more Meat and Food Inspectors. We need more Price Control Officers and we need people of a certain calibre, and we should give them proper travelling allowances, because they are given a flat rate now that I do not see how they can really do any inspections. I am saying this as Minister of Finance. I think it is something like \$38 a month. A fellow cannot even get a Honda to run him about to the 4,000 shops in this Island on \$38 a month. I think we increased it recently, but these are things we ought to be paying some attention to, and we hope that we get some co-operation from the public.

In conclusion, I want to say that I do not see that the package tax increase by reducing the size of the package to 50 pounds should greatly effect prices. The 10 per cent increase in the package tax is not a ten per cent, increase in the price of the commodity. It is only a 10% increase in the package tax. The foodstuffs which are on the essential products list vary between 10 cents and 15 cents per pound, whether it is rice, corn meal or flour, and the higher the price, the lower the incidence of the tax. On the low diet foods such as corn meal, rice, flour and so on where you get very low prices, the proportion of tax must necessarily be higher, but it should not make a difference of more than one-tenth of a cent per pound, though most of us know from our experience that the shopkeepers will put a cent or more on if they can get away with it. I think that by competitive shopping the consumers - and I am glad to see that there are consumer organisations coming up - should publish that this man is charging one cent or 1 1/2 cents more when he could very well absorb the tax himself and make it back on sales of some other things which are not really in the essential products list.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 7, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA; seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969-50 as subsequently amended, the vendor of a property is under an obligation to pay a tax, in addition to stamp duties, of 2

1/2% on the consideration for the sale; and the purchaser of the property, if that person happens to be a company, body corporate or individual who is a non-resident and non-national of the Island paid the equivalent tax of 2 1/2 percent. In the case of sales to non-residents there was a kind of penalty, and I think we make no apologies for it; we do discriminate between residents and non-residents, because in Barbados we have no Capital Gains Tax. I have never said that the Government will never introduce a Capital Gains Tax, but a Capital Gains Tax administratively is an extremely difficult tax to administer and to police. I use "police" in the sense of invigilation rather than prosecution. There are many ways in which Capital Gains Tax can be avoided. If I may say so, the beauty, to use an expression, of a property transfer tax is its simplicity because in every transfer of property from one person to the other a consideration has to be set out as an essential part of the transaction, and the Registrar who stamps the conveyances, whether it be a conveyance by way of mortgage or by way of sale, has the duty to impose the stamp duty at the time when the transaction is filed for recording at the Registry, and every such transaction is invariably filed with the Registrar General of this Island, and it is at that point that the Registrar in adjudicating the stamp duty is able to look at the consideration which is due under the Act and which is very-simple of calculation and easy to administer.

All we have done here in this Bill or are seeking to do is to increase the incidence of tax in so far as non-residents or non-nationals are concerned, and with that I think no one will quarrel. There has been a great deal of agitation in the Island that we should have an Aliens Land Holding Bill to make it possible for the Government only to approve the sale of lands to persons who are not residents domiciled or natives of the country only on the ground of a licence by the appropriate authority. It may work very well in Barbados, but I am not satisfied that it has worked as well as it should in some of the other Commonwealth Caribbean countries. I do not want to go into this any further, because I think that in some are as, let me put it this way, it has been used to hold up development if development was not compatible with the political or other points of view of the person responsible for administering the law, because I know of cases which have been filed in other territories, and I do not want to create any antipathy between the members of the Government of those countries and this country - or even this House - by being more specific than that. I know of several cases in which the operation of the tax has not enured to the benefit of the country.

1.35 p.m.

I am not in a position to say that the operation of the tax has not enured to the benefit of somebody or the other, but in so far as the particular countries are concerned, the Alien Land Holding Act has been a mere instrument for holding up development - an arbitrary action on the part of those who have the law to administer than it has been for the benefit of the countries concerned; and although we have an Act drafted, and I would say almost ready for presentation over five years ago, we have not put it away once and for all in the same way that we have not abandoned the idea at the appropriate time of having a Capital Gains Tax in this island. These things have to be considered very carefully and all the pros and cons are weighed, I personally feel that this simple tax which we have imposed is a direct assault on the whole problem of foreign ownership of our resources, whether it is shares in companies, land or otherwise, because every time a person from outside - and they invariably have more money than we

have - wants to acquire shares in a company or land in Barbados, he has got to pay more than the Barbadian pays. When I say Barbadian, I mean the person who is exempted from it within the definition of the Act; that is, a resident person and domiciled person here and that kind of thing, because now the vendor will pay 2 1/2% which I am sure he will pass on to the purchaser anyhow, whether the purchaser be one of us or one of them, and then there is the 7 1/2% which the purchaser also has to pay, which is at 10%. We will watch the operation of the tax; last year I estimated that it should have brought in some \$750,000 in the nine months of the Financial Year which were remaining, and it brought in \$890,000, because I had estimated that there was a volume of transactions in Barbados, and the way I calculated it was very simple. It was based on the amount of stamp duty which I collected, \$31 million, in the preceding year, that is, 1968-69, and if there was \$31 million in transactions by way of shares and the land transfers, calculating on the same rate as the nine months, I calculated that we should have collected \$750,000. We collected \$890,000 which gives us a net accretion of over \$1 million in a full financial year.

I cannot predict what the amount is, but I hope to collect up to \$1 million because, for instance, one hotel in Barbados since the introduction of the tax has traded hands with over \$6 million, a run refinery is going, maybe two refineries are going, more shares are coming on the market; I understand from what I read in the newspapers that every time there is a transfer of shares in a company there are also subject to the tax. I have said all of this not because this tax needs any argument; it is law already; but I think I owe a duty to hon. members to explain the kind of philosophy behind the tax, its ease of collection, and also that it is a temporary substitute - not perhaps completely a substitute, but certainly it is a measure in the direction of making it less easy for people who are not nationals of this country, residents, persons domiciled here, people who are contributing by way of personal taxation to the development of the country - these people are not in any way penalised by this particular measure unless they are vendors and their position remains the same. The purchasers now have to pay three times as much as they would have paid before if they happened to be non-nationals of this country. In conclusion, I should like to say that the reason for my explanation is to make it abundantly clear that I do not regard this particular tax as the final solution to the problem of foreign ownership of our resources, but certainly it is something which is calculated to discourage the acquisitiveness of people from abroad who have money and want to make undue profit from the resources which we have built ourselves. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

There are only two points in this, Sir; I believe we forecasted and spoke of the need for a disincentive, as we put it, for foreigners, particularly with devaluation, from buying up traditional house-spot land in this country as opposed to buying land for industrial or hotel development, but there are a few problems in the administration of this Act which have arisen; one, I think, is the treatment of leases. This is a

device which, I gather, is being used, and I would really like to hear a pronouncement for the Ministry of Finance under that section of the circumstances under which they would relieve taxes, because I know of particular instances in which companies intend to build houses, so to speak - and if they buy the land and they are foreign companies their sole purpose is to build houses - they have to pay 7 1/2% tax and when they come to sell the houses to Barbadians they will pass on the 7 1/2% tax. I do not think that the intention is to tax people who are using land as a trading asset, because these people who use the land as such will be paying income tax at 40% on any increment they make on the land. This is a very interesting development which is taking place, and I understand that very often some rulings for the land transfer tax do not cover leases; so therefore it seems that a relatively simple method will be devised very soon whereby people will lease land and just release the interest which the lessor has in it, and then no transfer tax is extractable.

I really feel that in the administration of this tax, until a drastic reform takes place in the land law of this country, we are going to have more and more problems cropping up in relating to this tax. The idea of having to convey all the land to another person to hold it subject to the repayment of a mortgage is something which I believe is only in existence in very few territories of the world now who follow the common law jurisdiction, and even in Ireland it has just been abolished. In addition to that, we still feel that this whole problem of land ownership has not been cured by this Act, but that we must have a proper land policy by the Government, and the quicker this comes the better. I am profoundly disturbed with the speculation of good agricultural land that is going on in this country as a result of a Resolution which was passed in this House, and I can say this quite clearly. We on this side are going to bring down another Resolution dealing with that very shortly, because all that has happened is that a door has been opened for the greatest amount of speculation and robbery to take place in Barbados.

Land that is being sold as agricultural land is now really, in truth and in fact, being sold as house-spot land, and when the planning applications start coming down to build houses on it, no agricultural endeavour is going to take place on it because the prices that are being asked for the two-acre lots are greater than the price that was asked on the four-acre lots previously. That is why we say that the differential of 7 1/2% to 2 1/2% is not going to stop this demand; I hear a lot of talk about an Alien Land Holding Bill, but I have had a lot of experience with this kind of Bill and I agree that it can best be used as a source of obstruction; it can also be used as a source of revenue. 1.45 p.m.

It is just like the Town Planning in Barbados. Whatever takes place in Town Planning in Barbados takes place with aliens, land-holding, and we know what takes place with Town Planning. Some of the most inexplicable decisions have been given under the guise of Town Planning. Some of the most worthy developments have been held up, so that it seems to me that any Aliens Land-holding Bill introduced should be introduced in the context of a proper Land-use Plan being prepared for Barbados with zoning and relevant usages of various areas of land being declared beforehand; so that the question of an Aliens Land-holding Licence would be a relatively simple matter, having decided that it is a type of development which is necessary for that particular piece of land, and not leave it to the discretion of

the administering authority.

Having regard to what I have seen going along in Barbados nowadays in the Ministerial Departments, unless there is an Ombudsman or some independent tribunal to decide on the Aliens Land-holding, I would never wish to see it vested in any Minister's hands. That, Sir, is our position.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to a Resolution passed in this House, and said that it is causing two or more lots of land to be sold for more than the cost of four lots. When that Resolution was passed it was for the sole purpose of preventing people who have money from buying four or five acres of land and then selling the land at a higher price to people who were unable to buy that amount of land at one time. My Resolution asked to make it possible for the small man to purchase land in 2-acre lots. The small man is unable to buy 5 acres of land at one time. The people who could afford to buy 5 acres of land at one time would be able to make a lot of money out of it. I am not a land buyer, a land seller or a land shark, but if the hon. member knew that advantage was being taken of certain people, he could have brought down a Resolution long ago asking the Government to stop it. (Asides.) He now says that he is bringing one, but all the time the people are being fleeced. He should have brought in the Resolution this morning.

Sir, I will be able to get rich, too, but I will not be able to tell you when. He was talking about this Resolution a long time ago, because I heard it in St. Joseph. He is trying to make the people believe that I joined with the Government to do this. That was his object in putting it to the people. He got up there and said, "Smith passed the Resolution with the Government, " He agreed to the Resolution in this Chamber; he sat in his seat and agreed to it, but he did not tell the people in St. Joseph that he had also agreed to it.

Mr. St. JOHN:

On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On a point of what?

Mr. St. JOHN:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. The hon. member is making a statement on what I have said. I told the

people that I believed the hon. member was genuine when he brought the Resolution, because he thought it was for genuine agricultural workers. We all believed so, but, in fact, it opened the door to speculation.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the door to speculation was opened before, because people like the hon. member could buy 5-acre lots and then speculate, but people like me could not buy one acre. I thought it would have been fair to put the small man in a position to be able to buy one acre or two acres of land. The only thing we cannot do in here is to turn a man into a woman and a woman into a man.

If the hon. member knows that the people are being fleeced he should bring a Resolution here, and I am sure that he will get the necessary support. I believe he is waiting until all of the land is being sold before he brings such a Resolution. After the horse is out of the stable, he is going to close the door. He can bring the Resolution as soon as next Tuesday and let us deal with it, because I know what is meant by the land sharks. I know that they will take your heart out of your breast when it comes to money. I am here to do my bit, and to see that certain things do not happen, as far as the poor man is concerned.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, there are ways of driving a coach and horse through the Property Tax Act, if you deal with leases in a certain way. I think, perhaps, you might be a little unpatriotic to say on the floor of the House one of the most reliable ways of doing it, but, I am sure that any lawyer, if asked, would give the necessary advice if he has the wit to devise it. That is partly by the way, Sir. I want to deal particularly with this question of property transfer as it affects the cutting up of these plantations especially when they are sold to Overseas Companies, and then divided ostensibly for agricultural purposes but, in fact, for residential purposes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that, relying on the dictum of the Town Planner, when you buy a piece of land for agricultural purposes you are always entitled to put a house on it. Big estates are being cut up, following the Resolution of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and since adopted by the Government as its policy. That is said to be the order in which it happened, Sir. It is only fair to the House to point out that the public is very dissatisfied with politicians at the present moment for a number of reasons. It is not only the bad behaviour in the House and the tax-free allowances, but it is the fact that members of the public are believing that politicians are feathering their pockets in many ways at the expense of the public. I have heard it said that the hon. member for St. Joseph has shares in Barbados Agricultural Estates Limited, a Cayman Island Company, which was the first beneficiary of the Resolution, Sir.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is very easy to hear things, and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is noted for that. He was born that way. He is always hearing somebody say something. I do not have any shares in anything at all in or out of Barbados, and nobody has shares with me. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas must be clean at some times, and he must not shelter by saying that he heard things. He is always hearing things, and I will swear that he never heard that. 1.55 p.m.

If he asks for it, he will get it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point,

Mr. SMITH:

In the same way, he said that the Leader of the Opposition had told him that I had a gun in my valise. He said that last Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Will both hon. members please be seated? (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS I told him that, and you did have it.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

He said you had a gun. (Mr. SMITH He does not know a gun yet.) The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is too severe. I wish to give him the opportunity of denying the accusation. It is said, and if you go and check the Register of Shareholders in the Cayman Islands, all you will see is that an estate in Barbados, Sandford Estate, has been bought by a Cayman Islands company whose shareholders or shareholder is a certain Bank Trust Co. The Trust Company holds nominee interests and it has bought a Barbadian estate, I believe, for Barbadians. It is said that one of the nominee interest is the interest of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. He must believe me that it is said so. If he wishes to deny it, I am glad to give him the opportunity to clear his name.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, I am throwing down this challenge now to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. If he can prove to this House that my name is there as a shareholder in this company, I will give up this seat now and leave this House; and if he does not find it, he should be man enough to give

me his.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that his name is not in any Register in the Cayman Islands as a shareholder, nor is the name of the Minister of Housing. What I would invite the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to do - I am not talking about the Minister - is to deny that he is one of the nominee interests represented by the Barclays Bank Trust Co of the Cayman Islands.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that does not arise here.

Mr. SMITH:

Allow me to deny it. I am saying "no", Sir. I have not one black cent in anything, and I would give him my seat if he can prove it. If he cannot prove it, he should be able to give me his seat.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member goes on talking about proving. If the hon. member is interested, when I was told about consideration and so on for the moving of this Resolution passing in his direction, I said I did not believe it. He will never believe that because it is his profession to believe anything that is evil and vile about people he is temporarily against. Nothing that is conceivably good about the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can be believed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I know his name is not on any shareholders' register, and he should be glad of an opportunity of clearing his name from the stain that attaches to that of some other members of this House. He should be glad of the opportunity I have given him to get up and tell the public that no consideration of any sort passed in connection with the passing of that Resolution where he was concerned, but he will not see it that way.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

This sitting now stands until 2.30 p.m. in accordance with the relevant Standing Orders.

On resumption

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum, and ask that the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained, QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. One answer only has been laid and I do not observe that hon. member to be in his place. So the answer may be laid.

There are no other questions, and therefore the House may proceed to Private Members' Business. When it was last on that, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, before you proceed, I should like to remind you that if I do not proceed with Order No. 12 standing in my name, the time will expire for it to remain on the Order Paper. It is non-controversial, and while I am on my feet, I am going to ask that Order No. 12 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already called the first Order of the Day in respect of which the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. I wonder if there is any possibility of an amicable arrangement being arrived at.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I had consultation with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when the Leader had already gone out of the Chamber for lunch, and it was suggested that Order No. 12 be taken first and then revert to Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must say that the Whips of both Parties are extremely lax. They should inform the Speaker of such discussions and arrangements. The Whips of both sides deserve to be censured, and I so do now.

Order No. 12 with the concurrence of both Leaders of the House stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution re repairs to certain roads in St. Joseph.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:

Whereas the residents of Fruitful Hill, Frizers, Vaughans Land, and Joes River in the parish of St. Joseph, due to the lack of proper roads in these districts, are put to great hardship and inconvenience in reaping and marketing their canes, and in getting to Church and to market;

AND WHEREAS these same bad roads are part of the reasons why an electric service is unavailable in these districts;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to have these roads in St. Joseph repaired as soon as possible.

Sir, this Resolution is a very short one and it has been explained in the truest sense of the word. We all know how inconvenient and embarrassing it can be when you do not have proper roads to get to and from your home, and it is more serious after growing a crop and you cannot get it reaped because of the absence of a proper road for your trucks to get in and take out the crop.

This Frizers Road was abandoned for a very long time; I was asking the Government to see to it and have it done. I drove over it a Bank-holiday morning and it has been made up to a certain point passable, but it is still very, very rough and a lot of water runs across it and leaves it in a very bad state. It was in a much better condition when I took the Prime Minister there so that he could see it; I believe it is due to the lack of proper drainage and maintenance, and then the water comes from the hills and washes the mould down into the drain and fills it up. I think you should have a cantonnier to keep these drains cleared, because when the rain falls in that part of the world and it comes down from the hills it brings along everything with it and blocks the road and the gutters, and there the damage begins. Frizers Road

is a road that serves the plantation as well as the tenants, and, when that road is out of order, the people and the plantation owners are put to great inconvenience, having to go practically two miles out of the way to get back into the same road a little further on. I am asking the Government to see to that, especially now that the rain is not yet with us - it soon will be here and you may say that the canes are all gone, but it is still an inconvenience to the people.

We have to think in terms of people, and Fruitful Hill Road was abandoned about five years ago. I was told that the people there this year -I am putting it to you as it was put to me - SAW h-e -1-1, to get the canes reaped. I know what the man meant because he is one of the local preachers and he did not want to tell me that they saw hell, but I know that was his meaning. Fruitful Hill Road leads from Parks to St. Andrew; it is a first class by-road in case you should have any trouble in the St. Andrew area. If Trio Path Bridge is out of order, instead of the people from Bruce Vale having to go all the way up to Cleland Hill to get into Bridgetown, that is a by-road which would serve a great purpose for traffic diversion, Fruitful Hill Road was always a road, a thickly populated area, and it is an agricultural area altogether. Fruitful Hill was a plantation when I was a boy and it was sold out, and one knows when a plantation is sold out, especially in the areas where the land is more suitable for building purposes; but the only thing you can do with Fruitful Hill is to grow canes. These people have to pay taxes, they have to contribute in the same way as those who are getting easy access to and from the cane factory with their crops, and I feel that it is the duty of any Government to see to it that the people of the country get proper roads.

Another road which is in need of repair is Vaugh-ans; it was a plantation and was recently sold out and a lot of land there is laying practically wasted through not having proper roads. Roads were built not long ago, but due to the slipping of the land up there, in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, these roads are well-nigh impassable and I would ask the Government not to spend all the money on them but to make them passable because if you spend an excessive amount of money on them, there is the possibility that the next day or two you will have a heavy rainfall and that will go the same way as if you had not done it. These roads are really essential, and some interest should be paid to them.

I am sure that the Ministry is well aware of these roads because I am always asking them about them and visiting the Ministry, and the last time I was very successful in having one of the officers to take around and show him these bad areas, and I believe he made some kind of report. 2.45 p.m.

We have one such as Joes River. That is an area where electric poles are already planted, but the Electric Company will not do anything more, because they say that they must have a road on which their vehicles can travel to enable their employees to service the poles and the houses. The poles are there, but no light will be given until a proper road is put there. I do not think I will take up any more time of this House, because everyone of us knows the mean -ing of roads, water and light, and how embarrassing things can be when one cannot get light, water and a road. Sir, even those who live practically in a

drawing room know that, when they compare it with other places where some people have to live.

Now the roads in St. Michael and certain parts of the country are very good. Those people who use only the St. Michael, the St. George and certain other roads may not know the difficulty people have when driving through the byroads in St. Andrew. Of course, we have no grouse about the main roads throughout the Island. I think Barbados stands as No. 1 when it comes to roads and we are comparing Barbados with the other West Indian Inlands, We Are not complaining about not having good main roads, but we are complaining about not having good roads in certain areas. If you have 12 roads: 6 good ones and 6 bad ones, then you can expect the people who live in the bad areas to complain and say that they cannot get good roads.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS; Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has very adequately and excellently put this Resolution. I agree especially with his last remark. It is true that Barbadians generally feel themselves better than anybody else in the world but, in this particular instance, we can say with justifiable pride that our roads, compared with the roads in other West Indian Territories, are extraordinarily good, except that some of them are not wide enough. When it comes to tenantry roads, something will have to be done about them. I am not on this occasion, because I have not got evidence, saying that certain roads, certain people and certain tenancies are favoured because of their politics, but, occasionally, you will get people coming and telling you that.

I have very much pleasure in seconding this motion. I hope that hon. members will forget politics and use their influence wherever they can use it to try and give everything the hon. member has asked for.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I did not know, and I could not have foreseen, that exactly some of the problems that I spoke of earlier, which would in the future arise as a result of the lack of policy of the Government in relation to subdivision of land in this country, would have been brought so forcefully to the fore. During the introduction by the hon. Mover of this Resolution, he stated that some of this plantation land represented land which had lately been subdivided, and it was only during the recess that I ventured the opinion that unless something was done immediately about the policy in relation to the standards of roads and amenities and the subdivision of agricultural land in this country, in future this House of Assembly would be plagued with requests for amenities to be given to the people at the expense of the general mass of taxpayers.

I am happy that this Resolution has been brought here, because it illustrates clearly the dangers and the serious financial consequences that are going to result in Barbados, if the Government does not immediately declare a policy in relation to this matter. As I have said, Sir, it is Mellowes today, Vaughans tomorrow, and in a couple of years' time it will be Cliff, Sandford and Oldbury and so on. I think it is very unfair if the prices that are commanded today are allowed to be obtained with those who are making the increment not spending one cent in providing even the most elementary amenities. Town Planning in this country is a hopeless institution. All of the Ministries should protest officially and demand that minimum standards should be enforced in any subdivision. If it is a housing subdivision, naturally the standards should be higher, because there will be more users of it. There should be a minimum standard of amenities for all subdivisions in this country.

It is unfair, when all of this cutting-up has been done since the passage of legislation, for other taxpayers to have to subsidise the profits, so to speak, of the developers, and that is why this Resolution is here today. If a minimum standard of amenities were insisted on at the beginning - can you imagine, Sir, that in the year 1970 an Electricity Corporation is telling people in this country that they cannot put in electricity because their trucks cannot go into land which has been subdivided recently? I would have thought that a minimum condition for any kind of subdivision for agriculture would be that there is reasonable access to electricity. If you are going to have chickens, livestock, vegetable growing, and so on, surely, electrification of the area is necessary for good productivity; yet, so myopic is the Government on the other side, so indifferent to what is going on in this country, that it is going to allow the minimum of standards to take place only to saddle future taxpayers with the balance.

Naturally, we will have to support this Resolution, because it illustrates the chronic indifference and neglect and the attitude of the Government on the other side to these problems. The Government is not doing anything about the matter, and Tuesday after Tuesday we are going to bring Re solutions here in connection with agricultural subdivision in Barbados until we shock the members of the Government out of their seats and make them do something about it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that, with the concurrence of both sides, the Resolution was given priority under Private Members' Business. 2.55 p.m.

I will now revert to Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business which is in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas, to resume debate on a Resolution re the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance for the fiscal year 1970-71.

When this Resolution was last debated, after the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had moved that it do now pass, the hon. junior member for St. Peter seconded the motion and he was yet speaking when Private Members' Business came to an end. That hon. member may now resume his speech.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I now return to a Budget in which people have been taxed even for their own cleanliness. Sir, there are one or two matters which need to be put right before I proceed. The Minister of Finance certainly has at his disposal the relevant data which has not been made available to members of the Opposition; but if one were to look at the Prime Minister's Budgetary Proposals, it would be seen that with reference to prices, he is recorded as saying that our economy continues to face the problem of rising prices, and he goes on to say that the index of retail prices rose by 5.5 points between the end of December 1968 and December 1969. Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge the Minister of Finance at that stage. I want him to deny that it was well within his knowledge that the index of retail prices had risen precisely 9 points between the same period stated, and it was misleading the general public and the House to have said it had risen by 5.5 points. That is certainly not correct, Mr. Speaker, and it is this kind of blarney that one hears from the Minister of Finance from time to time like some who bolt down a dark alley when they know not where to go, and that is what the Minister has been doing throughout these whole Budgetary Proposals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as regards our Gross Domestic Product and what we import, the Minister of Finance was at pains to emphasise that due to our high imports it would be appreciated that we at home would be able to exert very little influence on the prices of the several commodities we consume, but he goes on to tell us about setting up a Prices Commission. Nobody would deny that it is absolutely necessary to have a Prices Commission; but what has the Minister of Finance done by way of directives given to some of his Ministers and the proposals made to them for the function of their respective Ministries? We have in our midst the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The Prices Commission is to be created to deal with unscrupulous traders and importers, and what we are saying is that the most unscrupulous trader and importer in Barbados today is the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We are faced with a situation, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Barbados Marketing Corporation where it has been buy-ing commodities such as chicken locally at 60 cents a pound and selling it, without having to do anything to it whatsoever for its preservation or presentation, at 90 cents a pound to Government Departments. In other words, by a mere book entry the B. M. C. has been making 30 cents on a pound of chicken that was bought for 60 cents.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the B. M. C. does not buy chicken at 60 cents a pound. The B. M. C. buys chicken at 85 cents a pound locally.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made, but it is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that they buy chicken at 85 cents a pound, but when they buy at that price they also make 50 cents or perhaps more profit. Delivery in many cases is effected from the supplier directly to the Department concerned and the supplier merely passes its bill through the B.M.C., and for mere book work the B.M.C. is getting much more out of the industry than the person who had to rear the birds and go through all the processing. In the some way you find that the B.M.C. has been supplying things like beef to Government Departments at 90 cents per pound when other persons have offered to supply the same beef at 75 cents per pound. You will find that quite recently the B.M.C. attempted a last minute dive to save itself by not sending its tender to the Tenders Committee, but sending it to the Ministry of Home Affairs. That is the sort of thing that has been going on.

Mr. Speaker, I still see the Barbados Marketing Corporation being encouraged to trade without adequate capital; not that we are suggesting that it should be capitalised to any extent for the same persons who now run it to have any administration over the taxpayers' finances. 3,05 p.m.

You will find that the Barbados Marketing Corporation is running actually without money; and when you have an organisation such as that trying to carry on a business by making profit out of things it has absolutely no right handling, that is where the taxpayers of this country finally become saddled; they are burdened with things that they need not have been burdened with. In the same way, we come to the Pine Hill Dairy where we are dealing with unscrupulous traders and importers; where could you find such unscrupulous traders and importers except at the Barbados Marketing Corporation than at the Pine Hill Dairy? That is an institution which was set up in this Island to manufacture milk, and one would have thought that with the coming into existence of the Pine Hill Dairy, the masses of people would have been able to buy milk, even if not at a cheaper price, that they would have been able to buy milk of a quality on which they could rely and one which would make them happy. That has not been the case, Mr. Speaker, even up to last week. Even since the Prime Minister made his Budgetary Proposals, there has been evidence that the public had to reject milk offered by the Pine Hill Dairy, but you will find that the Prime Minister is telling us about our high import bill - I think he said it was \$197.5 million - and you will find that they have set up an industry in this Island to manufacture milk, and instead of manufacturing milk that same institution is increasing your import bill through a monopoly granted by

the Government. At the same time the Government is not lending itself to make sure at that point that the consumers are being supplied with milk, an item of diet, of a quality and standard required by the consumer; that is not the Government's concern; so you will find that Pine Hill Dairy as it functions at the moment sees no need to be a manufacturing industry. It sees no need to attempt to satisfy the demands of the people in St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Philip and the other country districts. But what we have seen is that many a peasant farmer in the country districts who kept a cow and was able to sell a pint of milk to his neighbour, with the coming into existence of the Pine Hill Dairy the peasant farmer has been discouraged from keeping his cow. Very few of them keep cows now, and for any of them to sell milk to his neighbour without having a licence to do so, he is offending against the law. You will find that there is much that could normally be gone into in a matter of this sort, and we ought to be able to see a considerable reduction in this high import bill of which the Minister of Finance had so much to say.

Manufactured goods amounted to 8, 6 million dollars of our imports, machinery and transport equipment \$5.7 million and our food bill was \$3.8 million. That is our concern-the \$3, 8 million above everything else, because it is the Government's bounden duty to see that if we cannot produce locally and the necessity arises for us to import to satisfy local demands, it should be so guarded, so protected that prices will not be inflated out of proportion that the consumer cannot make the best of the purchases through the high prices that will be offered.

Tourism. The Prime Minister, speaking of our trade deficit, pointed out that there is an increase of \$38 million, from \$88 million in 1968 to \$126 million in 1969. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and I are both aware of the fact that the situation with regard to tourism tends to worsen perhaps by the time of the next Budget Speech, because we know of present day conditions where almost all of our hotels are practically empty, and one has got to be extremely careful that we do not allow the name of Barbados to become too closely associated with what is taking place elsewhere and so frighten the tourist away, because indications are that we will be deeper and deeper in the red if we do not take a very stern hand where certain matters are concerned. But the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance soon began to ride on the crest on the international monetary scene, and he informed us of the fact that though the British bank rate was in two stages reduced from 8% to 7%, and certain major banks in the United States of America have recently reduced their prime rate to 7%, he went on to point out to us that it was not possible for Barbados to borrow money at any cheaper rate on the London market. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we have had to press the Prime Minister, roll him, and actually hold him and squeeze him on a previous occasion here to get out of him one of the reasons why it had cost Barbados so much only to learn where we could get \$4 million by way of a loan. I think at that time we learned that it had cost this country something like \$33,000 or thereabouts only to learn where to get \$4 million from! Because the Prime Minister had allowed himself to become so closely associated with what is known as the West Indies Stock Exchange, the taxpayers of this country were called upon to pay a high price for learning. In other words, we had to pay to learn, but that is not a good example for us. We wonder whether that is a reason why we are told by the Minister of Finance that you cannot get loans at any

cheaper rate on the London Market, or if the true position is that we have lost faith, or certain people on the London Market have lost faith in our ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, we are going right down to the point where the Prime Minister wants us to believe that the Public Debt, as he said, was \$54.9 million at the 31st March, 1970. We are satisfied that we are witnessing a bit too much juggling with figures in this country, and by none other the Minister of Finance. I want to challenge the Minister of Finance to deny that at the 31st March, 1970, the Public Debt of this country stood at \$69.4 million. When the Minister tells us that it will be necessary to raise by way of loans all the funds which are required to carry out the Capital Programme, and the Capital Programme will be requiring something like \$24.17 million, we are challenging him to deny that in truth and in fact, when that amount is borrowed, our Public Debt will not be standing at \$93.57 million instead of all that he has been trying to be us.

I am sorry that the Minister is not in his place, but that is the situation. We are saying that, if matters such as these were gone into, one would get a clearer picture of exactly what is the financial position of this country. There is no wonder why we have heard that one morning we will wake up to find that we do not have a Barbados.

We will now concern ourselves, Mr. Speaker, with one of the very salient points of these Budgetary Proposals. I have already dealt with the question of income tax, and we have even heard this morning something about consumption duty. I was very glad to hear what the Prime Minister had to say on the matter of the Gasolene Stations and the retail of petrol.

There has been an increase in the price of beer, but when one looks at the increase on a gallon of beer and then looks at the number of bottles that are filled and retailed from the same gallon, one can see quite readily that the consumption tax bears absolutely no relation to the price now charged for a bottle of beer. This, Mr. Speaker, is in the face of the fact of what the Minister of Finance said in his Budgetary Proposals.

"I propose to remove the import duties on raw materials used in the manufacture of beer."

If the import duties on the raw materials are removed but a slight increase has been affixed to each gallon, I am wondering what the people at the Brewery would say is responsible for the increase in the price of beer. We know that the Roebuck Street giants, the people who have set up a business within a

business, the "Wheel-in-a-wheel people" as they are called sometimes, are the people who dictate prices and run the country, so to speak, where the importation and the distribution of goods are concerned.

You will find that the small shopkeeper in the country districts now finds himself faced with the situation that he has to place an order for not less than \$100 in goods from a Roebuck Street merchant, if he wants the goods delivered at his door. You will also find that very often the small shopkeeper goes into a Roebuck Street store merely to find that the Roebuck Street merchant cannot supply him with all of the things that he would like to carry to the country on that day. He will have to pay off the Roebuck Street merchant what he owes; he has to place an order for not less than \$100, and he has to go elsewhere to place orders for other commodities.

3.25 p.m.

If he is told, as he has been told by the Roebuck Street merchants, that he must place an order for not less than \$100 if he wants them delivered, one can see the position with the small trader. I am saying that the absence of strict price control, the absence of adequate staffing in the Price Control Department is going to bring about for the small shopkeeper in the country districts increased suffering, because we know the system as it obtains in this Island, and it is that every country shopkeeper is tied to the Bridgetown merchant by the square foot of land or the size of the small house which he owns. These people have brought their plots and sales, they have had mortgages, they have given what is called a 'good' over their houses so as to be able to get a little credit to carry on a little business, but they in turn have got to practise a credit system in the country districts, because people in the country districts only have one pay day, and even when pay day comes, they are in more trouble on that day and the following day than if they did not have a pay day at all. That has been the case, I can say, with policemen. A policeman is never more unhappy until pay day and two or three days following. He would pray at some times that pay day did not come. That is the kind of life that our people have got to live. The economic situation has been such as to force this kind of condition upon them, whether or not they like it.

When you find, Mr. Speaker, that the consumption tax reaches down to our fruit juices, we have got to bear in mind that within the past two or three years, the increase in the consumption of fruit juices is something to be noted. It is evident that the Minister of Finance has noted it, because he sees it as a possibility of getting increased revenue with which to finance his several projects. People have come around to appreciating the value of fruit and vegetable juices, and when they are being taxed to carry them beyond the reach of people, one must look at the various complaints which cause our people to turn some of the doctors' offices into fish-and-pork shops. Some of our doctors find that they have more patients to deal with in the course of a day than some of the small supermarkets get between Tuesday and Thursday in any week, and doctors have been complaining of being tired and not being able to hold out with the number of calls that are made on them.

Mr. Speaker, people are beginning to appreciate the value of fruit as a diet, and when this is taxed, we do not consider that justice is being done to the man in the street.

We have our washing preparations, detergents, paints, enamels, varnishes and the like that have all been taxed, but we are saying that there are other avenues from which revenue could have been derived without placing this undue burden on the section of the population that would be hardest hit when we examine the list of items that has been taxed. It is all right, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the amount of cement that is used in the building industry; but if the architects, builders or whoever they might be are faced with an increased cement bill, it all goes into the cost of construction, but the man who owns a small 18' x 10' or 22' x 12' who has acquired the small plot of land on which his house stands, and because of an increase in his family sets out to make an addition and prefers to use concrete blocks instead of buying termite-ridden lumber, is going to be the person who will feel the pinch from the increased cost of cement. The man who tries to change up the front of his house to give it a face-lift is now faced with an increased cost in the price of cement. These are the things, Mr. Speaker, which we feel could have been re-examined or which stand in our view fit for condemnation and ought not to have been used with a view to collecting revenue, when we bear in mind that the people who are less able to pay are those who will be hardest-hit in this whole exercise.

Mr. Speaker, why has it been found necessary to impose a consumption tax on Tiger Malt and other manufactured malt beverages? The real reason for this, I am going to say, is that Government did much to promote the coming into being of Bim Beverages, and it is well known that two soft drink plants could very well meet the full requirements of soft drinks in this Island; but it appears to be an easy road, and the promoters of Bim Beverages came on the scene. 3.35 p.m.

They not only came on the scene, but when other beverage producers were making a 10-oz. drink, they thought they could do better by making a 12-oz. drink - two ounces more - but it is now known, it is no secret, that Bim Beverages found themselves very nearly on the way out, and the consumption tax on Tiger Malt and other manufactured beverages has been imposed - and I challenge the Minister of Finance to deny it - to help Bim Beverages get back on their feet. It is not something that is done in the interest of the community at large; it is done exclusively in the interest of Bim Beverages, and we say, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to the community.

The question of the package tax has been very much aired in the House already this morning, and I must even say we have heard quite a lot about Town Planning; we have heard it from the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and believe me, you do not know how sorry I am that the Minister of Finance is not now in his place, because the Department of Town Planning is one of the most corrupt in this country. A lot of development is being held up, and what we are now in a position to say is that

much of the development that has been permitted by Town and Country Planning has been done for favours, and the favours go beyond what might appear on the surface. There is now for sale the estate in St. James known as Trents. It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that a group of people, Barbadians amongst them, have signified an interest in purchasing Trents Estate for development, but when it was discovered that there was undue delay in permission being granted for certain types of development, certain members of the group were faced with a situation that was shocking - and I would ask the Prime Minister to investigate this, if it is not a fact that one of his Ministers has expressed a desire to permit development as requested by the intended buyers, provided he can get 20 acres of Trents Estate - and remember, not to buy - 20 acres for free. I am asking the Prime Minister to investigate that, that one of his own Ministers would permit certain development to be carried out at Trents Plantation in St. James if he, as a Minister, gets the assurance that he can get 20 acres for free. These are things that need investigation; these are things that the public must be told, and I repeat, the Minister did not ask to let him buy them, and even if he had asked to buy them he would be out of place; but he wants 20 acres for free and the group does not know where they stand in the matter. But Trents is still for sale; I believe some of them would swear to affidavits, they are so bitter. It is a definite fact.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most of the ills in these Budgetary Proposals have already been highlighted; but let us put ourselves in this position where the poor mothers in this Island try and, to use a common Bajan term, rake and scrape to help their daughters to go to England or elsewhere to study to become nurses; what is the position with these people now? When they reach the Airport, they have got to find an additional sum of money to pay as Airport tax. This, we say, Mr. Speaker, is a hardship that is being imposed on people who are just not able. I am to tell you this; my own experience is that many of our people who leave here to go to the United States of America even on a vacation, the morning that they leave home they are not able to pay for the taxi that is carrying them to the Airport; if they have not got the taxi fare, where must they find this money to clear Customs? It is not fair to our Barbadian girls.

These Hospital charges. We do not want to say anything about the Hospital charges, but we are concerning ourselves with the question of having to pay for the medicine. We know that through faulty administration in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there has been a considerable loss and much wastage which is being carried on until this day. Not many days ago, even the maids and the cooks refused to eat; they threw it in the swill. Even that is a loss of taxpayers' money; but you will find that the Prime Minister is telling us that he is imposing a charge for the medicine, and this is what he had to say: "All fee-paying inpatients in private wards will be required to pay for medicines at cost price plus 10%. This is far below the cost plus 80% to 150% charged by Pharmacists." 3.45 p.m.

In other words, here is the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in his Budgetary Proposals telling us that he is allowing the Pharmacists in this country to charge people the cost price of the medicine plus from 80% to 150%, and he is doing nothing about it! Mr. Speaker, all of these things must make us wonder what is happening. Is this really a Government that is interested in the poor, or, for that matter, anybody at all? I wonder whether some of the people who used to take injections will be taking them

any longer, and they no longer care what is charged for medicine and so on. Nobody could expect a Government to sit idly by, knowing that the druggists in Barbados are charging people the cost of the medicine and then adding on from 80% to 150% without doing something about the matter! Something has to be wrong. I believe that more on this will be said at another stage, and we look forward in the final analysis to the hope that the working-class people in this country will not be taxed any further, because at present it is far beyond their ability to pay, and in those avenues where relief could be given, it is not being given.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to applications for residence permits. This is another avenue which permits corruption. I can say that people who employ barristers that are members of the Democratic Labour Party are more readily accommodated by the Ministry of Home Affairs when they make applications for such permits. I am not afraid of saying this. The barrister has to render a service, but the type of service that the barristers, who are members of the Democratic Labour Party, are rendering and for which they are charging exorbitant fees - - they are robbing people. Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that they are using their wig and gown as a blind behind which to hide. What the lawyers do for these people and charge money, other members of the public are doing the samething for nothing. There is nothing at all to be done in this matter, but I know that lawyers, who are pillars in the Democratic Labour Party, are robbing people, and this should not be done.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is obviously not speaking of all lawyers!

Mr. HINDS:

I could not mean Your Honour. I have always regarded Your Honour as a member of the West Indian Nationalist Party, and I have never regarded Your Honour as a member of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue his admirable speech on the Budget.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think I have come to the point where I can sum up. Briefly, it is that one cannot expect a Minister of Finance to present Budgetary Proposals that are not studded with figures. Our contention is that we know the Minister of Finance and this is what we have learnt his figures can be taken to mean something on one particular day, and the same figures can be taken to mean something else on another day. It is in that light, Mr. Speaker, that I conclude my address, because apart from the fact that there are visible signs of our people being depressed from the increased cost of things arising from the Budgetary

Proposals, there is nothing in the Budget which can recommend it to the growing public as in any way meeting the demands or the requirements whereby we can call it the type of National Budget that the Minister of Finance would have us believe it really is.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, as far as this Budget Speech is concerned, I will say that it is very stale, because everything has gone into action and been made law. We are only fooling ourselves now, and we cannot make things any better, In other words, we cannot make the Prime Minister take off what he has put on, but there is a point I want to raise. It is something that is affecting the country, and if something is not done in the matter by next year we will be heading for trouble. 3.55 p.m.

Everybody knows the calamity of the sugar industry. The canes are being burnt and spoilt, and animals cannot get anything by way of fodder, and stock-owners are experiencing difficulty in feeding their animals due to the cane fire. What is the Government doing about it? It is time that we be told what is Government's intention in so serious a matter. To sit back and watch the industry go up in flames is not good enough. In the Prime Minister's remarks, he said that receipts from the export of sugar totalled \$22.1 million, a fall of \$7.3 million or 25% from the 1968 figure although there have been decreases in the acreage and tonnage of cones reaped as well as in the average yield. You can see, Sir, that every year it is worse and worse, and not better and better.

Mr. Speaker, taxing is all right; but when one does not find what to pay with when he puts his hand into his pocket, you can only lock him up, and that still does not solve the problem. Every one of us looks forward in some form or fashion to the sugar industry, and if the Almighty does not send down his rain from above after these fires and we experience a drought, it will be good-bye; Bonnie has gone down the low road. Let us think in terms of what can happen. It is not good enough for us as a Government or as politicians to sit back and smile. This is more a time to cry, although I hear that big people do not cry. But there will be some crying, because when one is hungry and believes that you have something to eat, do not think he is going to die from starvation and let you keep your fridge or larder full. They are going to make you empty and miserable. Regardless of how many policemen are at the door, they will try to get some and the policemen may even tell them to. remember them. A hungry man or woman can be a dangerous person. I read, I think in a Trinidad newspaper, that a child went home and the food was not forthcoming, and he took up a cutlass and did some killing. I believe the ones he killed were filled, but it did not profit them anything.

Sir, we have to take this matter seriously and go into the question of how we are going to solve this problem. People in my opinion are not prepared to cut any more unburnt canes. There is so much trash on the canes that it would turn back your motor car, far less a cane bill, I am sure it would turn back a tractor. People have to clean, top and clean again. Nowthe margin between unburnt and burnt canes is

none, because if you are going to pay a penny a ton less for burnt canes, who is going to cut unburnt canes when by cutting five tons of burnt canes they can get about \$5 or \$6 more? It is a bad agreement. If you pay so much per ton for cutting and so much for cleaning and you do not have to clean, then do not pay for the cleaning. You should make the price for unburnt canes a little more attractive so that they can see their way to cut the unburnt canes and still get a berry. Suppose a fire starts and destroys the houses of these poor people; there is a possibility of losing lives. It is a dangerous thing to burn canes like that, because the question of the lives both of human beings and animals arises. Let us think about it and let politicians, the Union, planters and everybody come together to solve this problem. We should even have a White Paper on this to know what the Government is doing about it. We are late now because very little cane remains standing, and what little there was must have been destroyed yesterday when the fires were rampant. What are we going to do about it? This is a matter that should concern not only the Government or the Opposition, but every person. All is well that ends well. 4.05 p.m.

The Prime Minister in his Statement said: "This Government, however is not indifferent to the problem, and the proposed Prices Commission is designed to protect unwary citizens against unscrupulous traders and importers." He is not indifferent, but what is the good of not being indifferent and still not paying attention? There is a big difference there; in other words, he should be trying to solve the problem. When we were discussing the package tax earlier, I asked the Prime Minister to see what he could do with respect to certain commodities, and especially salt meat, and he indicated that he was aware that you will have to pay for the brine when the packages are being weighed, but if a package is 350 pounds, the whole barrel is going to weigh 350 pounds and you will have to pay for the meat and the barrel as well. You are going to pay for the salt and the brine which you cannot sell, and then you will tell me that I have to buy something which I cannot sell and should be satisfied to lose it, I will have to put up the price on what I can sell. You may talk about Tour Inspectors and the like, but except you are going to tie an Inspector to each scale in the Island, even then you cannot detect what you want to detect because some people have the scale too near to the ground.

That is not going to help the situation; so let us face the facts. I know that we must tax because we must get money to run the country. I am not saying you should not impose any tax at all, but there are certain commodities which you should try to control. It is the policy of this Government, and every Government, not to create unnecessary burdens on the food for the people of the country, but when you are doing these things you should not put it on directly. You have not imposed any additional tax on salt meat, but when you impose the tax on a package the retailer is going to add one cent more to the pound, and the Government is sheltering behind that to say that they have not taxed the food and tell you that you must be careful, when you go into the shops, to see that you get your proper weight. But that is not good enough. Directly you are patting it on and indirectly it is being taxed; so let us face the facts and go into the figures and try to keep the cost of living as near to the people's pockets as possible at the same time you are running your Government.

There are other things that you can tax; it is better to put a cent more on beer or gasoline and take a

cent off salt meat or rice. Put a cent more on beer, whiskey and so on, but keep the poor man's food down because we cannot do without food, and it is a fact that the Government has increased the salaries of their workers to help them with the cost of living but up to now I have not heard anything about an increase for the agricultural workers. This is going to be a different problem and a very difficult one. The Government cannot tell an employer how to pay his workers. I think that is the duty of the Union and the Sugar Producers Association; but they will tell you that they cannot pay more for labour than they are getting for sugar, but the question is that the people still have to eat. You go into a supermarket and you can bring out \$20 worth of goods in your pocket-book; you do not have to hire a motor car to take you home with them, because \$20 worth of food is not as much today as it was some years ago.

We were talking about the Pine Hill Dairy; they are selling milk now in bottles instead of tins, and in the advertisement on Rediffusion it is stated that you are saving money because it is cheaper to buy it by the bottle than in the tin. But they will not tell the people who do not know or who would not take the trouble to go into figures that when you buy a tin of milk you do not have to pay for the tin, but when you buy it by the bottle you have to leave a deposit of five cents for each bottle, and there is the possibility that the bottle might get broken; so the milk is going to cost you five cents more at the beginning. This means an increase in the cost of living to the very poor class of people, my people, because I am not representing anybody else but poor people. 4.15 p.m.

You will notice that they will criticise me and say that all I can do is to talk about poor people. I do not know anything more; I know what it is to be poor; I know, when you do not have a dollar bill in your pocket, how you are looked upon. Even some people have a dollar bill in their pockets and they are still looked upon as vagabonds. These people have to find 5 for an empty bottle, and they used to get the milk in tins. I do not know whether the Minister has questioned this matter, and I hope he will explain it when he is replying. I want to know if the Minister knows the reason why they have changed the milk from tins to bottle. Of course, I know that the reason, from the point of view of the people at the Milk Plant, is to make more money.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to know why the Milk Plant have changed from tins to bottles in the case of producing Evaporated Milk. The reason is due to technical difficulties that have not yet been overcome, and they have had to resort to bottles instead of, as formerly, tins. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY What are the technical difficulties?) I am not a technical man; do not ask what are the technical difficulties; I am a politician; I thought the hon. member had more basic common sense. Does he expect me to come here prepared to tell the House about the technical difficulties at the Milk Plant? That is what has been told to me. If a technical man came here and explained it, the hon. member would not be able to understand the position.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is hardly a point of order, now.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, technically, that is a first class excuse for the people up there, but not for me.

Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order. I regret that the hon. member has deemed it as an excuse; I do not accept that it is an excuse; I accept it as a real condition of fact. Something has been discovered that is wrong, and a lot of experimentation has been done. I know that they have experienced technical difficulties and have had to resort to producing Evaporated Milk in bottles.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed with his speech. There are many other members who have not yet spoken and who may speak in their turn.

Mr. SMITH:

That is true, Sir. I did not accuse the hon. Minister of making any excuse. I said that it was an excuse by the people up there, but the Minister did not allow me to carry on. That is an excuse for them, but it is not one for me. From the time Adam was a boy, we were getting Evaporated Milk in tins; they took the matter out of the hands of the merchants and placed it in the hands of the B.M.C., and the B.M.C. put it into the hands of the Pine Hill Dairy. We were getting tins all the time; even when they were putting rock stone in the tins, we were getting tins. We were not told in the Budget that the Plant was running out of tins; the members of the public were not told that the Plant could not get tins. We are importing more milk than anything else, and I thought that when the Plant was put up, we would have been able to supply ourselves with all the milk that was needed.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order. I am sorry I have to interrupt the hon. member. There is no question of a shortage of tins. It is a question that technical difficulties have arisen in the canning process of Evaporated Milk. (Asides.) I am not a scientist; I do not pose as one; I am just an ordinary man and I know my limitations; otherwise I may not have been here now. I want the hon. member to erase from his mind that there is any shortage of tins. Technical processes are involved, and this is a technical matter to have the milk in sealed containers. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member make his point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, this is no excuse that is being offered. Other countries have overcome these difficulties. The Scandinavian countries have overcome these difficulties, but at our Milk Plant these technical difficulties are not yet overcome. As soon as the difficulties are overcome, they will revert to producing Evaporated Milk in tins or cans.

Mr. SPEAKER; The point has been made and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has a right to continue.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Are the technical difficulties in Barbados or overseas?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for the City has not yet spoken, and he will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, if they are experiencing technical difficulties up there, then put the matter back in the hands of the merchants who have not been experiencing any. Let the merchants get the licences for importing Evaporated Milk in tins, and we will be able to get on. In my opinion the difficulties are that they want to get more out of the milk than they should. They either want to give us more water or milk of not as good a quality as formerly. That is how I feel about the matter. All of these years we were getting Evaporated Milk and all types of milk, and when you put the milk into your tea, you had real milk. I cannot forget Carnation Milk, because the moment you put three or four drops into your tea it would change its colour. We were getting milk in tins and now you are turning to bottles. We are not satisfied with this.

Mr. Speaker, the people up there are increasing the cost of living by leaps and bounds. Do you know that the small man has to buy a certain amount of cases? He cannot send and buy 5 or 10 cases any more. A supermarket could send an order for 5 cases of milk without sending one cent, and the proprietor will have 60 days in which to pay for it. I understand that if you need 100 cases nowadays the

money must be sent with the order. The only item I know that the money must go with the order is when you are buying cigarettes. I do not care what they do with cigarettes. The doctor has never put me on cigarettes, but he has put me on milk. These people at the Plant are making it more difficult for the people and for the Government, too. If the members of the Government do not pull up their socks, it is their business.

4.25 p.m.

These people up there are making it too hard. Why can't they give a fifty or sixty days' credit as the merchants and agents used to do? What is it in this country that we are doing that is cheaper? Tell me something you can get cheaper than from outside. If you want to know how much you can reduce the cost of living, fly the tape on soap and certain commodities. Let Lever Brothers send soap down here, and let the other milk people send milk and other commodities here, and you would be surprised to know how cheap we will get such things in this country; but if you want to look at it in one way and save the situation in another, you will have to pay. These technical difficulties are all right. I know people might say ram angling for a Ministry, but if I were a Minister for one month, I would check up on everything. You would not be able to send me anything in writing and tell me any foolishness that I would not go into myself. This is not a reflection on the Minister, and I hope he will not take it that way; but if that had come to me as a Minister, I would call the bosses to my office and they would have to point out all the technical difficulties, and I would fire questions at them, and ask why it is we could not get these things. I would ask whether other people could supply milk in tins, and if they could, I would give instructions to order it. If the company is unable to can the milk, let the Carnation people supply the milk until the company can fix-it-right. But you should not fleece the people, because they are not able to carry the burden anymore.

Mr. Speaker, the bottle question is a serious thing. Imagine a tin of milk is for 30 cents and you are going to get a pint; now you will get the same pint of milk for 25 cents, but the bottle cost you five cents. You may keep the bottle too near the heat and it flies, or the children handle it too roughly and it breaks. It means you have to look for another five cents to pay for another bottle. I am only concerning myself with the increase. Why depart from the tin?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member may continue Private Members' Business at the next meeting.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for fifteen minutes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On resumption

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Government Business, and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was addressing the Chair when the House was considering the Property Transfer Tax.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I think I was speaking Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is what I said.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I did not hear my name.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid there is no cause yet for me to name the hon. member this afternoon. I hope I do not speak prematurely.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will upon this occasion satisfy the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and be not too long, but I would like while I may, to lend some support to the arguments of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, having had the reassurance from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on that somewhat ticklish point. There are a number of plantations that are being cut up, overseas companies are buying them, because when a group of Barbadians get together and agree for a Bank Trust Company to hold their interests and take nominee control of a Cayman Islands Company, that is yet an overseas interest. Sandford Plantation has been sold thus; I understand Turners Hall has been sold thus. These plantations are sold overseas. It is obvious to everybody that the selling or the purporting to sell as agricultural land is a sham. A mockery has been made of the Resolution brought by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. We ought at least in this House to have no doubt about his sincerity in wanting peasants to get a small plot of land on which to grow a few vegetables, but there is no doubt that these plantations have been bought to take advantage of the rule that, generally speaking, if you buy a parcel of land for agricultural purposes, you are allowed to build a house on it, and I predict that Sandford Plantation has been sold out in these lots under agricultural permission, and that on those lots nothing but tiny kitchen gardens are going to be placed. These lots are there for the purpose of people building their houses on. It makes a mockery of Town Planning. The Minister of Agriculture himself should take it on. It is reprehensible that a member of this House and a Minister should be associated with an obvious attempt to defeat the spirit of the Town Planning laws. All that can be said in his favour, as far as I know, is that at the time when the arrangements were being made, he was not then a Minister. That undoubtedly can be said in his favour; but the idea of selling plantations overseas, taking advantage of the reduction from four acre lots to two-acre lots, and then selling these lots at prices that make it obvious that they are intended for house building and not for agriculture, makes a mockery of Town Planning. The Ministry of Agriculture must look into it. Their studies have shown that you cannot operate efficiently on any two-acre lots. It might be that people want the land, and I have no doubt that when tomatoes are \$1.20 a pound you can grow a lot of tomatoes very efficiently on two acres. I believe that at \$1.20 a pound you can grow them on one-eighth of an acre lots and operate efficiently; but that will not be the general pattern.

Mr. Speaker, when you study the plans of Sandford Plantation, you realise that obviously these lots have been laid out with a view to the future roads, future electric service and future paraphernalia that will go with housing development, because, after all, if you buy a plantation for agricultural purposes, you do not need the same volume of roads as you need if you cut it up for house buildings. Many people may be quite content to have one road run down the side, a small road no bigger than is necessary for a

tractor to get in and out, but for houses you have to have something different, and when you study the plans approved by the Town Planner, even he must know that the spirit of the Act is being contravened. I am not making any reference to the Minister of Agriculture. He knows I do not have to emphasise it.

As far as the property transfer is concerned, the fact that the Government is getting a little speculation out of these cuttings-up should not blind hon. members to the wastage of the land and the price involved.
4.55 p.m.

This is the real problem. Barbados has a limited land area; it is nice to have two acres of land on which to build your house; it is pleasant; it is a nice thought that you can have a nice 2-acre garden - I would like one, myself - but can we afford it in the Barbados of today? If you, due to the pressures referred to by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, allow agricultural land to be sold in 2-acre lots because it is so little land that people cannot afford to buy it in any larger lots, then are you going to be told that 2 acres is an appropriate lot for the size of a house? Of course at some stage there will be further pressure; the argument that will be raised is that the people are not growing anything, they are building houses here; so you could as well let them cut it up into one-acre or quarter-acre lots, and some of the people who are buying the present two-acre lots at the plantations - Sandford and various plantations, I believe even in your own constituency, Sir - are cutting up these lots, and people buy a couple of them and they will be able to bring on pressure that, since they are not being used for agricultural purposes, you should let them cut it up further for house building purposes, and the whole Town Planning concept will have gone through the window. A viable plantation like Sandford, you cut it up in the pretence that it is going to continue in agriculture, into 200 lots and then the buyers of those lots and the owners of the plantation, the Cayman Island Company - I think in any case the whole concept of Cayman Island Companies in which you hide your name is disgraceful, and I would not be at all sorry to see legislation introduced to force the Banks and other trust companies to disclose the names of the owners and controllers of land in this country.

Land is valuable monopoly, and nobody, not even a Minister of the Crown, should be able to shelter behind a Bank's privilege; but the owners of the land and the buyers of the lots will say: "It is not being used for agricultural purposes; so let us cut it up for house building purposes;" and the most enormous fortunes will accrue to persons as a result of political decisions taken. It is not good enough, Sir, in my submission. I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church has made the point on behalf of our Party that we support the principle of discriminatory property transfer tax, discrimination against foreign buyers. I would like to emphasise this even more; as far as we are concerned, it could have been more discriminatory. I said this on an earlier occasion on a Private Member's Resolution in reply to the Budget, and I would like to go on record as repeating it there. Especially I would like to join with the hon. senior member for Christ Church and say that it is disgraceful that foreigners should be able to come here and compete for house-building land with Barbadians on equal terms or anything near equal terms. It is one thing about buying land to put up a hotel; it is a very bad thing indeed where you see the expensive residential districts of Barbados are made more expensive by the competition of persons from

countries with higher standards of living than ours. Never let us forget that in the Bahamas, for example, where the people perhaps enjoy a standard of living, let us say, 50% more than ours, the Government revenue in the Bahamas for 80,000 people is twice ours; that can only mean, and it means nothing more than this, that Bahamians have a lot of money in their pockets, money which due to the fact that the rate of exchange is not adjusted as between the Bahamas and any other member of the sterling area, money which comes from a position outside their own country more privileged than a position inside -and I do not grudge them this, although it is true, perhaps, that the necessities of life cost three or four times as much as they cost in Barbados; but when the ordinary lower eschelon workers in the hotel business earn 160 to 70 to 80 a week in the Bahamas, we only have to realise what we would do if there were an influx, even of Bahamians, coming to Barbados to buy land, because if you earn that much in the Bahamas, obviously translated into Barbadian terms, those people are competing with us for our own with resources which we cannot match -the resources of inflation in the case of the Bahamas, but the resources of national wealth in the case, say, of the United States, and for this reason I would quite firmly support this Bill.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, not in as many words as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, but I am giving the House and the people of this country this assurance, that I am very mindful of the sort of situation that can result if we allow sub-division of land for agricultural purposes and at the same time such sub-division as will result in establishing expensive housing areas that may be done to the personal profit of foreigners, Quite recently, just about two or three weeks ago - I do not think the hon. member for St. Thomas has heard this yet - but there is a group of plantations in St. Michael which have just changed hands. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY Which group?) I am not going to divulge which group; I am not a gossip monger in here; I am a responsible Minister of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing you, Sir, not so very long ago, about two or three weeks ago, information came to me that a group of plantations in the parish of St. Michael had changed hands, and I became very much concerned when I heard this, and the very next day I called in my Chief Agricultural Officer and I told him on no account must I hear or learn that any permission will be given to these new owners to subdivide for the purpose of establishing any housing areas. (Asides.) The real estate gentleman and the members of the legal profession may soon hear about it, I am surprised they have not yet heard, but it is a fact. (Asides).

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair, especially those who have not yet spoken, will please await their turn.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

They think I am a gossip monger. I am not a gossip monger in this Place; I am a responsible Minister of Her Majesty's Government in Barbados, and I want to say that I have my eyes on the ball and I know my responsibility to the people of this country, and I know that our land mass is very, very limited and we believe in rural housing. I am one member who represents a rural constituency and I want land for housing areas in St. Peter, but I am finding a lot of difficulty in so doing; when it is not zone-trouble, water is not available, or it is one thing or the other; and therefore I am not going to sit idly by and see useful areas of agricultural land changing hands, maybe, to foreigners who will come here to get fat because they are able to develop palatial housing areas. 5.05 p.m.

I am not falling for that. I like Barbados better than any other country. I am glad the hon. senior member for St. Thomas raised this point, and I am 100% behind it. I was not able to see very clearly the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church but, I think, to some extent it has been clarified by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who told the House that you do not need as many roads when you are developing agricultural units as when you are developing housing areas. This morning I was not very clear in mind as to the point that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was trying to make. He is usually lucid, but, I am afraid, not so on this particular occasion. I owe it to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who clarified the point for him.

Sir, I am as mindful and as serious as any other Barbadian that, at any rate, agricultural land, when it changes hands, should be preserved and retained for agricultural purposes. There is a lot of rab land in Barbados that can be used for housing. As a matter of fact, nowadays we hear that rab land cost more than agricultural land, because it is better for housing. There is a lot of land in your constituency, Sir, that is suitable for housing areas. I regret that there is not as much land in my constituency, but that is the position, I am watching this business. I have been watching it for a long time, and I am as serious as any hon. member that, when land is subdivided for agricultural purposes, it must be used for agricultural purposes. Land must not be bought with a view in mind to ostensibly say that it is being bought for agricultural purposes when the net end result is that you are going to develop palatial housing areas.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has today expounded that the policy of the Government will be that no land that is provided for agricultural purposes will be allowed to be sold in lots for building purposes. This is a departure from the policy of the Government, because I have made it clear in here that it seems to me that what the hon. member has said applies to local people when they apply for permission to cut up land; however, when foreigners apply for permission to cut up the same land they are given the green light.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I see no distinction between a foreigner and a Barbadian when

it comes to the subdivision of land for agricultural purposes. I would not sign permission for a man because he was a Barbadian and I thought he was going to use good agricultural land and convert it into a building estate. I wish the hon. senior member for the City will get this crystal clear once and for all that, as Minister of Agriculture, I see no distinction between granting permission to a Barbadian and a foreigner.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point. Let the hon. senior member for the City continue,

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear the hon. member say that he sees no distinction. I would like to know what accounts for this. Some young men in this country got together -one was a local Solicitor, Mr. Hewitt and they bought Grazettes land. It was agricultural land, and they applied to the Town And Country Planning Department for permission to cut up the land. Do you want to get up again?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to giving permission, the Chief Agricultural Officer comes into the matter, and that is done in my Ministry, but the Town And Country Planning Department operates under the Ministry of Home Affairs, where I have no jurisdiction as a Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Town And Country Planning Department will call in the Highways Department on the question of roads and so on. They will call in the Agricultural Department to decide whether it is agricultural land and for what purpose it could be used. I say that the local men applied and were turned down, and then a foreigner was granted permission to develop land. I say that without fear of contradiction. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS I am not responsible for that.) I am not saying that you are responsible, but it happened in Barbados. I am very glad to hear you say that the Government's policy will not be to allow people to buy land under the guise of cutting it up for agricultural purposes, and then allow them to build houses on it, or divide it for the purpose of building houses on it. If it is the policy for one, it should be the policy for all. It should be the policy for Ministers, Members of Parliament and everybody else.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; I beg to second that

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and MR. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr, YEARWOOD in the Chair,

Clauses 1 to 3 were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee,

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, before moving that the Bill be read the third time, I should like to state that during the interval which ensued between the second reading and the present moment, I have checked with the Minister of Home Affairs, and the Aliens Landholding Bill is being finalised today for presentation before the House shortly.

I beg to move that the Bill be now read the third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

5.15 pan.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, but I understand that copies of this have not yet been circulated amongst hon. members. I myself have not received a copy. I understand it is in the Printery.

Rt. Hon.. E. W. BARROW:

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, was cyclostyled. It is a very lengthy Bill. I do not know to what stage the Government Printery has got with it. During the interval I tried to check on it. I understand that the proof has been delivered to the Clerk of the House; so it is still in a period of gestation, and not digestion. But I am wondering if hon members would accept the cyclostyled copy of the Bill; I do not mean for debate now. It may save a lot of time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There were certain problems with the cyclostyled copy and the printed copy of the Public Order Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; I hope that in order to save time that after we pass the second reading, we can go to Select Committee and dispose of it that way, because it is a much more efficient way of dealling with a technical bit of legislation like that. Of course that is a matter for the House, I spent a considerable amount of time yesterday evening going through the clauses which I think would occasion some debate, and it could take a long time, because it is a fairly lengthy Bill and lot easily capable of comprehension.

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that Order No. 10 be the next Order of the Day,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 4) ORDER, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 10 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.4) Order, 1970.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The instant Order is a Civil Establishment Order made by me on 2nd June this year, and in accordance with practice I am seeking the approval of the House for the creation of a post of Secretary in the Ministry of Finance at the salary stated, the replacement of one post of Customs Guard by a post of Keeper of the Powder Magazine. In that context, I might say that we recently made an Order allowing

the former Powder Magazine to be used as a petroleum warehouse. Personally I think that the merchants ought to provide these facilities and pay for them. I do not think in this day and age that Government ought to be providing petroleum warehouses and matters of that kind for the mercantile community and charging them for them. I am all for the charging, but I do not see it is part of our duty. It does not happen in any other territory in the Caribbean. Anyhow we are looking into that. However, the Order here is for the replacement of the post of Customs Guard by a post of Keeper of the Powder Magazine.

In the Inland Revenue Department, we have had considerable changes in the structure of the Department, and we have divided it into three main Departments - an Audit Department, a Technical Department and a General Services Department. One of the officers at my request did a survey of the procedures which have been instituted, and by doing 33 audits out of a total of some 3,700 we were able to collect something like \$238,000 of additional taxes by the re-organisation. By a process of extrapolation one could come to the conclusion that we could probably collect another \$120 million worth of tax, but of course that is not so. However, I do feel there is a considerable amount of tax evasion and with a proper audit, sending people on the spot to check books and so on, we would be able to ease up on the incidence of personal taxation in the island if all the people who should be paying tax were made to pay by a proper system of inspection and audit. So any money that we spend in the Inland Revenue Department, in my humble opinion, is well spent. Having divided the Department into three sections - Audit, Technical and General Services -we will need three Senior Inspectors in addition to what we have now, three Inspectors, one Trade Tax Officer, two Assistant Accountants, two Senior Clerks, two Clerical Officers and one Stenographer Typist at the salaries stated.

I should also mention at this stage - it will not be seen in the Addendum to the Resolution - that we also administer all the tax collections for the former Local Government Authorities, and that is equivalent, as far as I can remember, to some \$5 million or \$5.8 million in additional revenue. As far as I can remember, those are the figures distributed between the three Local Government Authorities, but I speak subject to correction, and we have not had any commensurate increase in staff. We have had a slight increase in staff, but not comensurate with the amount of money which we have to collect and the number of tax bills which have to be processed. I hope to simplify the proceedings even more, because the Data Processing centre is now functioning, and I hope I will be able to invite hon. members to see our cumputer at work. We are now writing up the programmes for the different Departments whereby we can put a lot of these things on the computer and simplify the business of collection and billing. However, we still need this additional staff in addition to the staff which we have, working in close cooperation with the people in the Data Processing centre who are already at work.

In the Training Division of my office we need another post of Training Officer. The budget of the Training Division is something like \$300,000 for this financial year - it is certainly over \$200,000; it may be closer to \$500,000 - and we need another Training Officer in order to get the programme off the ground.

In the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology, we need two posts of Senior Agricultural Assistant. We have in the Ministry of Agriculture now recruited an Agricultural Engineer, and we will need the people to assist him who would be trained up to the sub-professional level in the job which the Ministry has undertaken of agricultural engineering, and this unit will advise the Minister on all aspects of mechanisation. As a matter of fact, the Agricultural Engineer has already been working very closely with the Sugar Producers Association on the inevitable question, as I said seven years ago, of mechanisation of the sugar industry of Barbados. We either mechanise or get out of business, and I do not think it would be a bad thing, because people take pride in machinery while they do not like using cane bills; not for any legitimate purposes that I know about anyhow, but they are being inspired by some of the cohorts of the people on the other side to use them for other illegal purposes. I do not know of any hon. member on the other side present and voting here today who is exhorting people to do this kind of thing, but I think cane bills should go out altogether, and if we can do the harvesting by mechanical means, so much the better. Maybe people will take a new pride in agriculture. For instance, I believe that fuses ought to go out and that all dynamiting should be done by the Police with electric detonators, and we have asked the Commissioner of Police to look into that too.

5.25 p.m.

There are certain things which belong to a bygone age and can only be used for purposes which cannot be beneficial to the community. The Agricultural Engineer is assisting the Ministry in the mechanisation of the sugar industry in the area, in relation, of course, with another aspect of his work.

In the Port we have automated, or we are in the process of completing the automation of the Lighthouses, and the posts of Head Keeper and Assistant Head Keeper have become redundant; most of the officers, five-sixths of them, are very close to retiring age, and for those who are not retired, alternative employment will be found for them somewhere in the Government Service or they will be given the option of retiring with compensation for loss of office.

In the Ministry of Health and Community Development we are going to create a post of Health Engineering Assistant. I understand that a very competent officer inherited from the Bridgetown City Council is doing a very good job in the Ministry, and I think that they need some assistance in this Department.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Education are helping the Ministry of Community Development; this is slightly more complicated an Order in that this is an adjustment to the first Qualification Bar in the salary scale applicable to Welfare Officers, Probation Officers and Mental Health Workers. The

present salary scale is \$3,600 -4,800 with a Qualification Bar at that point, then \$5,040 to 6, 480 with another Qualification Bar and then \$6, 720 to 7,200. The new salary scale will be \$3,600 - 5, 760 (Q.B.) 6,000 -6, 480 (Q-B.) 6, 720 -7,200.

As you will see, Mr. Speaker, the bottom of the scale and the top of the scale both remain the same, but the intermediate Qualifying Bars have been shifted upwards in respect of these officers. The reason for that, I am informed by the Minister, is at the period of training for posts is a minimum of three years to get over this qualification Bar; therefore they should be given an opportunity to go on to a higher point in the scale before the Qualification Bar applies. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Generally speaking, I think most of us will agree with the Order, but there are some comments which I would like to make. Usually you cannot make these comments when there is a Resolution for money relative to a Department, but while this is a Resolution to amend a Civil Establishment Order, I would like to draw to the Prime Minister's attention, first of all, a few things in the Ministry of Health. This Department is in charge of the Hospital, and there is a tremendous grievance going on there with people who have been acting in posts for as much as nine years and have not yet been appointed; the argument is that the Establishment can only carry a certain number of people. Nurses who recently have qualified there were called in - I think there were 16 of them - and told that they would have to look for work somewhere else because they would not have any work for them. You must know the disappointment which these young ladies met with.

With reference to the Ministry of Education, I would like to know from the Prime Minister what is the point of our fooling ourselves that the Establishment can only carry a certain amount of people. At the Primary Schools there are teachers who are on staff, receiving increments, but have been there for a period of about six to nine years and have not been appointed. This is a disadvantage because they do not know if those years will be taken into account when or if they are appointed. If they want to get help at the Bank, they cannot get this help because they are not appointed, and it is difficult for a person to work for nine years at a place, with the necessary qualifications, and to be told that they just cannot be appointed and given no other reason, but the reason given quite recently is that the Establishment can only provide for so many. We are just fooling ourselves that we are running a teaching establishment with a number of teachers, but really and truly we need more.

As far as the Hospital is concerned, I just want to make it clear that it does not seem fair to me to take Nurses and train them and then when they are qualified you do not appoint them; yet you need more Nurses because Nurses come in after them and are appointed. I would like the Prime Minister or the Minister of Community Development to give me the answers.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. junior member for Christ Church who has seconded the motion did not intimate that he would be seeking leave to speak later on.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has informed the House that the computer is now at work and he has expressed a desire that members of this House see it in operation. We are glad, indeed, that the equipment is functioning; but what we are particularly concerned with is this. Is the Prime Minister in a position to tell us what assistance, if any the Government gets from such places like International Systems Associates in their programming department or any other way in getting the computer to be functioning the way it is going now? It might appear a bit strange, Mr. Speaker, for an hon. member to seek that information, but one reason is that there are quite a number of young women who have been trained here by the same International Systems Associates, and when Government advertised for staff for the Inland Revenue Department, or the Computer Department, they made applications through Service Commissions, but as far as we can gather, up to the present only two girls from International Systems have been recruited on the staff of the Inland Revenue Department to work on this computer. 3.35 p.m.

There is a suspicion amongst members of the staff at International Systems that there is some sort of conspiracy between Government and International System? not to recruit trainees from International Systems to work in the Government Service. There are no two ways about it; our girls have shown an adaptability second to none in proving their worth in the Programming Department at International Systems. I say that as one speaking with a measure of authority. But what has surprised so many is that, for Government requirements, so few have been recruited from International Systems. We would certainly like to know whether it is true that International Systems render some assistance to the Government in its Programming Department or, perhaps, in other ways and Government is, sort of, compensating International Systems for what they have done by not attracting staff from International Systems over to the Government.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who has just sat down, to read the Constitution of Barbados. If I were appointing people to work, with my limited knowledge of data processing, I would certainly look for people with experience. Appointments are made by the Public

Service Commission, and the Minister has nothing to do with appointments; he can neither approve nor disapprove. I do not know, because I have not seen the applications, but I can get the numbers from the Personnel Officer. I think he will give me them, I will find out from the Personnel Officer how many of the girls from International Systems Associates applied for jobs. My impression is that most of the people who were recruited were people already working in the Government Service.

Now, you will have to work in the Government Service of Barbados to know that it is like some kind of Lodge or Freemasonry. You cannot get in from outside very easily unless you are initiated. As a matter of fact, they do not allow even Ministers to know what is going on, because they function as an independent Republic. I am telling you the facts now. Many mornings I walk into my office and see people sitting there, and I think that they have come in to hold on for people who have gone outside. Three months later when I notice they are still there, I have to go up, introduce myself, and say "Are you working with me now?" That happens because the Public Service Commission do not tell me when they are moving somebody from my office. Every week the Ministers come and complain to me that good officers are moved away or sent on training, and the Ministers are not even informed about it. They insist that this is in the Constitution of Barbados, and the Ministers are nothing to do with it.

Now, I did a little Cold Pone Management Course on Data Processing in Mexico. I have a brother who is an expert and, before you ask any questions, my brother came down here at his own expense and got the Unit going. Somebody dropped it on an aeroplane and \$30,000 worth of damage was done to it. Nobody knew what to do, and my brother came down and ordered I.D.M. to take back the machinery and send us a replacement for the main 1401 unit. He did that at his own expense, although the Cabinet had agreed to pay his passages. He said that he preferred to meet his own expense. He went to Mr. Bamson, I think it was, and asked him that while the machine was idle - they have a 1401, 1402 and 1403, the second generation machines that we have - and these people were being recruited and paid by the Public Service, whether he would take on some of them for two weeks to keep their hands in. If I may use my brother's expression, all of them down there appeared to be terrified of the machine; nobody wanted to go near it; they did not want to go into the same room, and, in order to get rid of this psychological fear of the machine, he suggested that that should be done, and it was done. There was an arrangement, and I believe it was done.

I am surprised to learn that there were young girls working at Grazettes doing key-punching, and so on, and the Public Service Commission would not take them on. One of the problems may have been that the qualifications for entry into the Government Service - perhaps these girls who were competent at the technical job may not have had 4 Certificates at Ordinary Level. I do not think it is necessary to have 4 Certificates at Ordinary Level to be a key-punch operator; I think that to be a programmer you will need two or three. It is a question more of aptitude than what formal education you have or how many Certificates you have managed to scraps together.

For instance, a long time ago in Mr. Puisinelli's recommendation we had 400 vacancies in the Government Service. We have only just got the Hospital up to its full establishment, after so many years, by recruiting people from England and so on. It is only within the last three or four months that the Nursing Staff at the Hospital got up to its complement of staff. We know the reasons for that, because they have to be trained people (Asides.) At one time we were 52 Charge Nurses short; so you can imagine what must have been happening with the patients.

The Minister of Health is here and he confirms what I have said. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Ask Mrs. King, the lawyer's wife.) That is because we are now up to our complement. Anybody who applies now will have a hard time, because we have now reached our complement for the Nursing Staff. We have recruited staff from all over the place, but the most of them are Barbadians.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has said "On a point of order."

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am now resuming my speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

You cannot resume in the middle of my speech. I thought you had finished your speech.

Mr. HINDS:

I gave way to you.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I thought you had finished. What kind of procedure is that? I indicated to the member that I was going to answer his question, and he sat down. He did not say that he was giving way to me.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, no Minister has to indicate to any member on this side that he is going to answer a question. I thought the hon. Prime Minister had something to say on a particular point, and I gave way.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, one thing.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Clerks at the Table inform me that they have noted that the hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke, and that the Hon. Prime Minister rose to reply.

Mr. HINDS:

That is not so. The Clerk is wrong. Mr. SPEAKER The Clerks at the Table.....

Mr. HINDS:

I am not concerned with the Clerks at the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The record also discloses that when the Hon. Prime Minister rose, it was not on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the truth is just this. I was addressing the Chair. The Prime Minister beckoned to me and it came to me as if the Prime Minister was saying that he had some point to make to some point I had raised, and I politely gave way. I was not in for any row.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would hear me, purely in the interest of justice - politics has nothing to do with it - with great respect the Clerks are mistaken. I got the impression that the member for St. Peter

was asked by his neighbour to sit down temporarily. There is a member of the Government Party there, and there is an Independent Member, They will bear me out as to whether we on this side did not get the impression that he sat down temporarily.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, on this question of the staffing.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I just want to make it clear, on a point of order, that I have not concluded my reply. I am sitting down because the hon. member says that he gave way to me. As long as that is settled, I do not have to cut any wires or anything like that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed with his speech.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to hear the Prime Minister say that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is now apparently for the first time in a number of years carrying its full complement of Nurses. Mr. Speaker, some time last year I visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Matron and the then Acting Director conducted me on a tour, and I am saying here and now that the Matron, of all persons, gave me to understand that the Hospital, as far as Nursing was concerned, was fully staffed, and I turned to the Matron then and told her that with the world shortage of nurses and she finds the hospital well staffed, Barbados could do an export trade in Nurses by training them and sending them abroad to make a living if they could not use them here. Those were my remarks to the Matron in the presence of the Acting Director. So when we hear that the Hospital is now staffed for the first time, something is wrong somewhere, and further, it was sometime during last year.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point or order, on a point of elucidation.....

Mr. HINDS:

I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member give way on a point of order?

Mr. HINDS:

He said he is on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member adhere to a point of order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I want to bring it clearly to the attention that at present there are thirty-six nurses who have recently qualified and whose services have been retained in that it is the policy of the Government to see that trained nurses' services are retained. There are not established post for these nurses, but they are being sent to District Hospitals in many cases to try and upgrade the staffing position in these places. They are not unemployed; there is a block vote from which we are paying them, but they have no established posts as such.

Mr. HINDS:

This now brings me to the point where during last year a trained nurse who had qualified in England, was sent to Ghana and worked in the United States, came back here, applied at the Hospital and was told that there was no vacancy.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, she may have applied for what we call well-diggers' jobs; that is, where you start at the top. Most people who go away, because they have been away, want to come back as Matron or Sister Tutor, and not as a Ward Assistant. I understand that I said it was from last year we were up to full complement. I understand from the Minister they may have been like that for over a year, and we have been carrying extra people that we did not have room for. So that is no big thing.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, whatever the Prime Minister might have to say or whatever the Minister of Health may have to say, there are conditions existing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at the Tutorship end. I am not dealing with the kitchen end of it. A Sister Tutor just a matter of hours ago had to resign. Why has she

gone? The truth is that they brought a foreigner and put over her head. I would like to hear the Minister of Health deny that that is so. But what must make conditions worse in the Ministry of Health is that during the Estimates I had to draw to the attention of this Honourable House the conduct of a Permanent Secretary, and I am saying here and now that when the Sister Tutor tendered her resignation, the Permanent Secretary told her it would be good if she could go then.

5.55 p.m.

That is the kind of thing that you are getting in the Service. On this question of nursing and nurses' training and the like, there is no denying the fact that there is much to be desired, and the nurses generally have numerous complaints. One particularly is their diet, and what we seem not to bear sufficiently in mind is the fact that if you have a hungry or a dissatisfied nurse in any respect, that nurse cannot be expected to minister to the needs of the sick because she has her own problems, and most of the difficulty with the nurses is that they are experiencing a hardship as far as their diet is concerned, and this comes from the kitchen,

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would suggest to the hon. member that he can avoid details and deal with the general principles of this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS:

What I am concerning myself with is that if an officer in any Department makes himself a nuisance in that Department, our suggestion is if by having him placed there he is making 300 or 600 - and in this case he is making an average of 1,000 - people miserable, we do not mind what his attachments are or his length of service; what we are concerning ourselves with is that we would very much like to know that nurses and patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or at any other Institution where the sick has got to be ministered to, are properly attended to, and that their dieting problems are of such as not to cause the doctors further difficulties in the cure of those patients. I would wish to know, not that Mr. Boo Spencer is dismissed - I would not like that; he has to earn his bread; but we would like to know that a trained decent Chef who knows his job is employed at the Hospital, regardless of what it costs the taxpayers. We are willing to vote for a proper Chef; and if they need two proper Chefs, we on this side of the House will be for it because it means that there will be no more loafers about the place - and remember this; the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a training institution just like the Mental Hospital. They have been upgraded, and we would like to know that all the key personnel in these institutions are shining examples for people to follow; that is what we are concerning ourselves with, nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, this question of teachers is one that has got to be looked into sooner or later; we cannot for any length of time go on as we are now going. It is unfortunate that education in this Island is in the

hands of the present Minister of Education. He lacks the experience with which to deal with educational matters, and he has shown that he is unwilling to accept advice when it is offered, and offered by very experienced people, people who have the interest of the Island at heart. We have throughout this Island teachers with grievances. Our Private Secondary schools are for the most part being blamed at every street corner that they are robbing people's children because they do not have enough trained teachers; we are saying that the Government ought to do something about having all of these schools equipped. They should be given more trained teachers according to their numbers, and something should be done to help the people's children to get.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is nothing in this Order I can see about teachers.

Mr. HINDS:

But there is something about the Gateman at the Hospital acting for nine years. They have no complaints against him, but for nine years he has not been appointed; that is something I would certainly like the Minister to look into. We do not want to hold up the passing of this Civil Establishment Order, and we just await the replies from the other side.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think that I have sufficiently answered the original question asked by the hon. member; the other observations which he made only displayed a wide sort of knowledge of what is supposed to be going on at the Hospital with which I am not fully acquainted. I do not think that any point has been made except an Establishments point, which is my Ministry, about the Gatekeeper who was therefor nine years. When I asked to have an investigation carried out, I discovered two things, first that some of the people there - the Minister of Labour and National Insurance knows about this - they have tried to get them on the Established staff, but they said they would not take an examination at their age and that they had been acting for five, six and seven years. That is one problem; I am not saying that the Gate-keeper was one of those persons because I do not know who the Gatekeeper is. The last Gatekeeper I knew was a man called Collymore in the days when I used to circulate around the Hospital when my uncle was on the Board and my sisters were two nurses there, but that is one case. Some of them came to me a couple of years ago and said that they had been acting all that time and the Public Service Commission had told them they would have to take an examination. That is one problem. 6.05 p.m.

The other problem is the problem of the Hospital Board. A lot of things have been in a state of suspension pending the return of the new Hospital Director, Mr. Williams, who will take things firmly in his hands. I do not know when the Ministry is going to recommend now, to be truthful about it. We did have everything ready for a Hospital Board, and all the people agreed that they would not ask for compensation. All of the Key Scale people were not put on the Establishment because there would be

the problem of a change-over to the Board. The Board would be directly responsible for them, and all the others who were already part of the Establishment of the Public Service would be in some kind of half-way house between the Public Service Commission and the Hospital Board, but in truth and in fact could only be disciplined or laid off through the machinery of the Public Service Commission.

Why a lot of the people equivalent to the Key Scales have not been taken on is due to the finalisation of the proposals for the establishment of a Board whereby they would come directly under the Board for all their conditions of service and so on. The people like the doctors and the nurses, who are already employed as part of the Establishment, and the people we put on today will remain as part of the Public Service and this is after an Agreement and discussion with the Whitley Council and so on.

With regard to acting appointments, we had Mr. Banfield acting at the Regiment for 7 years, but there was a reason for that. It was only after the Salaries Revision that the salary of the Adjutant was better than the salary of the Superintendent of Prisons; so we could not appoint Mr. Banfield as Adjutant in his own interest until we had changed the salaries. When people come to me and say that they had people working for several years and they were not appointed, the first thing I ask them is "Are they getting the money?" (Asides.) There is only one unfortunate case I know of, and that is at the Inland Revenue Department where the Commissioner was acting for three years and died at the age of 44, which nobody expected. That was not my fault, and you will have to ask the Public Service Commission about that one. When people act for eight or nine years, the minute they are appointed their appointment dates back to the day when they first took up the acting appointment. Sometimes these people are so happy; they have a nice job; they look around; they have nothing to row about and they say: "I have been acting all of these years and nobody is noticing me; I will go to my representative now and make a noise that I should be appointed." Sometimes it is not in their interest, because their substantive post may carry a higher salary than the post in which they are acting. You have people like Mr. Grannum acting as Manager in the Government Savings Bank when he was really appointed somewhere else. One has to do that thing sometimes as a matter of convenience and sometimes in the officer's own interest. In order to keep a man in a particular post you appoint him to a higher post, but allow him to remain in a certain Department. I do not think there is any real damage done. (Asides.) I will give way to the senior member for St. George.

We have a caterer, a young Barbadian with 8 years' experience. I believe his name is Mr. Marshall. -I understand that he is very competent, and I thought it would have settled all of your problems. We never had a caterer before in the Hospital.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir. I am telling the Prime Minister now that Mr. Marshall is being obstructed in his work by a Dispenser.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Anyway, that is not a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

What is the use of having competent people when this man wants to steal and do all sortss of wrong things in the Institution?

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day is No. 11. It stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the services of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1970.

FINAL APPROPRIATION (1969-70) Act, 1970

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, Section 108(4) of the Constitution provides that we may prepare Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure which shall be laid and voted on by the House of Assembly. We do that from time to time, and then as soon as possible after the end of the financial year, it is my duty to lay a Supplementary Appropriation Bill. There is no debate on this, because on each and every item in this Supplementary Appropriation Bill the House has already voted and approved of these appropriations by Supplementary Resolution. The purpose of the Appropriation Bill is merely to comply with the requirements of the Constitution of Barbados and have the Bill passed in its appropriate form.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be now read the second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to find out about this Bill is under the Schedule, Part 11, Capital, Head 109, Ministry of External Affairs. There is a figure of \$705, 836. It will be remembered that some time ago we had voted money to buy properties in Washington and so on, and that money either lapsed or we could not obtain the properties. I would like to find out from the Minister whether that money has yet been used with regard to the properties in New York and the one in Washington, and whether the other property in London has been bought.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, three properties have been acquired. Today I received notice of the final conveyance for the property known as "Belgravia", the former Czechoslovakia Embassy. The original one that we went for went through about eight different hands and came back to the Czechoslovakia Embassy, because the Westminster Council refused to give them the necessary permission. Eventually, we managed to regain it, but they were trying to sell it at a much higher price to various people. I am talking about the office. In other words, we will now leave Kensington High Street. As from yesterday we are in full possession of "Belgravia". I received the letter just an hour or two ago. That property is complete; the money has been paid, and I think it is 54,000 altogether. I can bring the actual figures later.

Now, there is a place in Wyoming Avenue, the former Panama Embassy. That is the one, I think, the hon. member is inquiring about. I had a look at that last week, and the renovation was going on. I think we will be in possession of that within the next few days. 6.15 p.m.

The third property is Thames-Ditton. This is the residence for the High Commissioner. That was paid for since the last financial year, way back in September or October, and I think I informed the House that that property has been acquired for 38,500, plus one or two little extras since we bought the Station Wagon and so on. All three purchases have been completed and I have seen all three properties. Thames-Ditton is opposite Hampton Court Palace on the opposite side of the river, and you would be very pleased to hear, Mr. Speaker, that we now own half an Island in the river Thames, so that we can talk about Barbados and its dependencies. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: What about a resident?) Do you mean about a High Commissioner in London? One will be appointed from the 1st July. You will hear an announcement within the next few days.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by lion. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. K. N. R, HUSBANDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER re-sumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISTION OF LAND AT SYNAGOGUE LANE

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order, No. 8, stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Synagogue Lane, St. Michael, for the purpose of highway improvement.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think hon. members on the opposite side need any preamble to this. The Schedule sets out the description of the property as follows-

All that certain piece or parcel of land (part Of a larger area owned by B.StC. Maingot et al and leased to the Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee) situate at Synagouge Lane in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island and containing by admeasurement three hundred and sixty square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on the remainder of the said larger area leased to the Synagogue Burial Grounds Committee and on Synagogue Lane or however else the same may abut and bound.

Hon. members will know that James Street is a one-way street going down, and Synagogue Lane is generally used if somebody is going down James Street and misses his way. He turns back through Coleridge Street and comes through Synagogue Lane.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I just got up to say that despite Party affiliation, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has been a friend of mine for some time, and I would like him to be careful, because something went wrong with everybody who interfered with Synagogue Lane.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

One other point I would like to raise, and it is whether anything will be done at the junction of the road, because it is very important if you are going to widen the road that the junction with James Street should be widened also.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, this is really a gift that has been made to us. I would like the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to be assured that I am not touching this. However, the reason why we are not going to tackle the bottom of the road at the moment is because you will remember that there is a shop and underneath on the left there are shoe-makers' shops and at the top is a lawyer's office. We do not want to disrupt them at the moment, because I do not want to invoke the wrath of the gods. (Asides.) I mean the

Jewish gods. Since the Hutchinsons have made this gesture, we have decided to accept it and see what we could do. Maybe, when we widen it, a car or two may be able to park without being an inconvenience to anybody who wants to pass.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not appreciate that any other hon. member sought to speak. The hon. member may do so with leave.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I wonder if the Minister realises that opposite the building owned by the Governor-General at the bottom, opposite the shoe-makers, that pink wall is quite derelict. The lady's shop does not use that side of the wall. You have there three or four feet of unused land. I know the area well because my office used to be upstairs. It is a tiny disused warehouse next to a lady who occupies a shop and used to supply me with lunch. I have often been in there, and I have never seen any activity carried on opposite the place where you go to buy shop goods at the corner, and this is what I think the hon. junior member for Bridgetown meant when he said you should widen the bottom. 6.25 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I can look into this.

Mr. St. JOHN:

If you pass there now you will see that part of the buildings which formerly belonged to a gentleman called Mr. Harewood, who is now dead, and there is a "for sale" - notice up. At the corner when you are coming out from Synagogue Lane and you try to get into James Street, trucks find it very difficult, but on Mr. Harewood's building, in which Miss Small has a cook-shop, there is a "for sale" notice there, and the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company is working for the estate. The problem is that at that junction where it goes on into James Street is impossible for a truck or any long vehicle to turn and the Police always have to be out there directing traffic.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if this work is necessary at all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member would give way, everybody seems to want to get into the debate now; so I might as well say something. The position is, Sir, that, in truth and in fact, it has the Minister at a disadvantage because the Ministry really had no plan for widening Synagogue Lane at all. The point is that they are giving us this land, and if it is being given away the Minister feels we should take it; so we have to do it this way in order to get a title. Not frequently I find myself in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition, but I think that streets like Synagogue Lane should have pedestrian walk ways permanently; there is no reason why traffic should go through Synagogue Lane at all. They should have a proper plan for widening the whole street, not any piece-meal nonsense. I think that the Minister will take note of what has been said, and either make it a pedestrian walk way or widen it properly by acquiring property all the way to the top.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave way.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, there are two reasons why I would suggest that this street be widened. Anybody coming from Bank Hall side.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

This not a point of order; it would have to be by leave.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

By leave, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Only if there is no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I was under the impression that they would be widening the street, and I would like to suggest to the Minister that the street should be widened because since Herreia's Furniture Store has opened business on that street, and there is also a bond there, it is virtually impossible to get from Magazine Lane on to James Street, and people who practise in the Courts and who try to get from the Courts back to Central Police Station have to drive all around town. Even though it is one way, it is blocked by traffic.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Government Business has now concluded. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for two weeks till the 23rd June, 1970 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.30 p.m.