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, 3rd March, 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); Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P. (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M. A. (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Trade and Tourism); Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P. (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS:

Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.; and Mr.

ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY,

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 13th January, 1970, I am informed, have been duly circulated and unless there is any objection, those Minutes may be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of that meeting duly to be confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following -

The Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year ended 31st December, 1968.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

The Customs Duties (West Indian Hosiery Manufacturing Company Ltd.) Order, 1970.

Statement showing Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders for the period ended 30th September, 1969.

Statement showing Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders for the period ended 31st October, 1969.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:-

A List of Government owned dwellings relating to Parliamentary Question No. 5 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to grant the sum of $50, 123 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 69, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of $23, 121 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Parti - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 70, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following: -

A Resolution to grant the sum of $36, 419 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1969-70, No. 71, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of $1,070 from the Consolidated Fund at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1969-70, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1969-70, No. 72 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Spencers and Hopefield plantations, Christ Church, for the purpose of erecting a Radar Station.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

I also beg to give notice, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 69, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also on my own behalf, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 77, 78 and 81, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to grant the sum of $8, 799 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1969-70, Annexed Estimates, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1969-70, No. 73, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question No. 59, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and Parliamentary Question No. 70, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, are ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 53, asked by the hon. junior member for St. George, is ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Resolution for $50, 123, the Resolution for $23, 121 and the Resolution for $36, 419, copies of which, I believe, have already been circulated, it is my intention to ask leave to deal with them in Committee of Supply at today's sitting.

In respect of the other Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next sitting to deal with those.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting I have consulted with the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and the proposal is that, since we have a fair amount of Government Business we would like to do as well as to conclude the debate on the Development Plan which, 1 believe, would need about three hours, it is for this reason that I move the suspension.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question in connection with Select Committees, especially the one dealing with the amenities for the House. This Select Committee was appointed long ago.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
What exactly is the hon. member doing? Is he giving notice of a Question?

Mr. HOPPIN:
I am asking leave to speak on this Select Committee, because I should like to know what is the position.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I will give the matter consideration and let the hon. member know in a short while.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, I beg to move that one month's leave of absence as from today's date be granted to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Philip who have both left the country on parliamentary business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be taken first.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Item.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to take charge of this Item and, if there is no objection, leave will be granted. Hearing no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, this Resolution will necessarily follow from the numerous amendments to the Civil Establishment Order, creating new posts in the several Departments of Government between 1968 and 1969. There has, of course, been in respect of some of these Orders changes in the designation and nomenclature of some posts, and also of course, in consequence of the recent salaries revision. 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be taken next.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:
Item No. 5 is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Ellerslie Gap, St. Stephen's Hill, St. Michael, for the purpose of improvement of the road leading to Ellerslie Comprehensive School.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, as the Addendum sets out, deals with the necessity of preparing a proper access road to Ellerslie Comprehensive School. This has been a matter which has been hanging fire for quite a long time, almost from the time the school was constructed, and several owners are concerned with various bits and pieces of this land. The question of who owns the land is important in order to secure both Indefeasible titles as well as to get some decision on prices; for these and other reasons the negotiations have been hanging fire, and it is therefore now decided to Invoke the Land Acquisition Act to remedy these defects. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not against the Resolution, but I just want to use this opportunity to find out something. The Ellerslie School is not visible from the road, and I wonder if the Minister would tell us how many are at this school; I have been trying to find out this for some time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this is a Comprehensive School built in 1964 or 1965 to accommodate, as far as I recall, 1,000 pupils; 1,400 to be exact.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave-the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that there be an Instruction that the House, while in Committee of Supply, deal with the following three Money Resolutions, one for $50, 123, another for $23, 121, and the third for $36, 419, copies of which have been circulated today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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 of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

12.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.67 A Resolution for $70,004 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, we have received a grant from the Commonwealth Development and Welfare Fund in connection with this matter. The Housing Authority has started the project and has to be reimbursed. I do not know if there is any question hon. members would like to ask.

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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.68 A Resolution for $200,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this arises out of the salary revision. There has been no provision, obviously, in the Estimates for this, and this provision has to be made from a Supplementary by this House.

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

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is obvious now that the only way in which members of this House will ever get a Report out of any Government Department is to threaten not to support any Money Resolution in this House. We have had the experience of dealing with the Trans -port Board, the Development Board, and quite recently we dealt with C.B.C. I would like to find out from the Minister when we will be able to get the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Barbados Housing Authority for the year 1968-69. I would also like to find out from the Minister whether the Report is ready, and how soon we will be able

to get it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, the 1969 Report has already been drawn up by the administrative staff of the Housing Authority, and it should be laid on the Table of this Chamber in a few weeks' time.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, I only hope the Minister of Housing will understand that Parliamentarians are disgusted with the fact that these Reports take so long to come here. We cannot discuss Intelligently the day-to-day matters unless these Reports are put before us. This is 1970 and the financial year of the Housing Authority ends on the 31st March, 1969. We are now one year behind.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to allay the fears of the hon. member. During the last year there have been frequent changes in the post of Manager of the Housing Authority. The substantive holder of the post has been on leave for about three months; he returned, spent a month or two in the Ministry, and he has gone on a course. The Manager is responsible for the drawing up of the Report, and his coming-in and his going-out have occasioned a delay.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, there is just one point I want to raise. I wonder whether the Minister can tell us whether or not all of the persons whose salaries are to be adjusted have been included in this Resolution? I have very special reasons for asking this question.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

As far as I am aware, yes.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.71 A Resolution for $36, 419 was called.

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus Resolution. Head 10 - Accountant General -deals with the Incidentals, Electricity and Water, Books and Stationery, etc., and a New Item for furniture. The explanatory Notes are quite adequate.

I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 14 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 14 - Ministry of Health and Community Development - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, with regard to these flats or apartments at Enmore Health Centre, my information is that there is a Doctor there who has refused to move out of the apartment although he is not on the Hospital's staff. I should like to hear from the Minister what he has to say on the matter. At Enmore it is very difficult for certain Doctors and tenants to get the services of the Engineer. The Resident Engineer is responsible for certain maintenance services at these flats, and I am satisfied that reports have been coming out from that area which make some Doctors feel that there is some sort of discrimination going on. If something goes wrong at a particular flat, the wife of a white Doctor will call up the Resident Engineer and get prompt attention; but when the wife of a coloured Doctor calls, several days will go by before she can get the services of the Resident Engineer. Some of them are very dissatisfied about the situation. 12.45 p.m.

I am to say, too, that if they are people who are known to be friends of the Prime Minister, they can get the services of the Engineer almost immediately. I understand that there is a building at the corner to be sold to a certain Doctor to open a clinic. Is this true?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the hon. member who has just spoken is trying to secure some sort of information. When he spoke he probably referred to our Maintenance Engineer and Supervisor, Mr. Etheridge, but I should like to tell him that if there are two competent people in the Government Service of this country, Mr. Etheridge, the Maintenance Supervisor and Engineer, happens to be one.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the Minister lapses every now and again into this nonsensical position. Nobody is saying that Mr. Etheridge is not competent. All we are saying is that he is not making his services available to each and every one as readily as he should. That is our concern.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

When the hon. member spoke, he said that this man was on the Hospital staff. He is still there because his contract has been renewed.

Mr. HINDS:

I think the Hon. Minister has missed my point. I was not referring to the Resident Engineer as not coming out of the quarters. What I said with reference to the Resident Engineer is that he does not make those services which he controls available to each and every resident at these flats as he ought to, and the residents there have every reason to believe that he is discriminating against some people. I am not saying that he is not efficient.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I will make a note of what the hon. member has said and draw it to his

attention. There is nothing against Mr. Etheridge. He is one of our best servants in the Ministry of Health and Community Development. As far as the Enmore Health Centre is concerned, I do not know to whom the hon. member is referring, but they never had it so good.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are referring to a Doctor who is occupying quarters there, though not being on the staff of the Hpspital, and would not vacate the premises. What we may say against Mr. Etheridge is merely that he has been known to lend Hospital equipment such as the lawn-mower to his friends, and the grass is growing on the premises of other people.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I happen to be fully aware of the problem. I know that the lady Doctor was not granted the full amount of consideration, because on matters appertaining to personnel, dismissals, appointments, etc. the Ministers as such have no say whatever. The Prime Minister as Minister of Establishments is the one person who deals with this problem, but I will ask my Permanent Secretary to allow me to have the file, and Dr. Yeo to whom the hon. member referred will be given a reasonable time to move and look for other accommodation.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there is no sense in folding things up this way. What has happened is embarrassing to a very high-ranking officer, and I want to tell the Minister now that the general run of Civil Servants, Doctors and so on are really disturbed about it. The Minister should bring the story out. The lady was dismissed a long time ago and she cannot sue through the Public Service Commission. If there were people in the Pine or at the Farm in a similar position, you would put them out. It is embarrassing to the young lady that somebody can come here and do this. I think it is wrong, and the Minister should expose the whole thing. To say that only the Public Service Commission and the Prime Minister can "do that is saying that the Prime Minister and the Public Service Commission are condoning that a person has been dismissed from a job and you cannot get the house for other people to live in.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I understand the reason for the embarrassment. In this case there was an enquiry and the enquiry made one recommendation - the lady appealed to the Privy Council - that suppressed the facts and refused to give, in this country where you are supposed to have justice, access to the lady's lawyer to the documents under the Public Service Regulations. It is no wonder she is staying put and embarrassing everybody, because it shows how you can wangle and suppress evidence while giving it. The whole Hospital Administration is embarrassed because a lot of lobbying went on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this matter is being investigated at present, and the lady Doctor in question will be given some form of employment on a sessional basis in order to assist our Casualty Department which needs so much assistance. I am aware of the problem and I am trying to see what can be done to remedy it. Please allow me to do that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Hon. Minister who has just sat down to follow the Leader of the House in that respect, that is, by telling us that this matter is now being investigated, and at the same time is admitting that an offer is being made to the lady to retain her services on a sessional basis. In other words, you are investigating the matter of having her vacate the premises, and on the other side you are re-negotiating with her so as to entitle her to remain. 12.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, it is true. My wife goes to her every week; she is my doctor and my wife's doctor, and I am dealing with her case on a personal basis.

Mr. St. JOHN:

This is what happens when the Police try to bring a charge; they get themselves in this situation every time. The true facts are that the lady was charged for not carrying out her duty, when the point is that she was supposed to do 72 hours' duty a week.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the lady has two children and cannot give the time because of her two children. She is a first class Doctor, one of the best we have in this country.

Mr. St. JOHN:

The Hon. Minister knows very well that unless something is done about this case -it was so badly handled and so much suppression of evidence took place that the lady went on appeal to the Privy Council and documents she was supposed to see in order to make this representation to the Privy Council were denied her Counsel. It is going to be circulated all over the island, and you will see how many Doctors you will get to come down here to work. I know it is embarrassing to the Hon. Minister.

The question that Head 41 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the Resolution for $36, 419 do now pass was put and carried nem. con.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No.70 A Resolution for $23, 122 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution includes Supplementary provision under Head 3 - Parliament, Item 18 - Refreshments, of $4,800. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I understand that (a) no increased emoluments have been given to the Caterer for many years, and (b) only those persons - - I do not want to appear to be rude to any hon. member of this House unnecessarily -but it does not look right. We want a change in the menu; you cannot have that sort of thing all the time. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL You do not eat any.) But I understand good food before you. I believe that the Leader of the House should tell us if there is going to be some change.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, under Item 18 -Refreshments, I think this is an appropriate time for us to hear something about the Select Committee which was seeing after the amenities of the House and the conditions that exist in the dining room. This has been taking place for some time, and we have heard nothing about when the change-over will take place. Those of us who take our meals there realise that at times when the House is in session we sometimes have to take these meals which have come in approximately two hours before, and by this time they are rather cold. Provision has been made in this Select Committee's Report for hot plates, fans and coolers, and I would like to know what has happened to those proposals., We would like to have these enforced as soon' as possible, because this question was on the Order Paper, the Committee was set up and they met, and nothing has been heard of it. I hope some member of my Party or some Minister will be able to explain what is the delay in the improvements that have been outlined for the dining room, as well as the amenities for the House.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, this is very important, because we had many meetings and we had people from the Public Works Department; a plan was produced and everything, and now it has gone into the deep recesses of the Government Departments. Where is it? A Report was made, and all of a sudden it has disappeared and nobody seems to know what has become of it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, in all fair-ness, that is not exactly right, because when the hon. member for Christ Church is going to say that it has gone into the deep recesses of some Government Department, that is not strictly correct. I represent the Government, but the House is not a Government Department and the member should have raised this when Mr. Speaker was in the Chair. I am the Minister of Communications and Works and I have heard of it. Nobody seems to be able to tell me where it is, but I know it is a matter for the House and not for my Ministry or for the Government as such. If the House decides this is to be, this must be. The point is that I do not know where it is, and I have been enquiring for it for the longest time, and all I have been hearing is that it is at my Ministry; it is not in my office, but let us put the blame where it should go. It is the people here who should follow it up; it is the Speaker's duty, and it is about time that somebody told the Speaker that this pampy-pampy thing has to stop.

Mr. St. JOHN:

We are dealing with Parliament, and if this institution runs itself that inefficiently, I do not know, because I was a member of the Committee and I was told by the Clerk of the House that it was in the Ministry of Communications and Works or the Cabinet Office; the financial implications had to be worked out by reference to the Cabinet. That is the last understanding I had, and we must know about these things.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Sir, I would expect in the circumstances that the Leader of the House would give us some sort of statement about it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

If the hon. member would give way, it is unfair to expect the Leader of the House to say anything on this. I am a member of the Committee; the senior member for Christ Church, the junior member for St. George and the senior member for St. Joseph are also members of this Committee, but I have given the answer already that I am sure it is not at Cabinet. 1.05 p.m.

I have been told that, but I do not believe it. The Leader of the House cannot say anything about it, because he does not know about it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly true that I was never a member of that Committee, but my understanding is that the Select Committee reported to the House; the House approved the Interim Report, and there is a copy of a letter which the Clerk has just handed me, which I understand from him that he sent off to the Secretary of the Cabinet. It is dated 28th August, 1969, embodying the Report of 1969. It says

"Further to my letter to you of 11th July, 1969, under cover of which I forwarded to you a copy of the Interim Report of the above Committee, I now have the honour to enclose a copy of the detailed estimates of costs submitted by the Ministry of Communications & Works with respect thereto." The letter goes on to describe a meeting which the Committee had With a Mr. Bolarinwa, and at the bottom of the letter there is a complete list of some figures which I take to be the estimates as well as for other tilings. The letter does not, as I read it here, tell the Cabinet Secretary what the Houses' wishes are; it is merely reporting that a meeting had been held with representatives of the Ministry of Communications and Works, and that estimates had been drawn up.

I further understand - I will have to check this out; I am only speaking second hand - that the Clerk has been advised that the matter has gone or will go to the Central Planning Committee of Government. I do not myself see why this should be so. Once the House has spoken its wishes on the matter, it should go before the Cabinet in the usual manner for a Resolution to be brought down. I cannot understand why this should not be done. That is the procedure which we invariably follow. Only four weeks ago a Select Committee was appointed on Members' salaries; the Committee reported; the House adopted the Report; the Cabinet was informed about the matter, and we brought down a Resolution. I must not have it said that the Government is in any way at fault in this matter.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Sir, the matter is lying in some Government Department. I hope that the machine will unstick now. What Planning Committee should this go to? The machine they have can only turn in one direction. It wants unsticking. Since August last year this matter came before the House. Of course, Civil Servants feel that the House should be treated with contempt. We will deal with them later on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, I want to address the House for a few minutes as a

member of the House and not necessarily as a Minister. I have told members of the House on both sides, time and again, that the way to stop this contempt of Parliament is for both sides not to be used as Court of Appeals for Civil Servants. This is a matter in which the wishes of the House should have been carried out. The gist of the complaint on both sides of the House is that Parliament is being held in contempt by Public Officers. I am always telling both sides pf the House that our views should be made unmistakably clear in this matter; otherwise, whether in the Government or in the Opposition, Government Officers will think that we are of no account.

The question that Head 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 24 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX ACT, 1969

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day; 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 amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on the 1st July, 1969, the Property Transfer Tax Act came into operation. This arose out of the budgetary proposals which I had made shortly before, and the tax provided for the imposition of 2 1/2% on the consideration paid in respect of the transfer of land or shares by the vendor of the property, and in the case of foreign companies or foreign nationals a further 2 1/2% in respect of the purchaser. All transfers, whether of shares or property, under the value of $25,000 Eastern Caribbean Currency were exempted from the payment of tax, and this was done in an attempt to relieve persons of moderate incomes who were purchasing or selling private property. 1.15 p.m.

I do not have the precise figures for the revenue collected since this tax has been imposed, but it has been a considerable sum, and I am not in a position to say today whether the expectation which we had at the time of the Budget has been fulfilled in respect of the $750,000 revenue expected to be derived from this tax. I do know that a considerable amount has been collected, and I have further expectation that in the coming financial year we will collect even more than we collected in the last financial year.

I should like to explain that in a taxing measure which is an innovation, it is always difficult to draft with precision an enactment which would take consideration of the eventualities which can occur in the antiquated system of Real Property Conveyancing which we have in Barbados and which we hope soon to amend. It is also difficult to anticipate what relief should be given or what particular bodies corporate - whether they are incorporated under the Companies Act, 1910, or whether they are incorporated by statute, or incorporated associations - would be affected adversely by the very nature of the Bill itself at the time. Because it is a taxing measure and the utmost secrecy has to be preserved, the number of persons who could be brought into the picture, as it were, has necessarily got to be limited. It is not possible in legislation of this nature to consult the Law Society or the Bar Association or the Chamber of Commerce or any of the other people who would normally be consulted in matters of this kind. If I can give an illustration of what took place in Jamaica. When my colleague, the Minister of Finance, announced early in January last year, some three or four months before I imposed this tax, that he intended to introduce a Land Transfer Tax which would be effective forthwith, he had no legislation drafted. At least I had my legislation drafted when I came in here because I realised that for the tax to operate, there would have to be within the statutory period that is allowed some enactment whereby the

tax could be forcibly collected. The Bar Association and the Law Society of Jamaica got together and deemed as unconstitutional the collection of the tax in Jamaica without the enabling legislation. I do now know what the outcome of that struggle has been, but I know that they did publish on a full page of the leading paper a constitutional protest against the imposition of the tax, because the Minister had directed that the tax should be collected pending the passing of legislation. Of course he had no statutory authority for so doing. Fortunately for us we have the Provisional Collection of Taxes legislation which made it possible for us to do a little refining of what myself and the Attorney General had drafted prior to the pronouncement. But even within the Act a lot of (anomalies have come to light, and I should like to advise hon. members that the legislation which we have here today is not the last bit of legislation which we will have on the Property Transfer Tax. This is only to take care of some of the anomalies. There are numerous other anomalies of not so pressing a nature of which the Attorney General and I are aware on which we had discussion with the Bar Association and the Law Society, but we have to take a much closer look at them. What we are trying to do in the amendment to the main Act which we are now discussing is some short-term back-stopping, as it were, to plug some of the gaps and take care of some of the inequalities which have arisen from the imposition of the tax.

I think it is unversally accepted that in Barbados the absence of a Capital Gains Tax - and I make no pronouncement on that at this stage - there are varying views as to its necessity and usefulness and facility of implementation. I am not saying that Barbados is not ready for a Capital Gains Tax; I am not saying that Barbados is ready for a Capital Gains Tax; but certainly in the light of the Land Transfer Tax we have gained a lot of experience, and we will never completely - I do not care how many investors will get scared away - abandon our investigation of the feasibility of a Capital Gains Tax in Barbados. If I intended to impose one next week, of course I would say nothing on it at all, but I am not abdicating the right as Minister of Finance at any time he thinks it necessary for the economy of this Island to impose such a tax. I want to make this clear. The Land Transfer Tax is not by way of being a Capital Gains Tax. It is more in the nature of a stamp duty indeed and in fact. This tax is collected by the Registrar General of the Island at the time when he makes the adjudication for stamp duties, and since it is an ad valorem tax, it could be probably regarded as an additional stamp duty; but we call it a Property Transfer Tax because shares in companies which are transferred are also subject to the payment of the tax. Having said these few words by way of Introduction, I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to enter into a long dissertation to show my knowledge of Real Property law. I leave that to the novitiates on the other side. (Mr. St. JOHN: Do you want a noise in here now?) If you consider yourself a Q.C. and a novitiate, that is a matter for you. I did not know that a Q.C. was a novitiate. Since I am not practising law, I do not have to establish my reputation as a lawyer. I have never on the floor of this House attempted to establish my reputation as a lawyer. You will remember that even after I became a Minister and I had been frequently questioned by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, as it is his right as a member of this House if he can get answers, on interpretation, I have frequently told him that it is a matter for the Judges, and that I was only introducing the Bill. If the hon. member asks me today what is the interpretation, I am not prepared to say this.

We are trying to draft legislation no that it is understood in the common, ordinary, broad meaning of the English which is employed. I am merely pointing out that the philosophy of Land Transfer Tax is not

an appropriate subject for discussion at this stage. What I am concerned about doing is to try to some extent to meet some of the questions and difficulties which have been raised by members of the legal profession, by both solicitors and barristers in their organisation's association. Those members on the other side who do not pay subscriptions cannot blame me if all their own individual representations are not brought to my attention. I can only deal with organised people, just as an employer deals with a Trade Union. He cannot deal with every individual employee and try to make separate laws for each employee. So I am pointing out at this stage that the representations which I have had to deal with are representations which have come from the Law Society and the Bar Association. If hon. members had other objections, they have not vouchsafed them to me or to the Hon. Attorney General. 1.25 p.m.

If in future, in the light of what I have said about this Act not being the final point in which Property Transfer legislation will reside in the statute law of this Island, if there are any individual suggestions which members will have to make, I enjoin them to make them at the appropriate time and not now, because I do not intend to amend an amendment here today; what I intend to do is to take all the representations before the final enactment is brought be -fore the House and try to embody them in the final legislation. I do not intend to read out the Objects and Reasons because I hope that hon. members have done their homework; but, Mr. Speaker, you will see that we have made provision for such associations as, let us say, the School for the Blind, the School for the Mentally Retarded and other companies like that who do not have shareholders, to give them the definition so that they can be properly exempted. That is one of the main provisions of the amendment.

We have also clarified the definition of a national of the country to make it clear that dependents of citizens of Barbados and persons who are domiciled in Barbados will be deemed to be nationals, and therefore on transfer of property, whether it be shares or whether it be land itself, they will not be liable forthe payment of the purchaser's part of the tax. There is a general provision in this amending legislation to empower the Minister - that is, the Minister of Finance - to exempt from tax such transfers of property as the Minister considers it equitable to do on the part of the person by whom the tax is payable. The purpose of this provision is that we have had many applications from solicitors who would normally have had to pay tax on behalf of their clients showing special reasons why the transfer of title was not perfected by the statutory date, which, I think, was extended to the 31st August, 1969, as far as I can remember. Although we said that any agreements for a sale entered into before the 1st July must be closed by the 31st August, there were occasions in which, due to the absence of the vendor or the purchaser from the Island and matters of that kind, it would have been inequitable to ask them to pay tax. One firm of solicitors alone would have been liable to over, let us say, $150,000 tax for reasons such as this; as a matter of fact there was not a single firm of solicitors which, if their clients had insisted or the Government had not given a dispensation, would not have had - in some cases, I must confess, through negligence on their part, but inmost cases due to circumstances over which they had no control - to pay a specific amount of tax out of their own pockets. My first reaction as a Counsel who has suffered at the hands of these solicitors was that it served them right. They actually wrote a letter from the Law Society of contrition saying that they knew they had not trained people to be solicitors, but they were now trying their best to catch up with the leeway of the years that the locusts had eaten - those last words are in italics and are mine. I am very glad that the solicitors in Barbados now realise that they

have to train young people and encourage people to enter the profession, and if it had not been for the Land Transfer Tax coming into force, we would not have had this admission on their part for something which we in the legal profession had suffered at their hands for all these years; anyhow, this is not the appropriate time for recrimination.

I am very glad to see that there are firms now in Barbados who realise that there are young people, not of the same ethnic group as themselves, coming out of our Government Secondary Schools who are capable of adorning the Solicitors' profession, as they used to regard it as a closed shop like the banks, and you could not allow certain people to know other people's business. This is pure, unadulterated nonsense, because I think that our standards have got to be controlled by the profession itself. The letter which I received made it quite clear that they were going to liberalise their whole policy of recruitment and get the people qualified. I have no control over the solicitors; I hope that they will realise now that with the tremendous volume of business going on in Barbados they cannot afford to be restrictive in the recruitment of people into their profession. That is just a general observation; it has nothing to do really with the subject matter of the amendment which I am now putting before you.

The Act has six short sections, and I would just like to say again in conclusion that since I receive the debates of this Chamber long after the discussions take place, any proposed amendments will be more effectively directed to the Attorney General's Chambers than to me sitting here today; any proposed amendments to the future Bill. I appreciate that members on the opposite side have had some experience; I cannot prevent them from regaling me with those experiences here today, but I should like to suggest that even if they want to exercise their parliamentary privilege, in so doing that it is going to run off me like water off the proverbial duck's back. I do better when I read than when I am harangued, and if they would like to direct to me or to the Attorney General any suggestions which they would like to make for the further improvement of the Property Transfer Tax legislation, we will be very glad to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest. Mr. Speaker, 1 beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, speaking on the second reading, it must be a little difficult for any parliamentarian in the Opposition to hear that any proposed amendments will be met by the Government with deaf ears whatever their merits, because that is the only thing.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, my second reading speech was so recent that I did not think that even the hon. member for Christ Church would have such a short memory of what I said. I said that I would prefer to read the amendments. I do not make amendments on the floor; so the hon. member should not say that any further amendment will be met with deaf ears by the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. St. JOHN:

That is the impression hon. members got. We know that water rolls off a duck's back, but there is no doubt about it that originally when the Bill was drafted it did not take into account the conditions that existed in Barbados. As I said when I spoke on it, I felt that as a measure to deal with the situation which was developing in Barbados whereby Barbadians were finding it impossible to own land in their own country because of the effects of devaluation, it has failed in that respect. 1.35 p.m.

I still feel that the Government will come around to the view that the differential between the tax which a Barbadian has to pay and a foreigner has to pay is too small, because he is still at a disadvantage. Now, $1.00 cannot compete with $2.00 in no part of the world. If one of the objects of this Bill is to discourage some of this pensioner-purchasing of land and property that is going on in Barbados by people from overseas - we are getting the core of these rich pensioners coming here because they can live better down here; their dollar is two for one - that would be all right. They are competing with people in the community - except, of course, the Ministers in the Government and the big business men. They are competing against the earning power of Barbadians, and it will be a potential source of trouble in the future. We do not want to get like Bermuda. I understand that there is no hope for a Bermudian of the coloured race to own property except for a very tiny minority in the future, unless there is a revolution. We do not want to reach that stage.

Sir, the best canvasser for the Barbados Labour Party at the present moment is the Prime Minister. I urge him to continue making his speeches. Let him take up T.V; the more speeches he makes, the more canvassing he will do. It has taken him all of these years to recognise that one morning he will get up and see that we do not have a Barbados - at least, not for the Barbadians. It is very interesting to hear that, after eight years in power with this Government, while recognising that the Conveyancing law was antiquated and outdated, the Government has done nothing to amend the Conveyancing law. The Government has a Survey Department that will never be able to finish its plans.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. I hope the hon. member would give way. The way the hon. member speaks, you would not believe that he is a Queen's Counsel.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member make his point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that the hon. member is well aware, as a member of the Bar Association, that for the same seven years the Government has been attempting to change the system of Real Property Conveyancing and the whole Real Property law of Barbados. The hon. member should remember that there are experts from the United Nations doing a cadastral and detailed trigonometric survey of this Island, and we cannot institute the new system of registering land until the surveys are completed. Professor Marshall, who is the Vice-Chancellor of the University, has drafted the legislation and it is ready, but we cannot introduce it until we get the surveys done, because we had no system in Barbados for training surveyors. The surveyors who are there now do not want to work for Government at all; they want to come in as special consultants and that sort of thing. Our Chief Land Surveyor is a Trinidadian. When the hon. member says that Government has done nothing he is quite incorrect. I can go no faster than the surveyors who are doing the work.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I know all of this, but I must draw out the Prime Minister, If there is one thing that everybody is disappointed in, it is the failure of the Surveys Department to get functioning properly. We created a Land Surveys Department especially in this country to do the background work. The Ministry of Overseas Development did a survey in a country the other day in six months. For five or six years we have had somebody working part-time and drawing full -time money running the Department -an old, retired, broken-down horse.

Anyway, there is still one fundamental point that the Government will have to make up its mind upon in dealing with this Property Transfer Bill. It is whether, in view of the system of mortgaging land in Barbados, a tax is going to be extracted upon the transfer by way of mortgage in which the former title is only transferred for a period of time. This is a fundamental point that we have to decide upon, because in truth and in fact it is not a sale. The second point that we have to take into account, is: what are you going to do with those large numbers of transactions in which a large number of small people in this country bought land in the 40's and 50's under the hire-purchase system and today they only have about three or four instalments to pay? (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW That will be less than $25,000.) The $25,000 does not relate only to land. We want to draw these points to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Finance, because there is a lot of hire-purchase land in Barbados, particularly in the parishes of St.

Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Joseph and St. Peter. Down in St. Joseph Mr. Farmer and Mr. Josh Haynes started to cut up land in the 50's, and the people who bought the land have not yet received their titles. These parcels of land are not registered and the people depend on what is called a possessory title. Therefore, the two points dealing with the question of mortgages and hire-purchases of land are very important.

As far as the definition of nationals is concerned, I would like to see the day, when anybody who happens-to own property in Barbados under the guise of a Bahamian Company or a Cayman Company, that any Bank that shelters the fraud that is taking place byway of Income Tax evasion should have its Banking licence revoked, I say that whether it is felt that I am a revolutionary or not. I say that the Trust Companies in this country shelter transactions which are nothing but naked taxation evasion in the Bahamas and Cayman Islands. No Company listed in the Bahamas or Cayman Islands should be allowed to own property in Barbados, unless they disclose the shareholders - they must not tell us that the Royal Bank Trust or any Trust is a nominee shareholder. That is nonsense. We must know exactly what is the financial position of some people; therefore, when we go into Committee on this Bill we are going to deal with one or two of these points. I am not satisfied with the definition of nationals, because there is a lot of tax evasion and crockery going on in this country. I feel that these points should be dealt with at the present moment. You cannot delay the situation. You must deal with mortgages and the question of the hire-purchase of land. There are a large number of mortgages to close, and some people are now paying their last two instalments and they are now told that they are eligible for the Land Transfer Tax.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Sir, I support the hon. senior member for Christ Church. The Prime Minister said that the definition refers to property, but I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church is right. There are places like Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, Ashton Hall, Haggatts and several other plantations in the 40's and 50's that sold land by way of hire-purchase. Parts of Haggatt Hall and Salters have not yet been paid for. This is a question of land and property, and the people must pay. There are no two ways about it. I can call several of the plantations that have been sold out in that way. 1.45 p.m.

If the hon. member feels that they must pay because you are going to catch them, he must remember that they entered an agreement in 1945. Everybody knows that happened with the land at Joes River in St. Joseph. All the small people there own the land. The land on both sides of Bruce Vale was sold to small people; at Farmers the land was sold to small people who paid their deposit and paid interest. You cannot Interfere with them with the interest be -cause in those days they were paying something like 4 per cent because you could not get any investment, and although it is interpreted by the Registrar that they must pay, I think it is creating a very great hardship.

While I agree with the Bill, I do not agree with the Prime Minister that the tax is a stamp duty; it is

nothing but Capital Gains. If I buy a property for 10,000 and sell it for -50,000, what is it but Capital Gains? It is not like in the United States of America where a person must own a property for two-or three years, and if you sell within that time then a Capital Gains Tax is imposed. The number of people that are coming here and trading in land and going scot free is surprising. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not any more.) You are making fun.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
What I mean by that...

Mr. SPEAKER:
Has the hon. member given way?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:
Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
I am aware that the hon. member has not finished his address, but what I am pointing out when I made the observation "not any more" is that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is keeping a close watch on these transactions, and I would enjoin hon. members that if they know of any case of tax evasion in any form, they need not even sign their names, but even though we do not encourage anonymous letters in Government, when it comes to taxes and you do not want to appear to be a dog-in-the-manger or anything like that, you do not have to sign your name. Just draw to the attention of the Commissioner, not to me, that there is certain evasion taking place, because we have $27 million more to find this year than last year, and I would welcome any member of the House who is aware of such evasion bringing it to the attention of the Commissioner. I will answer the other points raised by the hon. member later.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. senior member for Bridgetown gave way.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:
I gather from the hon. member that he will need $27 million more this year, and I heard just a few days ago that the Budget for this year will be around $100 million. We are happy to hear about that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

It will be $27 million more on Current Account, but Capital and Current Account will be about $99 million.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

We are very happy to hear that. As long as it is put on the people who really can afford to pay it, and the money spent on eople who need it spent on them.....(Rt. Hon. E.W. BARROW As it has always been.) We would not argue that today because this is not the time or place for arguing that. That can be argued at another place. That the money is not being spent entirely in the direction in which it should be spent, that is, in respect of people on whom it should be spent to uplift them, can be argued at another place.

The Minister said that on occasion I have asked him about interpretation. This may have happened, but what I am saying is that the Registrar has to operate this. I am merely a consultant now, and I have not even registered. The Registrar is the person who interprets this, and what the member for Christ Church said is true. It is not what can be termed hire-purchase in the strict legal sense, but people pay down so much on land and work and pay for it. What is going to be the position with them? I counsel the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to look into that carefully. He says he is not going to amend this amendment, and that he would rather read than to be harangued, and that any harangue here would come like the proverbial water on the duck's back. That is a very strong remark to make to an Opposition even though, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, the harangue or remarks might have a tremendous lot of substance. That means that you do not mind what happens, we can talk until we are sick. I have heard this before in this House when it was said that we can talk until we are sick; they have the numbers. That did not last forever and yours will not last forever.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2 I understand there is some feeling that the definition of "national" needs tightening up. I can only remind hon. members of what I said before. We would be glad to entertain any proposal for tightening up the definition of "national" who would be exempt from the payment of the 21/2 per cent, as it is now, which the purchaser has to pay. I also agree with the -hon. member who said that the differential of 2 1/2 percent is something which should be investigated, but Mr. Chairman, we will also appreciate that this would be a taxing measure, and it would not be appropriate for me even to discuss it at this stage although some of us may have our private feelings on the matter; therefore I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 3 subsection (4) I want seriously to draw for consideration of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance this question about mortgage. Is it really desirable that you are going to raise your tax when you know that in truth and in fact a mortgage here is only a transfer for a certain period of time? I can understand if you are going to raise your tax when a mortgagee exercises his power of sale, but when he does not exercise his power of sale, when a man is borrowing money, must he pay a tax to borrow money? It is true that you have exempted some of it by Clause 4 subsection (c) (3), (4) and (5), but there are many other considerations where people have to mortgage for the purpose of business and they have to provide the security, and that is not a proper period of time to put on tax. 1.55 p.m.

I do hope that consideration will be given to that fact.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

There is a difficulty here of course, Mr. Chairman, and I think what the hon. member is saying is that the defeasances in Barbados are very limited in ratio now. There was a time when you could borrow money for ten or fifteen years, then it got down to five years, then to three years, and now it is between six and eighteen months. The reason for this is not that the people who lend money, the mortgagees, want the money back in six months; the interest rates are fluctuating today at such a great rate, although we have a limitation on the ceiling of the rate of interest at eight per cent, mortgages of certain conditions and trusts are exempt under the provisions of the Rate of Interest Act; so there is a general reluctance on the part of people who have money to lend, to lend it out for a longer period, say, than eighteen months, but the normal covenants used to have a defeasance of about seven years in the fifties. What the hon. member is demonstrating at this stage is that a man may have a mortgage and the people may call back for their money and he may be able to get the money now from the Mortgage Insurance Company which we have, and may probably have a lower rate of mortgage, and he wants an assignment on the mortgage.

This is not a question of interpretation; this is a question of law, and the Land Transfer Tax has to be paid under the existing provisions. I am not unaware of this difficulty, but it also has other defects. For instance, people who may be borrowing money to pay a gambling debt would also be exempt - I am not saying this applies to anybody on the other side - certainly no one visible at the moment on either side. Mr. Chairman, the point is that this needs a little investigation and we will look into it because there are cases in which people will want merely to get somebody else to take over the difference for them, and there are cases in which this is happening every day, and we will have to look into it; but I am not fully satisfied that we will be able to plug all the loopholes in the short time that we had available to draft this amendment.

Mr. St. JOHN:

What about the question of assignments?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, with your permission. I would like to tell the hon. member that this question of assignments of debts refers to old mortgage debts. I think this is the point the hon. member tried to make, but these debts of long years standing will now be taxed.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 6 were called and passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
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, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I think we can break here now; therefore I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

2.05 p.m.

On Resumption:

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (MEMBERS' REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ACT, 1970

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be taken as 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.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 7, under Government Business, is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for payment of allowances to members of the Senate and to amend and consolidate the law relating to the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour and hon. members of the House will recall that some weeks ago this House set up a Select Committee to deal with this and other cognate matters. The Committee reported in respect of the emoluments of members of the House including, of course, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and so on. It has yet to report - as a matter of fact, it is meeting again tomorrow to consider the Officers of the House, and may have to consider something else arising out of this Bill. I thought that inasmuch as the Committee is meeting tomorrow, we might proceed some distance with this Bill so that if anything else has to be referred to it arising out of this, it can conveniently be done and brought back to the House within a week.

A novel provision demonstrated in this Act is the decision of the Cabinet to pay to the President of the Senate, during his tenure of office, a non-accountable entertainment allowance of $1,200 per annum and also to pay to every member of the Senate, except a Minister and a Parliamentary Secretary, a duty allowance of $150 a month, and it is stated in the Bill that this allowance should not be included in calculating assessable income for income tax purposes.

The other provisions are as have been reported on by the Committee and approved by the House, except that I would like to draw to the House's attention that in respect of members of the House, it is proposed to give a travelling allowance of $900 per annum. I believe that this is a matter which needs some second thoughts and some looking at again. However, hon. members will indicate their views. As I have said, it is a fortunate thing that the Select Committee is having another meeting tomorrow so that if anything needs to be referred to it, it can conveniently be referred. I think that in respect of all the other things, except that question of the quantum of the duty allowance, the House is ad idem on both sides on everything else.

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:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, we have had an opportunity of considering the Report of the Select Committee, and we have also had the opportunity yesterday of considering the Bill and the subsequent Cabinet decision. It appears to us that it would be better if this matter were referred back to the Select Committee, especially in view of the fact that, in considering this matter today, one must take into account that the day-to-day responsibilities of a member of the House have considerably increased since the abolition of Local Government in this country and the centralisation of all aspects of Government. It means that there is more detailed work by an individual member to look after matters which hitherto were done by Local Councillors in their constituencies. While members are not asking for an increase in salary, they feel quite strongly that they should be reimbursed for the legitimate out-of-pocket expenses which they incur in pursuing and investigating these matters. There fore, we would ask that this Bill be referred to the Select Committee after it has passed its second reading. It is better to deal with it via the Select Committee, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to endorse many of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Since the take-over of the Local Government functions and the establishment of various Statutory Boards, whether the Child Care Board, which at present is not compensated, or the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, the members of which derive some measure of consideration although not adequately, or the National Assistance Board, which needs a lot of adjustment as far as I am aware - as far as the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is concerned, for some reason or other $200 a month is not in keeping with the remuneration paid to a Chairman. All Chairmen get $300 a month, but in the case it has been down-graded to $200. The Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is a very important Board, but for some reason or other the remuneration paid to the Chairman was down-graded. I am looking into that matter right now. So far as the National Assistance Board is concerned, I think the Chairman should be put on regular monthly basis and be given that measure of consideration also.

Sir, I am saying that we have a lot of work to do. These Boards are taking care of the entire Island, and that is what I believe the hon. member spoke on mainly just now. Since the centralisation, all of these things fall under three Boards, and there must be some measure of consideration in so far as travelling is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I must apologise for a lapse on my part. I did not hear the hon. member, when he seconded the motion

of the Hon. Leader of the House intimate that he reserved the right to speak. On the other hand, if it does not meet with the disapproval of the House, he may speak. There being no objection, the hon. member may continue.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to explain what was attempted to be said. The Acting Leader of the Opposition did not really make the points. This falls under Local Government and I happen to be the Minister for the time being, and I am trying to elaborate on what was attempted to be said. If I am not in order, I can sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The House has given leave to the hon. member to speak.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am merely saying that the three Boards are doing the work which the Local Government Councils did before. As far as travelling goes, I feel that members of the House are now called upon to do a lot of extra travelling. All members of the House represent a constituency as such, and each and every one of us - Minister, member, or Parliamentary Secretary - should be given a proper travelling allowance as well as a car loan. When you are in here you must have a proper motor car. I was very disappointed when the Acting Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke just now, and he failed to make the main point which was probably beyond his resources. Anyhow, 1 made the points for him, and I hope that hon. members will endorse the points what have been made. It is not only $150 a month for travelling by virtue of the Local Government take-over, but also a motor car loan of $5,000. Each and every one of us must have a proper motor car. We all have constituencies, and we ought to be able to get to and from them when we want to. When you come in here, you must try and do your home work.

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

3.15 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that this Bill be referred to the Select Committee appointed to consider, review and revise the salaries and emoluments of the members and officers of the House.

I would further suggest, subject to what the other side would say, that we perhaps increase the membership, and I am prepared to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:
I beg to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Peter as an addition to the members of the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER:
In view of the intimation from the Government and the Opposition, I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for St. Peter if they will be associated with this Committee. I may mention that it proposes to meet tomorrow at 2 p.m. In view of that intimation, I ask those two hon. members to serve and declare them to be members of that Committee.

The question that the Bill be referred to Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
1 beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 53 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

QUESTION re COMMUNITY CENTRE IN ST. GEORGE

Mr. HOPPIN:
Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister: -

Will the Minister make available part of the Government-owned lands near the Infirmary, St. George, for the erection of a Community Hall to be used for the recreational and cultural needs of the youth of the parish?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

"Part of the Government-owned land near the former St. George's Infirmary can be made available for a Community Centre which may be considered during the preparation of the next Development Plan".

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 59 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph whom I do not observe to be in place. I direct that the Answer be laid.

Question No. 70 stands in the name (of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas.

In view of the fact that that hon. member has been. today given leave, that Question may stand over.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
On a point of order, did the hon. member ask that this Question stand over? Otherwise I would ask that the Question be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I rule that in view of the fact that leave was granted to the hon. member to be absent from Ms duties as a member of this House for a period named by the Hon. Leader of the House, that Question may stand over.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same thing applies to Question No. 69 which stands in the name of that hon. member.

In respect of Questions Nos. 77, 78 and 81, I direct that they be duly laid.

That appears to me to conclude Question Time. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for three hours.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the Hon. and Learned Deputy Leader of the Opposition would intimate what Private Members' Business he cares to proceed with.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Order No. 1, Mr. Speaker. RESOLUTION re DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1969-70

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Member for St. Thomas and it is to resume debate on the Resolution re the Development Plan 1969-72.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the whole of the three hours, but it is my duty to sum up the views of the Opposition on this Plan. Before I do so, there are a few specific subjects within the Plan that I will deal with, as the other members have dealt with them. I intend to deal with the Government's projection in relation to tourism and agriculture. We feel that in so far as tourism is concerned, the Plan fails to take into account some of the undesirable features that are taking place in respect of the development of this aspect of our economy. I would have thought that as part of the Plan the Government would have indicated quite clearly that it was their policy to exercise a greater measure of control over the development of this industry as a whole. We feel that all of us in Barbados cannot fail to recognise the significance of our standard of living because of tourism. As a matter of fact, historically, if you trace the development of tourism, you can see that the measures and policies, incentive-wise, which were adopted by this Party when it was in power are substantially the same measures which are adopted by the Government at the present moment; but what is necessary now is to recognise the fact that Barbados - and indeed the Caribbean - is only one part of the general worldwide area which is competing for the tourist dollar; it therefore behoves us to guard this industry-care fully. Gone are the days when we must rely upon the Hotel Association for ideas about the development of this industry. This industry is now of national interest, just as agriculture and other subjects are of national interest, and it is necessary for Government to have at its disposal machinery to control it, machinery to look after it and machinery to watch the world-wide trends.

3.25 p.m.

There is nothing at all in this Plan which even contemplates a redoubling of the staff of the Minis try

of Trade and Tourism to look after the long-term trends in this industry, and this is absolutely necessary. There is absolutely nothing in this Plan which envisages that the Government can look into the fact that today this industry brags and boasts that its gross contribution to the national product of this country is some $54 million, and yet the average wage paid in this industry is less than $30 a week. I was shocked when I discovered that the agreement between the employers and the Workers' Union of this country shows that a skilled person in the industry must still only get $30 a week in 1970 - an industry in which the charges at the hotels are comparable with charges more expensive than in some parts of New York - the charges in the tourist industry here in Barbados are more expansive - and yet still the wage rates in this country are exceedingly low. This is a serious thing, and it is during the term of this Plan that Government has got to make up its mind about this. You cannot have a service industry where you have discontented staff; that is an impossibility, because this industry is of such a kind that its very nature is dependent upon a contented staff. The basic thing you are selling if service, and how is it you are going to tell me tha waiters, barmen and maids in this country are going to feel satisfied that their wages are in the vicinit of $30 to $35 a week, and guests of the hotels mus pay an average of $US30 or $US40 per day pej person? It is shocking; the disparity is too great; an there is no statistic that any member of Government on the other side is able to produce to provide this House for analysis of the wage content as part of the total cost of the industry. Nobody knows what pr portion of the gross revenue received by the tourist industry in Barbados goes in wages, in hote employment. We do not know these things. We do no know whether food costs, building maintenance, wh proportion of the gross revenue received is allocate to that item of cost; as a matter of fact, tl statistics that you have in relation to the manufactu and growth in the agricultural industry you do i have in relation to the tourist industry. That ca only be met by an explanation by some Department of Government geared to look into the various aspects of this matter, and the Plan envisages nothing of that kind.

Secondly, another very and more important point. We have got to decide in our minds as to what type of tourists we want to attract to Barbados. I say that it is not in the national interest of Barbados a a whole to seek to attract Canadian pensioners or American pensioners here, because I have pointed out repeatedly that if you are going to attract these people as long-term dwellers in your country, you are creating competition for land, for services in the form of hospital, water, and other utilities, and it means that with the devaluation in the value of your dollar in relation to theirs, it will have repercussions in relation to other wage-earners in Barbados.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member seems to misapprehend matters of finance and the basis on which financing or banking is conducted. One American dollar or one Canadian dollar is tantamount to two of ours; he is trying to put up a case based not on fundamentals, but to prevent something which is probably controversial. A Canadian dollar or an American dollar is worth twice our dollar, and as long as they can come here we want them.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN:
It is not even a point of sense.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Comment unnecessary.

Mr. St. JOHN:
The position is that it is precisely because of the fact of the disparity of the dollar that you get the problem arising. What you are having is a larger number of people competing for your available land resources, and it is not the best use of your land resources. If they want to come here, let them come here, of course; but let them go and stay at the boarding-houses and at the guest-houses. I am not against them coming here, but what I am against is a policy designed to encourage them as long-term ettlers in this country. The Swiss people had to deal with this; many other countries in the world had to eal with this. You cannot allow a pensioner with a ension from National Social Security in the United ates, plus his company pension, which is very often quivalent to $500 and $600 U.S. altogether, which is ,200 here - whom is he competing with here? The p grade of your Civil Servants, you are paying in e vicinity of that now; so when they can hope to buy hd, what happens? Instead of having two or three people who can buy land at that price, you have ten twelve people; so the price goes up, and you have land policy. You must look at this matter in lation to the whole thing. Do you know that today 200 square feet of land on the St. James coast at iset Crest is selling for $50,000 E.C. purely because this encouragement of yours? How many people in r Civil Service today can afford to buy a house and repay it at $50,000? You do not understand this; this is too high for you.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
On a point of order, it is too high for me; it is not too high for you. Civil Servants do not have to live at Sunset Crest; they can live any part of the island apart from Sunset Crest.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that something was too high for whom?

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, we are discussing a very important part of our national planning, and I said this is too

high for the hon. members on the other side; otherwise we would not have these interruptions. What the hon. member on the other side does not understand is the fact that if you allow Sunset Crest to sell a house at that rate, it means that you are determining a market, a yard stick fay which everybody else who has a house feels he can sell his for. That is what is happening. So what have you? Look at what is happening in your country. You can become a country in which, no matter what your housing policy is, you are not going to be able to satisfy the desire of a large section of your community for house ownership - and if you doubt that, tell me how a Police Sargeant in Barbados with his income can own a house will all the available housing resources you have. Tell me how he is going to own a house!

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member has to be interrupted because this sort of hullabaloo will not persist around me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No; this is no point of order talking about hullabaloo.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

A Police Sargeant need not live in Sunset Crest; nor along where the hon. member lives, along Enterprise, or whatever it is, nor anywhere else for that reason, or Lakes where another hon. member lives. He can live any part of Barbados; the hon. member referred to Sunset Crest, but that is not the only place he can live. He can live along many other parts. The Police Sargeant need not buy his house yet; it is a question of employment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN:

If you say that it is employment for the construction industry, may I point out that, if you built houses for your local people, you would employ the same people? What I object to is the fact that you are determining 1,200 sq. ft. of house space and setting a yardstick of $50,000 on it. If you doubt me, there is another development going on at James -town Park and the price has moved from $60,000 to $75,000 for a standard three-bedroom house. With , the effect of Town Planning, you are restricting the amount of land that you have available for housing. That is the rationale of Town Planning, because you have to reconcile the best use for your land. If you restrict it, it means that there will be less land available. You have no price control mechanism in operation; so, therefore, free enterprise operating there is going to sell to the highest bidder. Unless you have an Alien Land-Holdings Bill, or differential taxation, or

something else, what are you doing? You are saying that the land that you have available, which should be available for housing, you are allowing that to go to attract pensioners and speculators from overseas. You have absolutely no policy on that.

Now, I see also another sign of things happening in this country in relation to tourism. You happen to be representing a constituency in which there is a lot of wealth. We are attracting here a number of tourists - with which we all agree; but we cannot continue to do so unless we provide amenities for them. This is where I am going to deal now with Town Planning. I say that unless the Town Planning Act is amended immediately to take out of the hands of any individual the power to grant planning permission, we are running headlong into self-destruction.

I go along Worthing and Rockley, and I see planning provisions being granted for people to build - the most intensive use of land, but absolutely no thought at all about amenities. When you go down Bridgetown and any local person tries to get provision for office development, he is told that he must have a parking ratio of one car park space of some 600 sq. ft. of office space. Go by Rockley now and you will see for yourself that just next to the road near Rockley Hill a big three-storey apartment is going up. The next thing you are going to hear is that there should be a silent zone in that area; that at night the car horns will not let the guests sleep; the dogs in the neighbourhood will not let the guests sleep, and the Hon. Minister is going to come down here in the same way as he came down about the Caribbee Hotel and pass a Resolution to create in a side street at Balmoral Gap a special parking area, because of the fact that the Caribbee's intensive development did not allow for a parking area. Those people in the Town Planning Office will tell you that they know about Town Planning! That is absolute nonsense.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order. There is one point I would like to make. The hon. member said that I came here with regulations in relation to Balmoral Gap to allow taxis to park. I would like to point out to the House that this took place years ago. I agree with some of what he is saying, but he must not try to make out that I came here and tried to give them facilities, because that is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I do not mind, Sir. This is not a Party matter with me; this is a very serious matter. I feel it is unfair for your planning norms to be such that some people can get one set of permission, and other people

cannot get the same set of permission. If I am going to be allowed a rate of intensive development of a particular piece of land, the result of which is going to necessitate subsequently an application to create special parking facilities, then I feel that you should have a parking policy.

Mr. Speaker, these hoteliers and these developers that we have here are buying land at such a rate per square foot that, when they go into the economics of it, they find that they have to get 8, 9 and 10 storeys in order to make it an economic proposition; therefore, they put pressure on the planning. My answer to them is that they should have investigated before hand what was the top price they felt should be paid for the land, having regard to the known planning norms in this country. Of course, we have none. The next thing we know is that we have absolutely no zoning; we have a series of hotchpotch decisions based upon individual applications, and you have a lot of eyesores all over the place. All of this is part and parcel of your lack of planning in relation to tourism as a whole.

The first thing, Sir, is: what are the provisions in the Plan dealing with amenities? Thare are no amenities for elderly people, Barbadians or tourists alike, being created in any of the high-pressured or the high intensively developed areas. The Minister of Home Affairs is clueless as to what is going on around here - clueless as to the necessities and the needs of the future. You only have to look around and see in Barbados what happens during the winter season, particularly along the South Coast. You can see people in the afternoon walking up and down the streets with no parks, no playing fields, no amenities, and so on. A part of your policy for tourism has to be to create facilities for tourists and natives alike.

Sir, do not let anybody fool you that the attraction of the sea and the niceness of Barbados and so forth will hold in the future. There are other Islands in the Caribbean who started after us who are aware of these problems. We have to compete with them. We have to compete with places like Malta, Spain and Portugal where, if you follow the Times newsr paper, you can get a tour for L35 for two weeks' holiday and a villa included. We do not have anything of that class here. We do not have that sort of accommodation available. It seems to me at the present moment that a complete review of the whole tourist industry must be gone into. With regard to generating income, I would like to know the basis upon which this $54 million was estimated.

Sir, I am still not convinced that, when you take . into account the production that you have locally in agriculture, the Government is not ensuring that local agriculture is getting the best benefit from this. I know the tie-up; they have suppliers here who can get permission to import a lot of things in this country which could be supplied locally. The position is that the suppliers have a tie-in with the Chefs, or the Food and Beverage Manager, and there is a split going on. That is one of the reasons why I would like to see a survey of the cost, because I would like to know what proportion of the gross revenue of a hotel in Barbados comes from food purchasing. If I know that, I will be able to compare it with international statistics, with the United States statistics, and with other areas in the Caribbean, and then we would be

able to see whether the se so-called expenses that they have are not really puffed-up expenses because of administrative "bu-ball" that is going on in the organisation.

Sir, our approach and our method of planning for the tourist industry is different from that of the Government's. An absolute necessity that you must have is a Bill ensuring that the worker or his representative is entitled to a portion of the gross bills weekly or monthly in a hotel. It is the only way that you can ensure that the true 10% is paid to the worker. He is entitled to get a certificate from the accountant of the firm of the gross bills over the week so that he can do the calculation himself because there is a lot of 10% stealing going on in Barbados. That is taking place on both Coasts, and the workers are not getting their fair share of the 10%. 3.45 p.m.

The workers are not getting their fair share of the 10 percent, and it is leading to a sullenness, an indifference and a frustration among the workers which can do nothing else but harm the type of service you are getting.

Now, Sir, when we come to agriculture, I want to say that our approach to this is so different from the approach of the Government. Agriculture has been a neglected industry in this country since this Government came into power. I was shocked when I saw the allocation for agriculture here. Not enough money has been allocated to agriculture. I defy any member on the other side to tell us how many producers there are of vegetables in this country. They do not know. The statistical base upon which you do any planning is non-existent in relation to this. You cannot have a hodge-podge census every now and again and expect to plan on that. You ought to have registered growers of vegetables in this country with some institution, whether it is the Marketing Corporation or the Ministry of Agriculture, because until you know who are the producers and what is the acreage devoted to it, it is impossible for you to calculate the volume of production. The Government does not deal with all these things. We go further. We are radical in relation to the organisation of this, be cause we feel strongly that there is not enough co-operation between the administrative aspect and the technical aspect of the Ministry of Agriculture. There is too much of a tug-of-war as to spheres of activity between the respective allocations in the Ministry.

As far as the small farmers are concerned, the Government has no plans for them at all. I have some information in relation to small farmers that I would be glad to show to the Hon. Minister, but I am not showing it to him because we will use it for election purposes. You do not know to this day what is an economic farming unit in this country. Not so long ago, I did not know the reason; then a Resolution was passed in this House asking to reduce the acreage of agricultural land from four to two acres on the ground that the poor man could not buy four acres, and I looked out to see what was coming. Previously when you had your unit as four acres, the price was in the vicinity of $1,000 to $4,000 an acre for raw land. No requirement is made in respect of electricity or even the main rudimentary roads. You look into

the newspaper and see agricultural land at $5,000 an acre or $2,500 an acre: and when you go and look at the $2,500-an-acre land, you see that it is in the back with no electricity and no reasonable access to it. Of course, you say that a two-acre unit is an economic unit. I would like to see the statistics on that because my belief is that today without irrigation and other capital expenditure on a two-acre unit you are not going to attract a full-time farmer, and that is what we want. We do not want a man who is going to be a carpenter or a fisherman one day and a farmer the next day. What about provision for loans? There are small tractors for $1,000 which small fanners can use. Has the Minister heard of them? All these things you have got to provide in relation to this; but you must attract, first of all, a full-time farmer, and you are not going to get a full-time farmer paying $10,000 an acre for land, so that again this whole thing comes back to a lack of land policy in relation to Government.

When we deal with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I do not know what to say is happening there. We have not had a Report lately; so we can only go by information received. I believe the farmers' confidence in the Barbados Marketing Corporation has gone up a bit, but the public confidence has not risen because it is still not an economic venture, and still not operating as an efficient organisation. We really and truly do not know what the policy is because for all the talk you have had in relation to putting down a processing unit, months and months are passing and nobody can hear yet when this building is going to start. The gestation period of a number of Government projects is so long, and even when they have a gestation period, the pains of carrying it are so great that any estimate they have in relation to cost always ends up as having no factual basis at all. It is always a gross under-estimation.

Sir, I do not know how to deal with fishing. I wanted the Prime Minister to be here when I spoke on fishing, because if I have ever heard an asinine statement in my life, it is the statement I heard that there are two classes of human beings - fishermen and human beings. I do not know if anybody with a pretension of sanity would make a statement like that; so when over C.B.C. the Prime Minister of this country could say that there are two classes of human beings - human beings and fishermen - then we can understand what kind of encouragement he is giving. Years ago it was the policy of the then Government to mechanise the fishing industry, and loans were granted whereby small fishermen with a relatively small amount of money could be encouraged to own their own fishing-boats. The belief has gone around that it is possible with trawlers and other types of boats to exploit in-shore resources in Barbados. I have talked repeatedly with a gentleman at the United Nations, and he told me repeatedly that from all the research they have done, they have proved that as far as 30 miles and in from Barbados, the best type of boat for exploiting this is the existing fishing boats. Yet the Minister of Finance, the man in charge of national planning in this country, is going to say that you can take all the engines and pump water with them. That is absolute nonsense. It is complete irresponsibility. All over the world you have two types of fishing: inshore and long distance. I know they have resources off Guyana, but the capitalisation is somewhere in the vicinity of $200,000 - $US 60,000 or $US 75,000 depending on the type of boat, but that is the equivalent to us of long distance fishing. In any event, you can get such a high price for your local flying fish even as bait in St. Martins in the Virgin Islands that it would still pay you to continue this industry. So far from discouragement, you should be encouraging by means of putting up centres at various parts of the Island for the distribution of ice so that you would have a better marketable product, and encourage the bone-fishing market so as to diversify your market in centres

whether through co-operatives or otherwise so as to encourage the existing number of boats. If the Government has so much faith in these fisheries that you can exploit off Guyana, how come this Socialist Government has not decided even to put in an allocation to allow the Marketing Corporation to join with private enterprise to exploit them? Not one cent has Government put in any of their plans to try to form a commercial fishing company in this country, although all the studies done by United Nations have proved that it is economic and you have consumer acceptance. And, of course, the best agency in the world to participate in it is the Marketing Corporation because they have the shore facilities and the distribution outlets. 3.55 p.m.

Bookers from Guyana can exploit Barbados' fisheries, and this Socialist Government that is interested in reducing the cost of living, this Government that is interested in encouraging local enterprise, has not got the courage to allocate $500,000 or $300,000 or $200,000 for this industry! The Government has not got the guts to take the lead; but the Prime Minister can get on the radio and insult local Barbadian fishermen! I would like to see him go into Oistin Town and talk any time between now and the next three years, or let him go down Brandon's or Pile Bay and talk; the only place he can go is in Consett Bay in St. John.

We are dealing now with some other aspects of this Development Plan in relation to livestock production. There is some token money here in relation to this livestock production and things of that kind; but I say - and it will be the policy of our Government - we are not afraid to introduce new measures in this country; incentives have got to be given to farmers in this country to encourage them to go into local production, and I do not mean any monkey incentives like giving them three or four dollars an acre or some foolishness like that for livestock production. The gist of all incentives that have been built up in these under-developed territories is based upon a certain amount of tax concessions; and just as you give the hotel industry concessions, so also it is possible to devise a system of fiscal incentives to the farmers to encourage diversification. You admit in the Plan that diversification has taken a much longer time to achieve than you thought. I would like to know, just as a matter of interest, whether a place like Farmer Bim in St. Philip which is probably the largest - other than Sunfarms that I know of - probably the largest acreage devoted to production of vegetables that I have seen here in Barbados - I would be glad to be corrected if there are other areas where they have any kind of incentives. It is quite possible to devise such a scheme, so that even if you do not give them the money incentive, it is still an incentive, and once you increase local production and get the public and the younger people in this country interested, and you have demonstrations and show them that this can be an economic proposition, it would go a very long way. The truth of the matter is that all of our technology, and all of our expertise in this country, and all of our trade have been along the lines of sugar production. This is what we find specialists need all the time; so it is a risk, and a lot of people feel it is a risk. Just as the hotel industry was a risk, so therefore it is in the interest of Barbados to give some kind of incentive, and it ought not to be beyond the ingenuity of the various Government Departments to devise a scheme which will not have too great an effect on your revenue image, because our views and attitudes on taxation is so different from this Government's. This is the worst country in the world from the point of view of income, the easiest country in the world from the point of view of capital; for never before have income taxpayer sand income producers in this country had to be subjected to such a large extraction

from their effort only to be devoted to great conditions to which capital multiples tremendously, and the Government is so scared to tax capital in this country. Sooner or later they will find out their mistake, because when you look at this Plan as a whole, you will see that your consumers and your producers have got to pay taxes to the extent of some 25% of your gross national product. A good rate of taxation, a good rate of extraction from Government; but whan you look at it and you see that we have no defence expenditure here at all to absorb any of our Government expenditure - absolutely insignificant defence expenditure - and other countries in the world where they have defence expenditure which gets some 9% of their national product, still only take out somewhere between 25 and 30%; so what are we finding ourselves with here? A serious situation in which capital - no wonder so much money is being put in speculation of this country, and this Government is really a Government that ought to put as its political philosophy "a Government for speculators" - not a Government for the people, and as some of my friends on this side said, "a Government by specdilation".

That is the position that we are in. It is a very serious position, and it ought to be part of the Government's planning and its taxation policy to try and do something about the disparity of taxation that you have here between income and other means. Income and Customs; when you tax on customs duties, you are taxing the cost of living, and when these people come in here and buy property through this machinery, this is so bad that you have created a market for the capital to gain, be cause from the time you have Town Planning in a country, it means that you interfere with the amount of land that is available for necessities - house building, industrial development and hotel development; so when you restrict the amount of land which is absolutely necessary, the State must devise a taxation machinery to bring into the revenue some of the windfall that is created as a result of State action, and this Government is afraid to face it. It is a Government by the property owners; it is a Government by the foreign interest in this country; all of the big money in this country they are afraid to tax. It is a Government dictated to by the land speculators of this country. That is what it is - a Government dictated to by the people who are interested primarily in Capital Gains; they are pulling the strings, and the puppet Minister of Finance that we have will go by the string-puller; wherever they want him to go he will go. We are going over too because we are dealing with the method of getting the money to finance this things.

Not so long ago I made a speech in this House, on two occasions, dealing with banks in this country; and I said, firstly when they were amending the Rate of Interest Act, and secondly when we were dealing with Property Transfer Tax - on both occasions I said that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of this country was allowing himself to be jockeyed by the banks in this country. He told me that I was an ignoramus, so to speak; he told me that the water was too deep; he told me that I did not know what I was talking about. 4.05 p.m.

I said then that the bank rate in England had absolutely nothing to do with the bank rate that should prevail in Barbados. He told me that I did not know what I was talking about. I am sorry he is not in here today. In the Times of England in the Business News Section - I am going to make this a document of

the House, Sir, and I want to send it with the House's compliments to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to let him see what is happening abroad. On Saturday, 21st February, 1970, for the first time as a result of pressure in England, the banks had to disclose their true profits. In a leading article in the Business News section - I would like to read this for the benefit of the Prime Minister, because when I accuse him of feudalism - Sir, this is what the article states:

Farewell To Feudal Age Of Banking.

Even in the United Kingdom they tell you straight that the bank rate of the Bank of England has to be disconnected completely from anything to do with the lending rates of the bonks. Do you know why? Because the higher the bank rates; the higher the interest rates charged by the banks. The banks are making more profits when there are high interest rates, because on that part of the loans that they grant which they get from the Savings Accounts and the balance in Current Accounts that cost them nothing, they are then getting 800% or 900% on that money. Let the Prime Minister read the article and let him see what is taking place. There are two clear functions. One is the regulation of banking where you set up the capital structure and try to ensure that you protect the depositors' money by lending ratios, etc., and the second function is to use it as a weapon in your lending policy.

I accuse the Prime Minister again categorically on the floor of this House of allowing the banks in this country to carry Barbadians for a ride. They are not lending out more money in Barbados than what they get from Barbadian depositors. The English bank rate has absolutely nothing to do with the cost of money to them here. 1 go further and accuse the Prime Minister of laxity and lack of foresight, because to this day he has not brought down any Act which would prohibit any Tom, Dick or Harry organisation abroad from utilising all of our advertising media to attract Barbadian deposits. On television in Barbados the Guarantee Bank of Jersey advertise for Barbadian deposits, when that Company is prohibited from accepting deposits in Jersey as its headquarters. A company that has no office in Barbados can utilise the television media in Barbados; it does not pay one cent to the Income Tax Department, but it is allowed to use our newspaper media, to use our advertising media to attract Barbadian deposits. When it gets Barbadian deposits it will be found that the Company is in bankruptcy in England. The Prime Minister sits down here and says that he is waiting on some Committee.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order. I would like to have this matter clarified. On page 24 of the Standing Orders, Rule 26 states

"Time and Manner of Speaking and Contents of Speeches.

1. A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspaper in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by refernece to notes."

I want this matter clarified, because when I do this at some time or other I hope nobody will object. He cannot make that any document of the House. I did not print the Standing Orders. I want to hear Mr. Speaker's Ruling on this matter.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I particularly did not read from the content; I only cited it, and I cited the heading for the purpose of identification; so that the Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works could read it and enlighten themselves. I particularly did not read the article. I quoted the page, and I read the headline for the purpose of identification. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair will realise that the Chair is interested in hearing only him who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN:

The debate cannot degenerate, Sir. I am speaking. As long as I am speaking I am not going to allow it to degenerate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not so long as I am in the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter, because the financing in this country and the utilisation of the resources of the country are very important matters. Right in the Development Plan you will see that the servicing of debt forms a very important part of the current expenditure of Government, and I would like to see more of that interest payment remaining in Barbados than the amount that remains now; therefore, we have to see that the capital intermediaries in this country are operating to the benefit of the economy of this country. We have the same thing with the Insurance Companies, but they say that the

legislation for Insurance Companies is going to come down. The 1961 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party mentioned that; but up to this day, eight years after, nothing has been done about the matter. This is another illustration of how long a gestation period there is between promise and performance with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as the lobbyists in Broad Street and the other Insurance lobbyists start to squeal, the Prime Minister will go backwards. As soon as the big interests in this country start to squeal, the Prime Minister will go backwards. He only likes to deal with the teachers and the Civil Service or any of the others. He will accuse them of all kinds of things; but once the moneyed interests in this country rally the force - they do not even have to do it publicly; they do it at cocktail parties and other activities in which the Government partake. They do it by secret lobby, by telephoning, and on these intimate occasions they lobby. When they lobby then, they lobby effectively. Nobody even knows when the lobbying goes along; we only see the promise of action and the action which results after the lobby. Our approach to these matters is so radically different from theirs, Mr. Speaker. We do not look for finance from those people. We do not look for that sort of thing. We do not care one bit about any finance from any business houses for a political campaign; we are not interested in that.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that nowhere in this Development Plan is there any concern shown about wastage in Government and wastage in Government expenditure. I believe that in the hon. Minister of Communications and Works' Ministry there is more wastage than in any other industry in Barbados. I believe that the productivity in any one of his sites is lower than anywhere else in Barbados. I have seen it for myself. In two parts of my constituency now some work is being done. They did some work in Fairholme Gardens, and I would really like to know the cost of it. I would really like to work it back by the square foot and to compare it with other competitive work and see the differential. Further, I have seen a Waterworks track being dug between Top Rock and Seawell, and I have never seen anything like it in my life.

4.15 p.m.

Today with all the mechanical aids, I would have thought that the use of one of these rands would have been commonplace; but you see it now and again, and then it goes. Imagine a peck and shovel in 1970 as the major instrument being used to execute such a programme. And do not tell me any nonsense that if you mechanise you do not have to employ as many peoplel There is sufficient backlog of water to be put in around Barbados that you can find more than sufficient work for the number of men you have available. There is one thing that you have in Barbados, and it is over-employment in the construction industry. The basic point is that the Civil Servants' tradition of "couldn't care less" still operates. People do not seem to think that Government is part of a productive process, and the same standard of efficiency which they would expect if they were paying for something directly is what they should require for Government. There is nobody who is more critical of productivity than I. I do not have to call the Civil Servants an army of occupation, but what I say is that I hope that they understand that today for

a Civil Servant to be useful to any Government, he must understand such concepts as management and productivity. They have got to take into consideration the question of productivity, because they are the people who have got to inspire the workers. The workers must be made to understand that if they want a fair day's pay, they must give a fair day's work.

Mr. Speaker, this is very important, and again I will come back to a very important point. I would wish that in comparing the amount of money to be spent here over the next three year period, a review would have been done with the last two Development Plans - the one executed by us and the one executed by them - and it would be done in terms of cost of prices, because I would have been able to prove one thing. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here. The Government is in effect spending less money than the Barbados Labour Party was spending, because when you take into account the difference in the value of money and the difference of the amount you are spending, you are spending less than the Barbados Labour Party. (A VOICE: That is a joke.) You do not understand the fundamental concept behind it. The dollar in 1961 could not be worth more than sixty cents today. We are operating under a strain in Government expenditure in this country because of the wastage on the Hilton.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, in truth and in fact, the real amount of money spent and projected by this Government to be spent in the next three years is less than was spent by the former Government in power despite the lapse of time. If the hon. member looks at Table XVI he will see that $9, 427,000 were spent in 1958-59, $10, 646,000 in 1959-60 and $8, 828,000 in 1960-61. Are you telling me that the same thing you could have done for $9 million then you can do for the same $9 million now? Why don't you check on these facts and do not be bamboozled by a few monkey figures?

Mr. Speaker, this country has been deprived of a great amount of amenities and an amount of productive expenditure because of the criminal wastage that took place in the administration of the Hilton Hotel. When that hotel moved from its estimate of $4 million to its actual cost of $12 million, at least $4 million or $5 million was wasted or disappeared out of the economy of this country. That money could have been spent in other activities - particularly housing, agriculture and any other bit of capital expenditure which you felt was needed. We will never allow the Government of this country to forget the criminal wastage that has taken place there, and I was shocked when I picked up the newspaper and saw that the same Project Manager who was in charge of that wastage is now going to be put in charge of $20 million at Seawell Airport. It is a scandal for a Government, when they know that in the projection, execution and administration of one scheme millions of dollars were wasted, to utilise the same person now that they are spending $20 million at Seawell Airport. There will be a monster debate on that in here. The second point is that in this Development Plan none of us is being told anything about the projections at Seawell Airport. None of the constituency representatives in the Christ Church area where the Airport is situated and who have to face constituents with the day-to-day problems has been given any knowledge as to what is going to happen to their houses, and whether they have to move or anything like that. 4.25 p.m.,

And what do we find? That this misguided, twisted Government thinks that the Chamber of Commerce in this country is more important than the people's representatives. When I picked up the newspaper and I saw the Project Director addressing the Chamber of Commerce in this country, illustrating with maps and plans the new Seawell Airport, and not one member of this House has ever been treated with the dignity of seeing one of those, I called that a shocking scandal and a contempt for Parliament, and the Prime Minister has got to answer for that either in here or throughout the length and breadth of Barbados. This is the Government by the monied interests in this country; he thinks it more important to disclose the schemes to the Chamber of Commerce whereby they can re-organise their business and exploit the increase in capital values than to tell the poor people up there where they are going to move their houses. That is the state of affairs we have come to; it is more important to pick up maps and plans and illustrate in detail to the Chamber of Commerce than to illustrate in detail to this House of Assembly. Not even upon the floor of the House, not in the Development Plan, nowhere will you find it, and I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in here because I want to charge him face to face. I charge him with being in cahoots with this reckless expenditure that took place. I have other things to say, but I will not say them on the floor of this House; I will say them outside because I will risk a libel action in relation to it. I would never, as an act of financial responsibility, commit capital expenditure in the hands of a man who wasted money at the Hilton Hotel, and now put $20 million in his hand to spend at Seawell Airport, and pay him more as Project Manager than you are paying the Chief Technical Director who has got to spend more money per year in the Ministry of Communications and Works; but some of us are favoured friends and favoured servants, and we will be pitch-forked into favoured positions. That is exactly what is happening in this country.

This must be the only country in the world in which you have a Minister of Communications with Public Works in his charge, the Port in his charge, all other aspects of transport are in his charge, but Seawell Airport must be somebody's pet baby and kept in the office of the Prime Minister. It is criminal. The Prime Minister cannot give the attention to the execution of that project; his Ministry does not have the cross-checks and plans by reason of the staff with the experience to cross-check anything up there; he must rely on one man, the Project Manager. Absolute nonsense! If you are going to commit the Port, the Deep Water Harbour, the administrative machine and so forth, into the hands of the Minister of Corrrminications and Works, why is it so illogical that your other gate way to Barbados must be committed to the Prime Minister's office? It is really a gateway, but not a gateway for the benefit of Barbados; it is a gate way for the benefit of somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, this is of such great import that I hope that this House will be immediately supplied with exactly the same information that was supplied to the Chamber of Commerce, and we deserve a public apology from the Prime Minister of this country. What in fact are we coming to? If the Chamber of Commerce wants to have political representation in this country, they have their money; why do not they finance a political Party? Why do they not come out and burn midnight oil and get support? They do not have to do that, of course; they can get stool pigeons from the other side and they will accept them, and they just have to ring up and they will get somebody to come down there devoting time to

explain to them in detail as to how they can exploit the increase in land values that is going to result. That is exactly what they are going to know; they must buy first, they know where the alignment is; they know where the ten year Plan is; they must get that first - and the Prime Minister is not going to tax them; but that is what we must put up with. We cannot put up with fraud, this scandal and this contempt for the House, and I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Health has left here because he owes it to his constituents to protest against this unfair treatment of members of the House of Assembly, and little does he know that it is within a constituency that he is picking too. Let him go ahead; if he is going to allow the coppers at the end of the month to prevent him from looking after the interest of his constituents, that is a matter for Mm; but no fear is going to prevent me from telling the Prime Minister that I regard that as a scandal and an insult. This is not the Prime Minister's hobby; this $20 million is not a hobby of any Prime Minister; this is the taxpayers' money - and the taxpayers' representatives and the people's representatives are entitled to know how it will be spent. How does Wason know you will spend $20 million when there is no plan? They do not know to this day the cost of anything up there because there are no engineering specifications. 1 asked the Prime Minister in here previously for the engineering specifications of the increase in the tarmac and he said that you do not need engineering specifications; you know the length and breadth and you know how much it costs per square foot; but where does he get the cost per square foot from? From the same Project Manager who told him that the Hilton would cost $4 million and it then cost $12 million? I would not take on estimste from him as worth no more than a bad penny because 1 would only be indulging in expenditure which has absolutely no factual basis.

No Government in the world should embark upon such a scheme without ensuring that it is proparly pre-planned in the sense of there being architectural specifications, in the sense of there being a bill of quantities, and in the sense of there being competitive tendering in relation to it. Absolutely reckless financial irresponsibility to do it otherwise! And that is what I accuse this Government of because that is what they have done; so that, all in all, the more we review this Plan, the more we go into the details of it. If you look at it from the point of view of analysing it to the extent of its projected amount of money, staring you straight in the face will be the fact that this $42 million will never be spent because the record of the Government has always been a record of puffing estimates and an inability to execute what they intend to execute. If we look at it from the point of view of whether this money that is estimated to be spent is being spent wisely in the sense that it is spent and you are getting value for your money, we know full well, and we are confident that it is the same Prime Minister's office that will spend most of it - it is the same Ministry of Communications and Works that will spend most of it - and we know that both are inefficient and ineffective, wasteful and indifferent to the taxpayers of this country. 4.35 p.m.

If you look at it from any other point of view than productive expansion, you will see staring you in your face that agriculture has been neglected. If you look at it from the point of view of the provision of Social Services, even the Hon. Minister of Housing has said that the Plan has a printed error or a typographical error. If there is one field of activity in this country that Government has neglected badly, I believe it is in the field of housing. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown dealt with low-income housing. I just want to make a passing reference to middle-income housing. Here, again, you see the Government's and the Prime Minister's propensity for creating stupid administrative structures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have a Ministry of Housing; you have 1,200 acres of land at Cave Hill, and you put that under the Minister of Home Affairs and charge him with building some 500 houses. Anybody with any conception of modern methods of organising for production would know and understand that what you want is a costing unit; what you want is a designing unit and a supervision unit. If you are dealing with housing, then all of the housing should be under the Ministry of Housing. What nonsense are they talking about? Because some little pet friend has something to do with this matter, you must be straddle two Ministries with it ! What kind of co-ordination can you have in that? What kind of policy can you have in relation to that?

Lastly, on housing. This must be the only civilised country that they have nowadays that does not have a minimum standard set-out in a Housing Code. Any butcher or speculator can come here - I hear you have an ice cream manfacturer coming here to build at U.D.C. Once he is foreign and he comes from abroad, if he hires D.L.P. lawyers, he has entree into the D.L.P. Government. We now have an ice cream manufacturer who is coining here to build houses for U.D.C. There can be no pattern of design, no invitation for developers with local experience to come in and build within this price range or price structure. Nothing like that has taken place. The planning has been shocking. The planning has been a complete wastage. People fail to realise that eight years ago that land was frozen, and now you can see the U.D.C. and the totality of their achievement. (Asides) I do not care whether it was U.D.C. before or not. I know it is true that in 1965 the U.D.C. was brought into existence. The Housing Authority was to look after that matter, but the Prime Minister felt that it was too big a job to put into the hands of another gentleman who was then the Chairman - the "bu-ball" would not go in the right direction, no doubt; therefore, you created another institution me rely to look after and cater to that.

Mr. Speaker, one of these days somebody, as part of a research project, is going to see the economic improvement in this country that my Party has done. These people have never understood the revolution that took place in this country between 1948-61. None of them ever understood the economic revolution that took place, but I saw it. Just think of it! Some 30% or 40% of your revenue is now spent on Civil Servants' salaries! We saw the array of Civil Servants in here two Tuesday ago, and you can look at them and see that they are all Barbadians. None of the money, or none of the personal income that is generated by that is going to be shifted abroad. That is one part of the revolution. (Asides)

Mr. Speaker, the more they climb, the more they display their ignorance; the more they climb, the more they talk. I say that the Civil Service was open to people of talent in this country between the years with the coming of Ministerial Government. Look at your Permanent Secretaries now and see where they came from. Have they not come from Barbados? The speech made by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works shows you that in content it is nonsensical and figurative in tone; it has absolutely nothing in it; it was irrelevant and, thirdly, when I listened to it, I realised why the Prime

Minister said that Seawell was too big for him.

Mr. Speaker, look at the capital expenditure between 1956-61. In those days.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose.....

Mr. St. JOHN:
I am winding up and I am not giving way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
On a point of order. Do not tell me that you are not giving way. Are you mad? Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the hon. member forgot that when we came into power they had at the Tourist Board and at the Development Board two Englishmen. They also had an Englishman at the Gas Company. What about that? They brought them downhere. Why did not they get rid of them?

Mr. SPEAKER:
Point made, but no point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, asininity is a funny thing; it always manifests itself; it is really fantastic. When you look at the total number of Civil Servants in this country today and you see the percentage -look at the difference in the 50's and see how with your Ministerial Government you attracted a large number of people from teaching to form the nucleus of your administrative machinery. What nonsense are you talking? When you look at the economic development of this country it stems from the impetus given by the Deep Water Harbour and Seawall Airport. Who built them? (Asides.) Are you tired?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House be now suspended for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTILEY:
I beg to second that.

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

4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Immediately prior to the suspension of the sitting, the hon. and learned member for Christ Church was adressing the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, I think I had reached the stage when we were dealing with the basic allocations in the Plan. There are just two more significant deficiencies in allocations in the Plan that we on this side would like to draw to the attention of the House. We believe that too little consideration has been given to the development of the Bridgetown Port. Even the Plan concedes that the expenditure there was a wise one. It has now been opened for approximately ten years. The need for its expansion has been proven, and we fail to see why the Government has been so lacking in appreciating the significance that an expansion could play in economic terms in Barbados. Too little priority is being given to it. I was shocked to hear not so long ago that the shrimp industry of this country is likely to move. This to me is a very serious thing. For some time people have been saying that the present congested conditions in the Careenage were not good enough even for the existing boats, far less for the projected expansion which can be undertaken and which it is economically feasible to undertake. I would have thought that, with the amount of money that has been built up in the Betterment Fund, the Government by now would have commissioned engineers, and we would have had plans for the expansion of the Port; but up to this day they are still relying and looking for some agency in the Organisation of American States to come and do the planning for them. I caution the Government to make proper use of the resources available to it. They should not believe that because they have saddled this country with an expenditure of some $3 million or $4 million in external representation, they must necessarily wait on international agencies for all advice.

Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Harbour is a matter that you can hire advice for; it is a matter well within the resources of this country, and we can raise the money here to do the Harbour and the Airport

at the same time because it was done before. The Deep Water Harbour was built, the Airport extended and the Terminal Building constructed at the same time. If you say that the economy of this country has improved to such a great extent under the genius of the financial management of the Democratic Labour Party, how come, when we had no Minister of Finance we could build the Deep Water Harbour, extend Seawell Airport and build 260 houses a year all at the same time, and now that you tell me your human, technical and financial resources are such that you can only execute one major scheme at a time? That is a glaring deficiency in the Plan.

Now, Sir, we come to something even more basic. This Plan fails to take into account the enormous amount of centralisation in shopping and in everything in human movement that is taking place in and around Bridgetown. Tremendous pressure is being created on Bridgetown unnecessarily. You are supposed to have a Physical Development Plan, and up to now the Prime Minister of this country refuses to release that Plan although all the land speculators know it. The machinery of Government is such in this country that they cater to them; they must have inside information; but by now you should have had a development of subsidiary centres of shopping, schools and things of that kind to try to relieve the pressures you have on Bridgetown. I have been tracing some of the policies of Government, and when I look at the projects that Government is doing and look back in our Manifesto, I see them in ours, but I do not see them in theirs. This talk of Oistins and Speightstown is nowhere in the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto, and I challenge anybody on the other side to point to it in their Manifesto; but when you look in our Manifesto you will see it. On page 14 of our Manifesto you will see this: "In order to ensure the ordered development of physical facilities for the population of this Island and to raise and maintain a high level of employment, the Party will embark upon a number of urban and rural development projects. The following are among the Party's projected works (l) Oistins, Speightstown, Holetown and Central St. George will be developed as subsidiary urban areas." This is in our 1966 Manifesto, not in yours. You picked that straight out of this. You are in power and we do not mind that, but we are not telling you what our plans are for the future.

Mr. Speaker, to see what is happening with the transport system in this country, you only have to look on a morning in any of these areas from Silver Sands, Oistins and Seawell Airport right down, and you will see hundreds of people trying to get into the few buses you have available. Your transport utility, according to the Prime Minister himself, has to subsidise the movement of school children. It is shocking that your planning is so bad that you cannot create sufficient schools within an area where the people live so that they do not have to indulge in public transportation and leave home at 6 o'clock in the morning to try and get to school. As long ago as 1962 when the now Leader of the House was Minister of Education, he went on the radio in this country and said, immediately after the assumption of this Government - and he was Minister of Education - that a Secondary School, whether you call it Comprehensive or Grammar does not matter, would be built in Central St. George, but to this day not one sod of earth has been turned in respect of that. They have given absolutely no thought to decentralising shopping or schooling, but they let an inefficient Department - I mean the Ministry of Civil Aviation run by the Prime Minister - give them projections for spending as much money as possible at Seawell Airport just as they did at the Hilton Hotel; so this Plan even upon the Government's statements would have to be modified.

Mr. Speaker, the development of Oistins and St. Peter ought to be an integral part of this Plan. The whole thing needs re-phasing in that respect because they ought to be top priority. Top priority ought to be given to the development of Holetown and Central St. George, in addition to the Airport and the development of the Deep Water Harbour.

I have already spoken on this policy of creating Industrial Estates other than in Bridgetown. I agree with it, but I have already pointed out that unless you have the machinery for decentralising your Labour Department and your Ministry of Welfare in these various sub-areas, the drift is still going to be towards Bridgetown, with terrible problems in relation to parking, transport and the cost of land. The way how land values are going in Broad Street now, soon there will be no retail businesses there, and I am only waiting to see one thing, because if my information is correct, hon. members of this House will have it early and they will be able to prove conclusively a point we have been making. I understand that a bank has been given permission to extensively develop a site in Broad Street without creating one parking space. I am watching the building and if it goes up and adds another storey to it without creating a parking space in Bridgetown, then we will have a major debate.

5.15 p.m.

Watch what is going on in Broad Street and tell me whether the former Jason Jones building is not being converted into a bank site, and I want to know how much parking ratio the Town Planners are demanding from them. We must emphasise this again, that serious consideration must be given by the Government to the creation of these subsidiary centres, not only in my constituency but in other constituencies. The Oistins Development Plan which is only being created to facilitate, by the way, an oil company, pays absolutely no regard to the requirements of the large number of sub-divisions that has taken place in the southern half of Christ Church -absolutely none; no regard at all for them; nor does the Ministry of Communications pay any regard to them either. 1 would have thought that in this we would have had some indication by the Ministry of Communications that by now they would have had a survey of every potential tenantry road in Barbados that needs doing, and let us sit down and know what we are going to do; but that kind of planning is beyond the scope of the Ministry, and it is no wonder - if the Minister cannot plan, how do you expect the Ministry to plan? The Minister would not even rely on his Civil Servants; so anything that happens in there we have to expect. You do not know what roads will be done because the Minister has to see the roads before they are done; you do not know how many street lights you will put in because the Minister has to see where to put them. There are some six or seven miles of road in Barbados, and it ought not to be beyond the resources of the Ministry of Communications to draw a map of all the existing street lights that there are in Barbados and find out where the needs are, how many houses there are - the potential needs; it ought not to be beyond the resources of the Ministry of Communications to insist that in future in all subdivisions, as part of the terms of Planning permission in addition to lights, water and roads, there should be street lighting to a minimum amount. None of these things is part and parcel of the Government's planning, but they like

pressures. Regency Park will get street lights because pressure there is greater than in other areas; some of these sub-divisions will get because the people who live there are more important; they indicate that they will vote DLP. We had it clear from the Minister of Housing that as far as he is concerned his type of politics is that Government money must be used to support his supporters. You need not want it more clearly; he said that the passport of the DLP is the pas sport to the job. I think that the public are sick and fed up with all of this; so I only hope that the Government will have a serious look at the Civil Service as a whole in this country. Reorganise it; the Ministries want reorganisation; the group of subjects and the allocation of subjects is made on a personal basis, without any reference to similarity or any managerial convenience or anything of that kind. You want a reorganisation.

The Prime Minister has too many subjects under his control - far too many; and his having Civil Aviation under his control is absolute nonsense. What does his Department have any uses for or how do they know how much it will cost? Do they have access to any technical information? Of course not! Secondly, the reorganisation of the Civil Service must be by reference to productivity and management concepts and things of that kind; and most of all, you have to. have a completely new attitude towards the Civil Service. My view is that the Regulations must be so amended that you can have a free movement in and out of the Civil Service, because there are some people who believe that there is more money to be made outside; if they feel that way, let them go; but what I am against is they cannot be inside and outside at the same time. You must amend your Pension Regulations that if you have given ten or fifteen or twenty years' service to the Government, and you feel that you have now got your experience and built up your contacts and you want to go out, go out; but you must get naturally compensation for the time you were in by way of a deferred pension. Similarly, there are many people outside who may be willing to give five or ten years of service to the Government; let them come in and Government will have a blend of experience gained by long years, on being part and parcel of the Civil Service, and experience gained from outside by the difference in the commercial attitude - because Government today is business as much as any other business, and we must get the most efficient people in it. We cannot get that with the existing terms and conditions; I am not one of them who are jealous of the so-called paper money the Civil Servants make, be cause that is only paper money anyway; if any body ever compared the rewards they get here with what they get in private industry - because these people do not reward themselves in private industry; they get their money in private industry by being owners of property and holders of shares and they know that share values are going up; they do not want income because income is subject to taxation, and this myopic Government policy of taxing income in this manner and letting capital free operates to their advantage, not to the advantage of any honest wage-earner it operates to the advantage of the owner of capital; so when we have this reorganisation of the Civil Service, without a re-phasing of this Plan, without the ability of the Government and the willingness and the desire to tackle the banks and the other financial institutions in this country, little progress will be made. This Plan is only a tokenism, a little window dressing; it does not tackle the fundamentals of the society, and these are our views.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I shall in a few words make what necessary reply I think I should do the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down, dealing with agriculture. I hope I shall not be rambling, but I shall

stick to the items to which he has paid some attention. I think the hon. member began first by making some reference to his regret that we have not got in the Ministry of Agriculture sufficient statistics informing us as to the number of small vegetable producers; that is true. I remember in a conversation this afternoon, the hon. member brought up that point and I admitted that, as far as the Ministry of Agriculture is concerned, we cannot at the moment tell you the names and numbers, including every individual small peasant producer of vegetables. But it does not stop there; we are in the process; we have created a Department in the Ministry dealing with our agronomic statistics, and that Department is functioning and is collecting information. So it is not that we are not doing something in that direction; we are doing some -thing in that direction, but at the moment and today we cannot boast of being able to produce and furnish a register that is complete; that is factual. I hope I have completely answered his point on that.

I think if I follow him again down the line -because that is the way in which I intend to run my little oration - he mentioned small farmers or the subdivision of land. He dealt for some time on that, and the reduction from four acres to two; but I must inform the hon. member and let him not live under any delusion, that a two-acre sub-division of land is not a permanent fixture; it is only a temporary measure, and I hope on another occasion, when the hon. senior member for Christ Church is expatiating on this matter, that he will bear it in mind and give a factual presentation. It is a temporary measure; it is not a bit of legislation as the legislation enacted by the Medes and Persians; it is a temporary measure.

5.25 p.m.

With regard to the Tractor Scheme referred to by the hon. member, that Scheme has not been abandoned. If he had cared to take the opportunity to read the Report - nothing to do with yesterday's newspaper - he would know that this Scheme is still going on. As a matter of fact, only a few weeks ago an individual farmer made an approach to me to service his own individual plot and this was done. It is all right to get here glibly and make a speech. I like to put the best motives and the best construction on the utterances of my political opponents. I would not say that the hon. member intended any undue reflection on my Government. Of course, any member of the Opposition has the right to see to it that he embarrasses the Government as much as he can. That is his right. He can use it up to his limitations. He must get the facts and talk.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member, who has just sat down, is a clever Gentleman of the Long Robe, and he will ask questions to bring you out. I do not mind being brought out if, after I have produced the right information, it is understood and appreciated.

With regard to the Pig Processing Plant, I have been in the Opposition, too, and I have been anxious for things to be done. With my political experience, I could not think that members of the Opposition are

always motivated by improper motives, if ever at all. That is not my function. That is not my way of thinking. I appreciate the anxiety of my hon. and distinguished colleagues on the other side when they are anxious for something to be done.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, they read this Report and understood, I believe, all of it; but they are so clever as to appear to have completely forgotten the projections that they have already seen being caught up with, and so they come out with the things that have been omitted, as they imagine. Within the course of any projected Plan, a Government does not just produce a Plan and say: "Let us go to bed; that Plan is going to work." During the time that Plan is going on, the Government must have, as my Ministry has, contact with responsible external agencies with whom we are in contact in producing and getting down for us overall feasibility studies.

Mr. Speaker, a member of the Government cannot get up here every day and tell the Opposition: "Hon. members, we are now in the throes of a feasibility study relating to this and to that." I am sure, as I look over there now, that only the junior member for St. James has had the privilege, benefit, or opportunity to have sat over there when the other side formed the Government of Barbados, I am quite sure when they were the responsible Government of this country, they could not disclose to their opponents on the other side whatever was cooking when it comes to having a feasibility study of this or that being done. (Asides.)

Mr. Speaker, I would not copy a leaf from the book of the hon. member. Mr. Speaker, you always include "learned" when you are speaking to certain Members of the Long Robe - that tradition which 1 hope will soon die. I would not copy a leaf out of that book. I would not copy a leaf out of the book of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, my erstwhile colleague. It is a fact that right now the Inter-American Development Bank is committed to sponsor on overall feasibility test that will be of guidance to us in the Ministry of Agriculture for overall planning.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. members, when they hear this, will understand that we just do not formulate a Plan and stop there. You cannot do that. Our contacts with international and with national agencies, especially the O.B.M. and C.E.D.A. -those things go on all the time. We have to depend very largely upon the expertise from foreign countries. Everybody knows that the Government of Barbados, especially the Ministry of Agriculture, is committed to a plan of agricultural diversification. I could almost .speak after the hon. member, who has just sat down, word for word on this. He said that we know a lot about sugar, but we have to know a lot more about vegetable roots, the diseases, parasites, pests and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was locked in conversation with me during the luncheon hour, and he spoke to me about the cotton industry. We have a type of cotton that is unmatched anywhere in the world. We stand unique in producing this item; it is sought after, and I know that every bit of cotton produced in Barbados for this year is already sold. You would not hear a shouting on the other side about this. Who would expect that? It is not their business. They will get on a platform in St. Jospeh, and I hope they will soon go there and shout this to the house-tops. They can come to St. Peter if they like. As long as I am there, I am sure they will be welcome. 5.35 p.m.

I promised to stick as closely as possible to the points raised by the hon. member. With regard to livestock, he looked in the Development Plan and saw when it comes to the 1970-71 column, "Attached", and immediately he mentioned the words "token vote". He need not have done that. As a matter of fact, he was generous to me in that to have included so much as a token, but there is nothing there. However, I can tell him that, representation having been made to me in consultation with my administrative and technical staff, a good sum of money is to be included in this year's Estimates for provision of livestock, and with good and sufficient reason. You see, planning does not stop when the ink on the Development Plan has dried. That is what I want to get home with force in the minds of my political opponents on the other side, and I hope they can understand that. If they think, the moment the ink has dried on a Plan, that our brains become mummified, they have another think, as the Americans say, coming. The hon. member will note that an amount of over $100,000 -I will not give the exact figures yet - will be included in this year's Estimates, and he will be able to debate it within three weeks from now.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was carried away with the vehemence of his oratory to such an extent that he missed the bus. He said that he likes to speak after certain hon. gentlemen, that they get carried away with their own oratory. I have still a different approach from such members because 1 am just more experienced. It is not my fault, and some day he will be like me, seasoned, not just a political neophite, learned, maybe, only in the law. The hon. senior member for Christ Church told us that we had no sense of certain things, he had taken us out of our depths, we were in deep waters and could not find our feet. He said that it could be proved that the outgone Government spent more money on public services than this Government has done because when they spent money, money had its worth, but when this Government spends money, money was worthless. Now I am going to deal with quantum, not money; and I am not now electioneering and therefore would not attempt to mislead this ancient and Honourable House. I am too serious a member for that. This is how we can refute that statement. When he was going guns and in peak form, I was as calm and cool as a cucumber, but thinking; and I am going to deal with quantum. In the period 1956-61 - the hon. member knows who was in power at that time - 77.14 miles of pipeline, not done under the Ministry of Agriculture, but in another Ministry, were laid. In the period 1962-67 - the hon. gentleman also knows who was in power for that period - the quantum is 103.41 miles of pipeline. Let us think and deduce. Are we to believe, Mr. Speaker, that 103 miles of pipeline, done in the period 1962-67, cost less than 77 miles done in 1956-61? Coolly, calmly and dispassionately let us think and reason. I am just like somebody who said "where are my accusers now"! The race was never for the swift, Mr. Speaker, nor the battle for the strong, but for him who would endure to the end.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to incentives, let me say this: I always pay some respect to speeches made by the hon., and let me not forget, learned member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Stick to tradition.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:
Yes, Sir. You know it is quite possible to get up and in a flurry of a motion get together some words and roll them out in very high-sounding phrases, but containing nothing material. One would have thought that in this three-year projected Report, we had had nothing to say about incentive legislation to farmers. Now I will tell the hon. member and the House that we are going to go even beyond what is written in that Report after due thought, but I am not going to give it out now. It is good always to reserve something. We could have been handled just fairly. On page 81 of the Report this is what we have said under "ProductionIncentives" -"The global amount provided for meeting the cost to the Farm Incentive Scheme during the planned period is $250,000. All loans authorised under the Scheme will be advanced through the Agricultural Credit Bank". One would have thought that there was little or no incentive being offered to farmer sunder this three-year Plan. It is just to know and to endure. I will go further. This House knows, and my colleague the hon. junior member for Bridgetown knows and remembers that he and I were interlocked in debate whn I came here for some improvement in the terms of borrowing and repayment of loans to peasants under an amendment to the Agricultural Credit Bank last year, because when he wanted to include an amendment which I resisted and we postponed the matter for further consideration, we came back and accepted the amendment as it was originally intended. We not only brought down a Farm Incentive Scheme in reality and the money to boot, but also during last year we made amendments that redounded to the benefit of the individual farmer. 5.45 p.m.

That is in the Plan; that is that. I go on a little further; let me see what else I could have forgotten. Mr. Speaker, I hope I have not dealt too tritely with the remarks made by the hon. member for Christ Church who made a very good speech, but at times it appeared as if he would have lapsed into a little electioneering - which is pardonable at this time and at this season; so we have to forgive that and understand it - but otherwise I anticipated him; I always anticipate him. If there is one hon. member on that side that I must pay some attention to, it is the hon. senior member for Christ Church, not that other hon. members are not capable of making proper and valuable contributions, but speaking so late as he has, I know he intended to wind up what the Opposition would have to say; of course, the hon. junior member for the City has the right to speak again, but I cannot wait for him; I think that one member of Government would have to come after him.

There was a time during the course of this debate when I thought I would have had nothing to reply to, but there it is. Now we go on to the Pork Processing Plant. My hon. friend mentioned that, but I can tell him this; it has not been abandoned, but the hon. member can imagine that the Government just cannot work in a sort of casual manner, without due preparation. This Pork Processing Plant is under active consideration - that sounds like a particular cliche. It is not just under active consideration and that is all; what is being done now, I think, is a matter for the lawyers; this is a legal matter being gone into. But 1 would say it has got as far as that tenders have been invited to apply for putting up this building; so we are not just dragging our feet.

The fish problem. As the hon. member knows, nowadays the CARIFTA Organisation, of which Barbados is a member - what we are doing is that the Project staff have stated that resources within the range of the existing fleet are rather limited, a point already made by the hon. member which is true - we all know that; as a matter of fact, the same expert who spoke with him spoke with me and he got the same information from the same man; so he was not giving the Government any new information; but the formation of a fishing enterprise in the area is now under consideration of CARIFTA. He knows what CARIFTA is.

There is another point that the hon. member made that I would not like him to say I have not replied to. I was searching for it but I cannot find it; probably I did not made a written note of it, but some other time I will give him the information.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need speak at any further length. There is nothing more for me to answer; had there been, I would have answered. I take things easily; with me, it is "easy does it." I am glad that I have been here and that I have been able to defend the Government in reply to the hon. member, but I have a lot I could say; I do not think there is any need for it because I will tell the Opposition and the House maybe within three or four weeks from now, but they do not need it at this stage. For this debate it would be superfluous be cause it would be on the credit side. What we have done within the course of the three-year Plan, getting almost two-thirds of what is being projected on the road, is vegetable production, but it would be superfluous at this moment, and I think my hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, is willing to make his speech at this time in defence of the Government and his Ministry.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, in this debate on the Development Plan, today is the first day during this debate for one who has sat here during the entire period of the debate to say that one who opposes something had some alternative or some contribution to the measures of what should be done, and I would like to say here and now that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is the first member on the other side who has

had anything to say and to add to this debate. All the others had nothing but criticism, and absolutely no alternatives to what they consider should be planned. If in debates of this sort hon. members could make criticisms of any particular point and could add something to make it better, then the Opposition would be doing what I consider its honest work. As I have just said, the hon. senior member for Christ Church is the only member-who has added anything, and anyone in this hon. Chamber, could well appreciate his contribution, although all might not have been in the best of spirits, and he had to have his occasion for criticism.

He has contributed, and I think on this side that several of us in various Ministries have achieved some of his ideas which have been perfectly sound in adding to a better Barbados and better development of this country. In tourism, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members on the other side should probably have known that none other than the Leader of the Opposition in the 1950's refused to give any incentives or to do anything in this country for the development of tourism; otherwise tourism would have been much further in this country. He said that to take agricultural labourers and train them to be butlers and maids would have left all the canes in the fields and stagnate the agricultural development of this country. Mr. Speaker, along there where the Blue Waters Hotel and Blue Waters Terrace is now, in the 1950's there were firms who formed a company in Barbados for the development of the hotel industry, and I can say that, years after, all the steel that came to Barbados was exported to Venezuela because they were given no incentives, no duty free concessions or anything to develop tourism in this cosntry. 5.55 p.m.

It was good enough in those days for everybody to be an agricultural labour: one set in one category and the other set in the field. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has seen things differently. I would never, even as Minister of Tourism, like to see Barbados solely and wholly dependent on tourism, and this is one of the reasons why we are doing everything possible to keep our agricultural policy and the development of agriculture going ahead. I have seen too many countries that were wholly and solely dependent on tourism fail. Even those countries are today trying with their agricultural and industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados is a small country of only 166 square miles and a very large population. It will give any Government in power headaches, if they have the interest of the masses at heart, to find employment for the people. That is this Government's concern, as well as it would be of any Government that had any regard of Socialist philosophies for the people. This is no easy problem. This is one of the reasons why we have to keep tourism; we have to try to expand our Industrial development and every possible thing in the community that can create employment for our people in Barbados.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church said that we should have some quick means of control over tourism. Mr. Speaker, Barbados is not the only country in this area that is developing tourism, and we have to compete for the tourist's dollar. The hon. member also spoke about wasting moeny and throwing

away money in the Hilton Hotel. The Hilton Hotel employs at least 340 Barbadians who can get their living out of it. The Hilton Hotel provides. employment for all types of tradesmen in the industry. The hon. member must remember that; be belongs to a Party and any excess revenue that they could have saved anywhere would have been exported out of this country. Any amount of money that this Government can find anywhere will be ploughed into the economy of the country to find employment for our people. That is the big difference between the two Parties. They would have loaned the money to somebody else at low interest rates to develop his country and to find employment for other people. We would have to put such money in Barbados. I am sorry that we do not have about ten Hiltons in Barbados making the returns that the Hilton is making in Barbados and finding employment for our people. The Hilton Hotel has not only created work for our people, but it has been an incentive for other hotels to be established in Barbados.

The hon. member also mentioned something about low wage rates. He wanted to know what part of the dollar goes into the revenue directly and so on. The question of wages is a matter for the workers and their Unions. If people are working at the hotels, the Unions must be responsible for their conditions of work and their wages and not the Government. Government cannot be the watch dog over every possible thing in a country. The people themselves will have to pay attention to their own welfare. It is the responsibility of the Union and the workers to make sure that they get proper working conditions and wages. If an industry is making money, by all means, the workers should get a fair return out of it. Without the workers you cannot make money; the workers are silent shareholders of any industry, and they should get a proper return for their labour. That is how we feel on this side.

With regard to the fishing industry, the development of the fishing industry and putting money in the Development Plan, I think I have spent several years in this business and can speak on it as an authority, just as much as anybody from the United Nations can. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Department has not found one thing to add about the development of fisheries in the Island of Barbados. If today people believe that croaker and trout have been coming here since the people from the United Nations have been down here, I can tell them that it is not true. Vessels have been trawling in Guyana waters since 1950 with Dr. Browne, and catching croaker and trout. The United Nations Fisheries Department has not been able to add anything to our local fishing industry, and I do not think they will be able to add anything to it either. They have carried out several experiments here for lobster and various types of fish, but that was not economical.

In our Development Plan, Mr. Speaker, provision has been made developing the moorings at Bathsheba and Conset Bay. If there is one person in this Chamber that would hate to see the barrier completely destroyed off-shore to enable boats to come in, it would be myself. I know that in the days when there were sailing boats you could not lay on a direct course, and they had to blow channels wider than it would be necessary to blow them today. Now-that we have powered boats you can put two markers in range and the boats will be much safer. I do not think we should destroy a reef where encroachment is taking place. If you destroy the off-shore reef at Conset Bay or the off-shore reef at

Tent Bay, you will be removing the protection of the boats in the inner basin, and you will have erosion - and a lot of land along the sea coast will be lost,

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this Government to blast a channel and keep a channel cut with markers, and at night they would carry lights. The people in the boats can keep their markers in line and enter the basin safely at night. I feel that the off-shore reef should always be preserved in order to prevent greater encroachment than is taking place today and over the last 40 years. Along Conset Bay where the railway lines used to be when I was a boy is now about twenty feet into the sea. That will give you an idea of the erosion that has taken place. If you destroy a reef, you will get stronger and greater encroachment on the land.

Mr. Speaker, in all countries in this world you have two types of fishing: in-shore fishing and offshore fishing, separate and independent. Irrespective of whatever fishing takes place in this country, you will always have your local in-shore fishing. The price of fresh fish in every country is far above that of any frozen commodity in fish any part of the world. In Norway, Sweden and America fresh fish will bring a far greater price. 6.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody to be blamed for the present condition of our local fishing industry, it is the last Government, and I say this without any apologies to anybody because they did not go into the economics of the industry. In those days we had over 300 sail boats at a cost of about $600 to $700 each. On the 3rd December, 1952, we had rough seas around the Island which destroyed over 40 boats on the coast. We were losing an average of 12 lives every year, and I went to the then Fisheries Officer and told him that the only salvation for life protection in this country would be to resort to power. I imported the first engines in this country, laid down the first keel and steamed it from here to St. Vincent and back with two fishermen and myself to show the competence and assurance that I had in the type of boat. If I had to build the same design, I would build it and still feel sure about it; for fresh fish you would not be able to go farther than the distance you could travel, say, within ten or twelve hours as our boats would usually travel.

Mr. Speaker, in 1958 I stayed ashore for five months when several firms had contributed $70,000 and hired an auxiliary schooner with an ice-box, and we used four of our local fishing boats and travelled as far as 160 miles from this Island experimenting on the catching of flying fish, and we were sure at that stage that the solution to our in-shore fishing would be a mother ship. As the hon. senior member for Christ Church would tell you, the long hours spent in our inshore fishing are spent going to and from the banks and searching for fish; but after you find fish, if the boats were competent to stay longer hours, then you would have more fish. As it is, with a small fleet having to come in day by day, you would have to have a mother ship in this venture, so that when the small boats get into the schools of fish, they could catch, and the mother ship could take the fish from them. This experiment was proving a success.

I was not then in politics, but politics came into it. I was in charge and I was not paid a cent; this was free. Because of my move for Barbados and the contribution I could give to the country, I left my own ship and went into it. The boys in my boats were paid handsomely, and on occasions they learnt so much that I saw those four boats leave 140 miles and come to Barbados, just giving them courses. Politics came into it, and the next thing I saw was that you were turning fishermen into people like agricultural labourers in this country when the men themselves were more than satisfied with what they were getting for wages and what they were learning for better development. I wiped my hands completely of it, but I can still say today that the solution to in-shore fishing would be a mother ship. In spite of the capital investment involved in that for the short period that our season lasts, we would have to find some other employment for the men. Our season, Mr. Speaker, between January and May is about the limit for the catches of flying fish. We also carried out experiments not because flying fish have got wings and can fly and people believe they live on the surface, and I have stayed for six days with flying fish and after their period of spawning they descend as far as you can see just as any other school of fish.

Mr. Speaker, the catches of flying fish in this country are due to the open Atlantic Ocean and the first land fall where they are looking for weed in which to spawn, and in the experiments we have carried out we have found that in areas with lots of plankton there were no fish, and in areas with no plankton, but with drift stuff, there were lots of fish. There is no time in the period of the fishing in this country when one could say that they found flying fish plentiful unless they were female fish ready to spawn and male fish ready for fertilising. At all the other periods you will find them with hard roes or melts just one by one. In the prime of the season just as salmon come in the Fraser River, before their spawning period, flying fish come on the surface around the period to lay their eggs, and for the male fish to fertilise them. I spent at least six days at a time watching schools of fish and carrying our experiments with my own money. It is dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to take up Government's money or somebody else's money to carry out experiments. If you have got your own, you can experiment with it and nobody can ask you anything about it; but to ask for money to carry out experiments of this sort and fail, you know what you would hear - it was not yours and you were throwing it away.

The United Nations are still carrying out experiments on the development of fisheries, and it would not have been wise, Mr. Speaker, during a period while experiments are still being carried out, to produce a Plan with something that you were not sure about. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, in most countries where you have got large populations with no natural resources, Government will always have to bear the headaches of finding employment and doing their best to keep people alive and earning something, and this Government is prepared, with every possible move that we can make for development and encouragement, to see that people get a fair share of what they earn, and it is a matter for them and the organisations like the Unions etc.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas was the first member in the Opposition to speak on the Development Plan. He found fault even with the laying out of the geographical position of Barbados. When you come in here with a Resolution for land acquisition, the same hon. member condemns, and

rightly so, plans when the position was not properly laid out stating that the land abuts and bounds on lands of Mr. So-and-So, on lands of So-and-So and on a Government highway, and such was his tendency for strong criticism of this Government that he criticised the geographical position of Barbados as laid out in the introductory paragraphs. The other hon. members did not make any contribution. All they had was criticisms, and any member who can criticise without giving alternative proposals or contributing something for what they consider wrong is adding absolutely nothing to the development of this country.

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Speaker, if Development Plans have anything in common, it is that they can extract from Opposition members some measure of debate, and this Development Plan does not fall short in this respect. I was not privileged to hear any of the speeches made previous to today on this Development Plan, but I was particularly interested in some of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church who in prosecuting, if I can use the term, the Government for their shortcomings in the Development Plan made a good speech, but when his speech is stripped of the emotion and possibly electoral implications and examined in the light of what has taken place in the last six years and what took place between 1954 and 1960 and what is hoped to take place between 1969 and 1972, his speech can easily be taken apart.

6.15 p.m.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there has been such a lot of talk about banking and credit and economies and various privileges which banks enjoy, that a layman like me, listening to the hon. member's speech, is liable to accept that the banks in this country are taking the people of this country for a ride. Now, Mr. Speaker, there might be some truth in this; but while it is true that the banks in this country can be in a position today to take the people of this country for a ride - and they might be doing it - the truth of the matter is this, that the people are enjoying credit in these banks today and that they never had that privilege between the period 1954 to 1960. In this country today there are people getting credit from banks end from business houses who even were afraid to deposit money in these banks, and were afraid to make purchases at these business houses. On Broad Street, I know, in the early fifties, shopping was for the middle and upper classes, and Swan Street was for the lower class; the banks in Bridgetown had belonged to the normal working man in this country, and so the Barbados Savings Bank and Symmonds' Co-operative Bank just around the corner - and I would say this, it is because the Director of that bank tried to extend credit to several people who abused that credit that caused the bank to find itself not in existence today. Several people, so-called decent middle class people, borrowed money from that bank and refused to pay it back, and this is one of the reasons why it is not in existence today.

While it is true to say that banks are taking the people for a ride, the people of this country are enjoying a standard of living and sometimes 1 am tempted to say it is 'too much too soon, ' because most of them get these credits from living on a standard that very often their salaries cannot take -and this is

not common to the man in the street alone; this extends even to the middle class. As the Acting Leader of the Opposition said, the production which you get now is not what you got between 1954 and 1960. If this argument is true - and I accept it to be true, because there seems to be a laissez-faire attitude in the entire Civil Service, and it has gone to some business houses, and they think it can continue, and the Civil Servants seem to be setting the standard; if you say that there is less production and that a dollar today does not do as much, if you accept both of these things to be true, then the fact that the Government has been able to provide more services on a lower production, when the dollar does not take you as far as it used to, is credit to the Government, because you have been able to do more on a reduced spending power and lower production. Very often you read in the paper - and this is one of the embarrassing things about reading "Our Readers Say" - you can always read about a man who is leaning on a pick or on a shovel, or sitting on a wheelbarrow; but you never see what is taking place in offices. Even to get an ordinary letter of acknowledgement that they received your letter and action is being taken, which is the regular Civil Service term, or that the contents have been noted - even to get an ordinary acknowledgement sometimes takes three weeks. But nobody complains about this; they always run down the man in the street who has to produce.

Mr. Speaker, between 1961 and 1969 this Government was able to provide 20,000 additional services in houses; but if you take a six-year period between 1954 and 1960, the previous Government, with money going further than it can now - and production was greater - was only able to put in half the amount, just 10,000, and this brings me now to the question of Housing. They talk about our Housing; but go into the Pine now and you will see that there are wall houses on the Princess Royal Road in the Pine with toilets in the back, one family living upstairs and another one downstairs, and to get to the family upstairs you have to pass between two ordinary toilets in the back and a pig pen and enter the house through the kitchen door. These houses were built in 1954; so if you produce that type of house, you will always be able to do more. There are several lanes in the Pine where it is impossible to walk with a bicycle, because they are too narrow. When most of those roads were put in the Pine, it was never thought that people up there could own motor cars, and now nearly all the main roads have cars parked on them because the people cannot get their cars in the lanes. They were built with absolutely no imagination, and I remember well, when they were building the houses, at least when they started again, Dan Blackettwrote in his Torch that it was time to supply water services to these houses, and this was only recently.

If you compare the past Government's most recent housing development in the metropolitan area - Grazettes - if you compare that with the Farm or St. Matthias or St. Barnabas or Parkinson Field, there are entirely different fields. You can build a lot of bad houses; but if you intend to give people proper houses with water-borne services, it is going to take longer because plumbers do not work quickly, it is going to cost more money, and because of the fact that the houses are better houses, people working for $40 and $50 a week want to live in them, and a lot of people working for $10 do not want to rent those in the Pine. The amount of houses we are building today, the people are pressuring the Government for more; there has been a general upsurge in the standard of living in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the time for Private Members' Business has now expired, the time being 6.25 p.m., are we will now proceed to Government Business.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I think we had agreed with the Leader of the House that if we could complete this tonight, he would permit us to do so. It is proposed to do this and then do as much Government Business as possible. 6.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be extended until 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Accordingly, Private Members' Business may now resume. The hon. senior member for St. Michael, who was addressing the Chair, may continue.

RESOLUTION RE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. . Speaker, I was saying that we must accept that there has been a general upsurge in the standard of living in this country. Although the Government is not responsible for electricity, just a few days ago we saw the Electric Company advertising in the newspaper that in 1958 there were only 16,000 services, but in 1970 there are 48,000 services. The mere fact that there can be a 300% increase in electricity alone is proof that there is a rise in the standard of living of the people, and the majority of the additional 32,000 would obviously come from the people who could not afford electricity previously, and the

remainder from the development within the country. This is commonsense. The people who could have afforded it before had it, and the people who could not have afforded it were put in a position to get it, and development in the country took charge of the balance. If there is development in a country, money will be in circulation, and the people will spend it and enjoy several of the things which were unknown before and, in some cases, completely unknown to this country.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there is a talk about the rising cost of living. If your income, regardless of how high it is, must supply the things that you did not have before, if it must pay for services which were foreign to you, automatically your cost of living goes up. If you start to enjoy the luxury of a motor car instead of travelling in a bus, if you enjoy watching T.V. instead of walking down the road and listening to Rediffusion, then your cost of living will go up, and this will be reflected in the behaviour of the banks and the commercial houses crediting you.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand economics like the Prime Minister and the Acting Leader of the Opposition. My economics are pure and simple. If people are living better today than they lived in 1958, then they must be living better and they should enjoy it. We are here for a time, and we should live as best we can while we are here.

I do not know if this was said in my absence, but I have not heard any per son touch on what Government has done for education in this country which, to me, is a very important part of the Development Plan. The cost of educating a child today must be more than it was in 1960, It must cost the Government more, because they have completely abolished school fees, and the $3/4 million which would have gone to revenue as school fees by parents will now be carried by Government.

It is known that the Government have relieved parents of the payment of school fees in Government Schools. When this is put against the fact that there are more children today enjoying education at the same level as those children who had to pay for it before - (Asides.) I am saying that more children are going to Secondary Schools free today than there were children paying to go to Secondary Schools between 1954 to 1960. The fact that no school fees are paid in Government schools is in itself proof. (Asides.) Mr. Speaker, they extended Harrison College. Did they extend those places to make garages? It is obvious that, if the buildings are extended and the number of children on the register is higher, the cost per child would increase the amount of money spent on education. It would cost more than it cost previously. (Asides.)

With regard to the salaries of teachers some of the teachers were over - paid any-bloody - how Mr. Speaker, I beg you pardon.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No, it was on the border line.

Mr. SPRINGER:
Some of the teachers are grossly overpaid. (-Asides.) I know that some of the Government school teachers are well qualified but grossly overpaid, and they do not intend to do any work. Some of them go to school with tennis racquets and they look forward to their leave. These are cold facts. There are more children in school, and the cost per capita is in the vicinity of $500 per pupil. I do not know if that is true, but those are the figures given to me by the Ministry of Education. If you get pupils drawn from a certain group - I do not like to refer to them as under-privileged or lower-class pupils - having the facility of going to schools that they only heard about, and they are suddenly drawn into these schools, automatically it will affect the earnings of the parents, too. They will have to start buying books, and the cost of living will be reflected in the educational system. 6.35 p.m.

The fact that the Government has removed these school fees, you have to admit, shows the intention by Government to bear some of the responsibility of educating the people of this country. (A VOICE: All are not getting.) It is their responsibility to educate all, but they only achieve it in some. Suppose we only manage 10 percent, Mr. Speaker? Do you know that that 10 percent is 100 percent more than they managed?

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I used to like to hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown say is: "I know I can't help all, but I will help some"; well, this Government is doing that. The thing about it is that more people are in a position to get help now, and even to pay than could pay before. While on this matter of education, I should like to say that I have not been privileged, unfortunately, to have had the benefit of a University Education. (A VOICE Why unfortunate?) Because I feel I could have been a better citizen. I think that anything that I can give my children that I did not get, I was unfortunate not to have had it. There are at the University here at Cave Hill Campus several students drawn from the poorer classes of this country, and if 1 can admonish them in any way, I should like to say this "You are there to be educated; make sure you take advantage of that opportunity and then enter in the field of revolutions and what not that you care to enter; but it is not fair to ask parents who themselves did not have the opportunity to pay for this opportunity which you are getting, and you, because of some external fad, agree to abuse it".

Mr. Speaker, I should never like to think that what happened in Trinidad last week with the Roman Catholic Church and the Royal Bank of Canada could happen in Barbados, and whether it is a Barbadian

student or a West Indian student, I think that the people of this country, whether they know it or not, and whether they are conscious of the direct or indirect taxation which is responsible for the education of the youths, would hate to think that Barbadians or any person who comes into our midst would use this opportunity which we are paying for.

Mr. Speaker, in 1958, 1960 and 1961 it was difficult to believe that 2,400 children in this country could be getting free secondary education at Government-aided schools. It must be more difficult to accept that there are students within our midst drawn from parents down the street who are getting University education today. This is an achievement which, not a Government, but a country the size of Barbados can well be proud, I remember well that it was a big thing as a schoolboy - and 1 was among those who had to pay - when you knew that one of your team-mates was going to a University and we all had to be there to see him off. Very often people get things and they get the feeling that it would have been so anyhow, but there are people who sacrificed to make it so. I should like to feel that Barbadian parents can instil in their children that this is something which they longed for, dreamed of, but which the children have.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything more I can add other than to say that a Government's Development Plan will always be open to criticism. I remember when the other side brought their Plan, it was open to criticism on this side; but a Plan would be useless and have no merit in it if you did not see something in it to criticise, and the fact that this has been able to evoke debate for three days and approximately twenty hours is proof that it has some value. But I would like to end, Mr. Speaker, by saying that when one examines what we are accused of not putting in the Development Plan, it is one of the few times that the Government has said that it is going to do something and the Opposition says it can do more. This is one of the times when we accept that we can do more, and I believe that more will be done than the Plan says; but when everything is fully examined, we must come to the conclusion that if they in their 17 years had done a lot of the things which we spent time doing, ... (A VOICE: Not 17 years.)

Mr. Speaker, let us call it 11 years; if they had done a lot of the things which we had to do in our first three years, we would have been able to do more than what the Plan says. It is because we had to take up the backlog of things left by them that we could not do more. The last Government never did a tenantry road, nor did they plan to do one. However, the point is that the Government produced a Plan, it has stood up to some criticism, but anyone must be satisfied that if what the Plan says is achieved in the space of three years, then the Government and the country are better off for it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, dealing with this Plan.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member spoke after the amendment was made, and accordingly is not entitled to speak again.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown has not yet spoken - not that I am encouraging him to speak if he does not want to. 6.45 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the original Resolution as moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said

"RESOLVED that this House note the Development Plan laid in the House on 13th January, 1970, and strongly condemn its failure to cope adequately with problems of inflation, banking and finance; the problem of the agricultural industry and fisheries; the problem of land utilisation; tourism; housing and social amenities; and education; and accordingly call upon the Government to review the Plan immediately to make adequate provision for these problems."

Sir, the amendment moved by the hon. junior member for St. George was to the effect that -

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House, noting the Development Plan laid in the House on the 13th January, 1970, approve the several proposals contained therein and accordingly undertake to expedite their implementation by speedy legislative action."

Now, Sir, one thing is quite clear, after listening to the debate and the contributions made on both sides of the House. Despite the fact that it is fashionable in here to get up and say members did not make a contribution, I would not even say that of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. It is quite clear that even on the admissions of almost all of the Ministers of Government who spoke, and even on the admissions of the backbenchers, they do agree - although I have no doubt they will vote against the Resolution - they admit that the Development Plan does not adequately cope with the problems facing this country.

You had only to listen to the Minister of Agriculture, and he told us that certain money was put in for livestock development, and of the fact that the Inter-American Development Bank is carrying out some survey. This in itself shows that the Plan does not deal adequately with the problems facing us. We have a statement by the senior member for St. Michael who just sat down, and he said that the Government could do more. This is the whole purpose of our Resolution. We are condemning the Development Plan because it is not doing sufficient, it does not provide sufficient solutions or a proper solution for the ills, and the problems that confront this country today; this is why we are saying that the Development Plan as it stands does not cope with the problems before this country. One had only to listen to the Minister of Tourism and you will see he made the same admissions. These are admissions which they make, but no doubt when they come to the question of voting they will obviously be voting against the Resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member has said something that I did not say; 1 said this is one of the occasions on which the Opposition is saying that the Government can do more, and not that what they are doing is impossible. I am saying this is one occasion on which they are saying that the Government can do more.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order, but a point of elucidation.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I take it that the hon. member is saying we are saying the Government can do more but they are saying the Government can do more, and if he .....

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I did not say. I said.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

To what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. SPRINGER:

Elucidation again, Mr. Speaker. I am saying this is one of the occasions in which the Opposition says the Government can do more; that is what I have said. I am not saying that the Government can do more be cause I ended by saying if the Government does as much as the Plan says, then we can be proud. So I

am not saying they can do more; I am saying this is one of the occasions in which you say we can do more.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Point of elucidation made; let us proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
He must either accept the fact that the Government can do more or that they cannot do more. We are saying they can do more, and it is obvious from the speeches of the other side that they themselves have accepted that the Government can do more. It is quite clear, when one listens to the speech made by the Minister of Housing who said in here that it was a mistake - that is a lot of rubbish; how can he say this of a Development Plan in this House when this Plan must have been discussed at Cabinet? It cannot come here unless it has been discussed at Cabinet; he is the Minister of Housing, and if there is an assumption of everything being right, I can only assume that as Minister of Housing he would have seen the Development Plan before it came to this House, and it is only after the Opposition attacked that Plan in the House of Assembly he realised it was a mistake.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
On a point of order, the hon. member said I saw the Plan before it came to this House, but the hon. member has forgotten that I was not a Minister during six months of last year; so the same way he can assume I saw it, he must assume that I did not see it. It could have gone to the Cabinet when I was not in Cabinet.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
With all due respect to the Minister, I would withdraw my statement about it if the Minister is prepared to get up in the House of Assembly and say he was not in the Cabinet when it was discussed in Cabinet. I challenge him to get up and say he did not see it in Cabinet. He said it was nonsense, and I said that the person who wrote the part of the Development Plan on Housing does not know the housing needs of this country, and I aked the Minister if he agreed with me that it was nonsense as regards Housing, and he agreed with me. I challenge the Minister to get up and say that he was not in Cabinet when it was discussed at Cabinet. I know that he has agreed that it is nonsense, and that is why I would like to see if the wording of the amendment ".....that this House approve the several proposals

contained therein"; I would like to see whether the Minister in all conscience would get up in here and tell us that part of the several proposals contained therein is nonsense, and whether he is going to support this amendment. 6.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. The hon. member said that I said it was nonsense to provide $1 million a year for Housing. I said that, and I have absolutely no apology for making that statement. I also said that over and above that $1 million, we are coming here next week with $6.8 million to spend on Housing this year. I also told the hon. member then that I had no hand in the Housing Programme at that stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's point is made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a further point of elucidation. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown yet has the right to address the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must appreciate the fact that the Development Plan was made before I was Minister of Housing, I pointed out to the hon. member that, were I the Minister of Housing at the time, no person could have told me to spend $1 million a year on Housing. I told the hon. member that I had not accepted it; I have seen the shortcomings where that is concerned, and I have asked for an additional $6 million this year.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is proceeding to make another speech to which he is not entitled.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious from the last statement made by the Minister that the criticism by the Opposition has not fallen on deaf ears. It is quite obvious that because of the criticism made by the Opposition.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In August or in late July I was asked to be responsible for the portfolio of Housing. The Estimates for the Housing Authority were prepared and the Department was given $1.4 million to spend last year, but I did not accept it. All of this was in the Development Plan. The Development Plan was not prepared in a day; it was being worked on for over a year. The point I am making is that even last year I did not accept the $1.4 million that they had -allocated for the Housing Authority. The hon. member knows that I came here and asked for an additional $1.6 million. From the time I took over the Ministry of Housing I disregarded the $1.4 million completely..

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not entitled to make another speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am on a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point is made, and the hon. member is making another speech. The point of elucidation has been made with considerable clarity.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one thing is quite clear and it runs throughout every one of the Development Plans - that the Government never spent $3 million in any one year on Housing; therefore, do not come here with any story that you want $6 million to spend on Housing. It is quite clear that, after the criticism in here when we pointed out that it was nonsense to talk about spending $1 million on Housing, an attempt was made to improve things. Since 1966 you said that you wanted 300 houses a year for the Bridgetown area alone and that would cost you $1.8 million. When it was pointed out to you that since 1966 you were aware of the fact that you wanted 300 houses in the Bridgetown area alone - (Asides. As a matter of fact if one goes back to the Development Plan 1962-65, one will see that the Government stated that the housing needs would be 2,000 houses over a period of three years. You have never yet matched up to anything you have mentioned in any of the Development Plans.

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear the Minister say that it is ignorance, or madness, or nonsense to spend $1 million on Housing. I would like the Minister to get up now and tell this House if he was not the Minister of Housing during the 1960's, and how much money he then allocated in the Development Plan for Housing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order. The hon. member knows quite well that I was Minister of Housing for a short while, and was then moved from Housing to the Ministry of Trade. That was done between 1964 - 65. Housing was added to Community Development or Social Services, as the case may be. It was added in May 1965, and I was moved from Housing to Trade in November 1965. There was no time for a Plan.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the Minister was the Minister of Housing in the year 1965.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order. I said that Housing was put on to the portfolio of the Ministry of Social Services - which then got the name of Community Development and Housing - in May 1965, and there was a resignation from the Cabinet in November, 1965. In that short space of time I was asked to look after Trade, and I had no time to do Housing.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to know whether he was the Minister of Housing in 1965.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Yes, for six months.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that he would shy away from accepting responsibility for the provisions contained in the Development Plan for 1965-68, That was the same period when he was responsible for Housing. I have no doubt that he will tell us that he was not the Minister responsible when the Plan was formulated. In 1965-66 it will be noted that $1.4 million was provided for Housing. It is interesting to note that in 1965, under the last Development Plan, the total amount of money which the Government said they would spend was $4, 186,000. Under this Development Plan the total is $4, 253,000. I would not go into details with things like the devaluation as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has

pointed out.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Agriculture knows very much the value of money. He is an expert on the value of money. No person in here knows better that he does the value of money. (Asides.) You know the true value of money; you know the difference of money between 1965 and 1968.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I have gone beyond the stage of just accepting the words of certain Ministers. The Minister got up and said that it was a mistake. 7.05 p.m.

Is it a mistake when you total the figures? It cannot be a typographical error because it is repeated throughout the Plan. Is it a mistake at the Printery?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
On a point of order, it was a mistake in planning.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
In other words, you agree with the Opposition that the Government can do more with Housing. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS In respcet of Housing, yes.) Seeing that the Minister has admitted that much, let us go on to certain other remarks made by the Minister. Sometimes 1 believe that the Minister speaks without thinking, that he sets his tongue in motion before his brain; otherwise the Minister could not be capable of the sort of utterances he makes to the effect that all you have to do is to show him a Party card and he will give a job. I want to deal with this to show the lack of understanding of the relationship between the Minister and the Housing Authority, because how on earth can you get a Minister stating in your National Assembly that he would give certain contracts to certain people? Am I to understand that the Housing Authority has not got the responsibility for giving out contracts?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
On a point of order, the hon. member forgot that I said if I had to give contracts'. I do not have to give

contracts; the Housing Authority gives them.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I do not accept that he said 'if he had authority to give contracts'. He said that he would give contracts. How else could Rayside have got a contract? .

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, I did not say that I gave contracts. I said if I have to give them, I would give them.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I withdraw the statement. I would like the Minister to tell the House the basis on which Rayside was awarded a contract to build houses at Silver Hill. Did you go to tender and advertise for them?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, I have already answered that in my address.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that Rayside can build a house for $6,500 and the Housing Authority's projected cost is $6,700. Does the Minister expect people to believe this? Does he really expect to say that Rayside is the only person who can build a house for $6,500? Did you ask any building firm in this country to tender and see for how much they could build these houses? If Rayside can build a house for $6,500 and the Housing Authority can build for $6, 725, it means that something is inherently wrong with the costing system at the Barbados Housing Authority. What has the Minister done about it? Has he checked to see where the mistake is and to see why it is that Rayside can build houses for that amount of money and a Government agency has to spend more money?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The answer is simple. People waste more time on Government work than they do under private contract.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I do not think the hon. member could be serious. Does he sit down in a Ministry and appoint people to the Housing Authority Board and say that people waste time on housing contracts?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, 1 sat down today and listened to an oration from the other side, attacking left and right public servants and people in direct labour in Government Departments for standing up along the streets and not putting in production. It is a question of the lack of productivity by people who are working with direct labour in Government Departments. You get better productivity from private enterprise than in the Government service.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the fact that you have Ministers who would make statements like that that the sort of thing can happen in this country, because rather than the Minister going to the Housing Authority and seeing why it is that to build a house it is going to cost more. than by a private person, he does absolutely nothing about it, and the situation is allowed to continue. The only answer as far as the Minister is concerned, is not to give it to a Government agency, but to give it to a private contractor. If the Minister adopts that attitude, it is no wonder that the labourers down to bottom adopt the same attitude.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the hon. member is getting on as though.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

This is just a preface to my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No preface; point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, the matter complained of is what existed in every Government Works Department in this country not only under the Democratic Labour Party but under the Barbados Labour Party, and will continue because of the attitude of people and the low productivity of Government Departments.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point, but it was not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I will take the Minister to task and show that this statement that Ray side is building cheaper is a lot of nonsense. It may sound good that Ray side can build for $6,500 while the Housing Authority is building for $6, 725; but if you look at the price at which the Housing Authority built houses at the Farm, you will see that it was $10.93 per square foot, Rayside is building at $10.40 per square foot but the projection for Silver Hill is $10.76. You built the other places at $8.25; so Rayside's projection is not lower than all these other projections.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

If the hon. member would give way, the position is that the houses were built cheaper at Pleasant Hall because of better foundation. We had foundation problems at Silver Hill; we had testings made and had to dig out pockets of mould which took time and labour, and therefore to get the building off-base, it cost additional money. The Housing Authority put this money in the Estimates for Silver Hill after having built twenty houses there and knew what they cost. However, the point is that it cost private contractors less to do it because they get more production out of their workers.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made, but no point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Am I really to understand the Minister as saying that because you can get better productivity out of workers in private enterprise, every single thing that is to be built by Government will go out to private enterprise?' 7.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
This is what we are saying.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
If this is so, why do you not give the Airport to them too? (Asides.) Mr. Speaker, there are some people who believe that the only way to answer anybody's argument is to indulge in personal abuse.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No names have been called that any person is indulging in personal abuse.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
I have known the hon. member for a very long time, but unfortunately it is only since 1 came to this House that I realise how unmannerly and how rude he is.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, I take offence to that and I am asking him to withdraw it; it is unparliamentary.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Sir, I have not said anything about him; I said the "hon. member" and if he knows that it applies to him.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
When we reach past certain hours, I notice that in this House tempers become very flared.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, I ask for a Ruling; the hon. member used unparliamentary remarks.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

It would be for me and for me alone to say whether anything is unparliamentary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I am taking offence to it; therefore I am asking you to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Did I correctly understand the learned member for Bridgetown to say that he had withdrawn the remark which the hon. member thought might have been addressed to him?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I will withdraw the remark; I did not mean it to him. Mr. Speaker, what I was saying was simply this; you cannot expect to take up taxpayers' money and put into the pockets of Rayside purely because he is a member of the Democratic Labour Party, or purely because he gave you the trucks to use at a bye-election.

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the hon. member said "you", to whom was he referring?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I mean the Government, Sir, with all due respect. Is the Government aware that there are other building firms in Barbados that can do the job as well as or better than Rayside? Do you ask him to send in an estimate? No. Now, Sir, I believe that those points are the only points I wanted to answer in reply to the speech made by the Minister of Housing, and I think it is sufficient that he had to admit in the House that as regards to several proposals in the Development Plan, in particular those with regard to Housing, that the Development Plan is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have, had to deal in this House with several Development Plans, and I remember the first Five Year Development Plan - in those days I would talk for five hours without anyone telling me how long I could talk on it - and anyone who says there was not a Plan before is a stranger to the truth. There was a Plan before and the now Government was in the Opposition, and I remember well I was asked to come out about 6 o'clock in the morning. As an old Parliamentarian, I will say to the Minister of Housing that, however strong he feels in a matter, it is not wise to get up and make the type of statement he made in the House. If you had a newspaper in this country which would report things, a lot

of peculiar things would happen after he made that statement.

Dealing with Housing, I remember well, when Mr. Louis Redman took over the Housing Authority as Manager he discussed with me the question of what the houses would cost, and I asked him a very pertinent question, which was whether he had invited tenders in this matter; he himself did not seem very satisfied with the way things were done and how awards of contracts were made, and I am going to-read on the floor of this House what the Prime Minister said there when he wanted everybody to believe that the present Democratic Labour Party Government was like Caesar's wife, and was beyond suspicion. The hon. and learned Prime Minister said that every tender must come to his Government, whether it is a Board or otherwise, and must go to the Tenders Committee, and he made a very strong statement then against the Party that he succeeded, to the effect that what he had discovered was that the Tenders Committee used to sit down and they never met - if I am wrong I would like the Leader of the House to correct me - but they never met; they used to award contracts by a round robin. I will ask the Leader of the House now if a Tenders Committee met to award these contracts for these houses. If you are spending a $1 million anywhere, it might be true to argue that when the Deep Water Harbour was built it was awarded by contract and a lot of noise was made in here about the terms and conditions of the contract, but at least we only heard that the Hilton was awarded by contract. We know that more than one person tendered, we know that it was awarded, but in this case when any Minister can stand up and admit that his own Government is not exercising as parsimoniously as it should, it only means that corruption is taking place, and it is a very bad thing to say that it does not make any difference. If you feel that way, keep it to yourself. I want to know about this award of contract, and I am asking now if you intend to wind up this debate tonight or not. 7.25 p.m.

I am going to talk out the time. With my experience, I warn the hon. member that he should be very careful with what he says in this House. The Prime Minister said on the floor of this House that if they wanted a contract for meat, if they wanted a contract for vegetables or something for the Hospital, the matter should be put out for tender. Now, the Prime Minister is head of the Government and head of the Cabinet, and no one can tell me that if you had put the matter out for tenders.....(Asides.) All you had to do was to get your specifications, your? borings for the foundation and so on and ask for tenders. This is what I understood from Mr. Redman. After you have done that, you can ask people to tender for it. I feel that the public would be satisfied if it cost more.

I understand that it cost the Housing Authority more to build the houses; I understand that is true, but the Prime Minister cannot come in the House and make one statement, and then have his Ministers come in here and make another statement. "The Minister of Housing said that he gave Mr. Rayside the houses to build. When I was in charge of Local Government, if the Bishop was not around when the City Council bought the Nightengale Home for L5,000 after the Solicitors had bargained for the price - Mr. Speaker, I was accused in here of selling my friend's house.

I also remember, when I bought an extension for the Cemetery from Mr. Branch at the Belle, a similar thing happened. You cannot get up in public and say that something is awarded to a man. You cannot award a job like that to a particular man. If you wanted to award it to a particular man, there are other means of doing it. I want to warn the hon. member about that. He has a lot of courage, and at one time I was accused of running his Ministry, He has the courage to say that $1 million to spend on Housing is nonsense. The Cabinet must have seen that $1 million had been inserted in the Plan; it must have been to him; if we accept his excuse that he was not in the Cabinet at the time it was discussed, you cannot put $1 million in the Estimate sand then spend $6 million. He must accept the criticism, and I warn him that in any country other than Barbados there would have been trouble, I can tell you that if this had happened to the Barbados Labour Party when they were in power, the present Prime Minister would have caused a lot of trouble, and somebody would have had to see about it. You cannot just say that 'I like a man and I will give him the contract to build houses'.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I am afraid that Private Members' Time has expired.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:
Question!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Time be extended for five minutes.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:
The question which I will now put is, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question". Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye", and hon. members of a contrary opinion will say "No". Methinks the "Noes" have it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Divide. The House divided and voted as follows

NOES:
Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. COBIN and Mr. HOPPIN - 9

AYES; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS:
Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HOLDER and Mr. St. JOHN 6.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I have been advised that 9 hon. members voted "No" and 6 hon. members have voted "Aye". The question now is, "That these words be inserted". Hon. members of that opinion will please say "Aye", and hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Divide. The House divided and voted as follows.

AYES:
Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. CORBIN and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

NOES; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. St. JOHN and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 6.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I am informed that 9 hon. members have voted "Aye" and that 6 hon. members have voted "No". Consequently, the "Ayes" have it and those words are duly inserted.

The question that the Resolution as amended, do now pass was put and re solved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspend until 8.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

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

7.35 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:
Will the Hon. Leader of the House please Intimate what he intends to do?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:
When Government Business was last before the House, the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and House resumed Committee of Supply Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

RESOLUTION FOR $23, 121 (Cont'd.)

Head 24 - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, the Note reads that this amount is required to settle outstanding claims for repairs to office equipment at Government Headquarters, As the Leader of the House is well aware, I like to do my homework when it comes to this question of office equipment and machinery. Certainly the Leader of the House would be willing to tell us at this stage the office equipment that has to be repaired and how often, and whether it is the new machines that are breaking down more often than the older ones, and if so, what is Government's policy.

The question that Head 24 - Home Affairs - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 29 - Prisons- was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, under this Head is Item 24 dealing with the Farm. I wonder if the Leader of the House has any information that prisoners at Glendairy have been found with keys and icepicks in their possession. Does the Minister know that these items are being manufactured in the Farm? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR I would not know; I am not there with them.) You are asking this Committee to vote money to support activities in the Farm. Can the Minister tell us what activities go on in the Farm at Glen-dairy? Here is a Minister coming to the House and asking us to vote money to promote activities in the Prison Farm and now admitting that he does not know what activities take place there. Are you asking us to give them money in the Farm to make more keys so that one night when the Minister is asleep some of the prisoners can turn up at his door? (Hon. N. W. BOXILL You are wasting time.) The Minister does not waste time, but he is telling us that this money is to buy medicine. The Note, however, reads that this amount is necessary to settle outstanding claims and to meet commitments to the end of the financial year. Claims totalling $604.80 for the financial year 1968-69 were met from the provision in the current year's Estimates. I wonder if the Minister in charge has on his file that this money is to buy medicine. Under Item 18 you have maintenance of Hospital, I believe the Minister has invited me to sit down because he knows how the gates were put on at my house.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, if I can help the hon. member with the information supplied to the Cabinet, it is as follows- "An amount of $2,700 was provided under this item in the current year's Estimates. At November 30, 1969, the sum of $2, 142, 97 was spent leaving a balance of $557.03 with present commitments totalling $443.36. Claims for services during the previous financial year totalling $604.80 were paid from funds provided in this financial year. Supplementary provision of $700 is therefore

required. This is all the information which I can put at the disposal of the hon. member.

The question that Head 29 - Prisons - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 8.40 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1969-70 No. 69 A Resolution for the sum of $50, 123 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement certain items under Head 26 - Police. They range from Special Constables, Incidentals, Travelling, Subsistence, Band Fees, Newspapers, Court, Tickets, C.I.D. Apparatus, Corpses, Scientific Investigations Expenses, Furniture and Office Equipment, Motor Vehicles; and the addition of two new items, Sirens and an Air Conditioning Unit. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman, under Item 80 - I hope when we are voting money next year that we can put some new lights in here. Under Item 80, dealing with Motor Vehicles, the Note says that this amount is required to purchase three (3) motor cycles ($7,500), sirens ($318) and one (l) Chrysler Valiant Estate car ($7,500), Radio, Telephones ($3, 480) - a revote of lapsing funds, and also to replace the Land Rover which was attached to District "C" and which has been written off after being involved in an accident. First of all, in adding up these prices I seem to come out about $4,000 short, and I would like to find out from the Minister in the case of the Land Rover that has been written off, what has become of that particular vehicle - if it has been sold by an Insurance Company, and how much money that vehicle was sold for.

Secondly, I would like to find out if the Chrysler Valiant Estate Car referred to in this Resolution is the one which the Police already have and the one which the Police have been driving for quite some time. The reason I am asking this is because if it is the one the Police already has, I would like to know from whom they purchased it because one thing is quite clear, that that Estate car is not a new one.

I would also like to find out this; I believe the Government has purchased three 3-litre Austin cars for the Police costing over $9,500 each. Besides being used for the purpose of driving the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House, I would like to know why it is necessary to purchase such expensive motor vehicles; you have purchased, perhaps, one of the most expensive motor vehicles that is being made in England outside of the Jaguar and so on. I would like to know the reason for doing this. I wonder also if the Minister is aware that one of these vehicles has been damaged and what is the position since it has been damaged, whether it is going to be repaired or whether it is going to be sold. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know about that.) I know you know about it because I see you driving in it sometimes. I would like to find out why is it that the Government has decided to use such expensive cars as Police cars, and to find out whether one of these cars has been repaired after being damaged in less than a year after it was bought. Secondly, I want to find out about the Valiant, if the money here is for the one the Police are already driving. If that is so, that car is certainly not a new car and I would like to know from whom the Government is purchasing it.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, let us begin at Item 30 - Special Constables. The sum of $1,000 is required to pay watchmen, among other things, for watching the residences of Government officials when they go overseas on Government business. I wonder if we would consider if Mr. George Moe, Senior Crown Counsel, comes within the category of a Government official, and if, when he goes overseas, a watchman watches his residence. How many times has Mr. Moe gone overseas and his house has been broken and entered while he was overseas? Is the watchman conniving with the breakers or what? 8.50 p.m.

All I am asking is this. Mr. George Moe is a Government Official, and he goes overseas on Government business. From the Addendum here, we understand that a night watchman would normally be placed at Mr. Moe's residence. All I want to know is if the residence is still being broken into once, twice, thrice or four times, five times or almost six times? Is this night watchman still doing his job, or is there no watchman there? Is the Addendum misleading?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

This is simple. We have a watchman at Highways and Transport. There is a lady up there who sells food to the workers, and this morning is about five times within the last five weeks that the place has been broken into. That is just an illustration of what takes place. I do not know how many times Mr.

Moe's place has been broken into, but I know that a watchman is provided to look after the houses of Government Officers when they go abroad on Government business. Mr. Moe lives in a big house. We know how thieves operate. Thieves are very clever and sometimes they enter your very room while you are sleeping in it. What is to prevent a thief from watching a watchman's movements and then breaking a house? We cannot put a watchman to watch a watchman.

For instance, Elmer's Supermarket in St. Peter was broken into last night. The hon. member knows that at the gasolene station at Redman's Village, St. Thomas, they had a watchman and still the place was broken into. It does not necessarily mean that the watchman was conniving with the thief. It is nobody's fault if a thief goes and breaks into Mr. Moe's house. There is a saying that God helps the watchman, and He helps the thief. You cannot hold Government responsible for that.

Hon. C.E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which I would say that hooliganism is the order of the day. Government provides old, retired policemen to serve as watchmen to watch certain places when certain people are abroad. Now, Mr. George Moe is a Parliamentary Counsel and when he goes away his wife does not remain here in the house. When he is abroad, she prefers to join him. I am fully aware of the fact that hooliganism is the order of the day, and that Mr. Moe's house has been broken into on several occasions.

In so far as I am concerned, I have been affected also, but not on as large a scale as Mr. Moe has been. Of course, the retired policemen must be requested to serve as watchmen. Unless you ask the Minister of Home Affairs and his entourage to pro -vide you with a watchman, or ask the Sergeant in your area to provide you with a watchman, you will not get one. I must say that they have done very useful work as far as I am concerned, and they have been very helpful to my family, I have had the privilege of being given that protection,

In so far as Mr. Moe and his wife are concerned, 1 know that they have been having a lot of trouble with thieves, There is no security as far as they are concerned, and they have suffered very much at the hands of these intruders and hooligans. Hooliganism seems to be reigning supreme, and unless we have proper and competent watchmen, hooligans will take over eventually.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown asked for certain information in respect of vehicles. On the 30th of November last in a request for supplementary provisions for certain items, the Commissioner of Police reported that in respect of this item the sum of $17,005 had lapsed at the end of

the previous financial year and that this amount had been earmarked to purchase three motor cycles at a total cost of $7,500; sirens to cost $318, and 1 Chrysler

Valiant Estate car for $5,700; radio telephone costing $3,500. He went on to say that those items had been ordered and provision had been made for the financial year. Now that he has recevied them the total cost is $16, 998. He made a request for a further supplementary of $6,000, and it would give us $22,000. He explained this by saying that this further sum was required to replace a Land Rover M - 8109 which was attached to District "C" Police Station and which had been written off as a result of an accident. The Land Rover was taken over by the Standing Insurance Committee, and it appears that the sum of $2, 211, which was its written-off value, was paid into the Treasury and into General Revenue on the 10th December, 1969. That is all I can say with respect to the vehicles. It appears that they wish to replace the Land Rover which was damaged and also to pay for the car as well as the motor cycles and other things.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the Leader of the House that the Commissioner of Police says that the Chrysler Valiant Estate Car cost $5,700?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Then why are you asking us to vote $5,700? 9.00 p.m.

According to Note 13, it says one Chrysler Valiant Estate car $7,500.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
It is the motorcycles that will cost $7,500, and the car $5,700.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will know that the Addendum is not part of the Resolution. The amount asked for is $16, 998 plus $6,000 for the replacement of the Land Rover. If he adds the total

amount and puts in the car at $7,500, he could not get $16, 998. All that has happened is that the figures have been turned around, but this does not change the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I can see the day when you are going to have real trouble in Barbados with the hon. member who has just sat down. He is trying to be a lawyer a bit too soon. He first rises -to tell us that the Addendum is not part of the Resolution. That is a lawyer's approach to the problem. But it does not alter the fact that the figures given us here are not borne out by what the Leader of the House has just said.

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, we are asking that the figures "7,500" be changed in the Addendum to "5,700".

Mr. HINDS:

Let us get back to the night watchman.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the Valiant is a second-hand one and from whom it is being bought, because you cannot get a new Valiant for $5,700.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

If the hon. member would give way, the point is that the hon. member must understand that all the Police vehicles bought by Government are duty-free, and the duty is something like 30% plus 20%. If I wanted to buy one, I would have to pay $10,000 or $12,000 for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

What I would like to find out from the Minister is whether it is part of Government's policy to buy these expensive cars for the Police. Why is it necessary for Government to buy three -litre Austin cars for the Police to track down people? It is one of the most expensive cars in Barbados. I would like to find out what is the position with the three-litre- Austin car that had been damaged. I know there is a vote for a State car, but just because the Prime Minister does not want to buy a State car, he uses the Police car all the time. The Hon. Leader of the House used the car when he was Acting Prime Minister. I should like to know whether the car that was damaged has been repaired or sold. How much duty are you getting off? If you get 30% off an American car, you cannot get 30% off an English car. An Austin three-litre car is sold to an ordinary person for almost $10,000; so it must cost the Government between

$7,000 and $7,500. You are telling me about consumer tax and you cannot tell me what has become of the car. Do you mean you are not interested to find out what is happening with the taxpayers' money? Did you know the car was damaged? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR No.) I like the way you run the Ministry.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Leader of the House can tell us how long ago it was part of the Government's policy to supply these watchmen for watching the residences of Government officials when they go overseas. 9.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

My understanding is about three years.

Mr. HINDS:

I wonder what is the position with the Medical Officer from the Health Centre at Speightstown whose residence was watched by the Coleridge-Parry watchman when he went abroad. Prior to that the watchman worked for whichever officer went abroad, and the officer on his return would compensate the watchman; but in this particular case the watchman worked for about three to six months. How did he get paid for it?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised a good point. In the past the officer himself compensated the watchman, but a decision has been made by Cabinet to see that the watchman is properly compensated.

Mr. HINDS:

Item 46 - Subsistence, an amount of $5, 849. "This amount is required to settle claims in hand and to meet commitments to the end of the financial year. Due to the increase in the establishment of the Force and the increase in the number of the recruits sent to the Regional Training School the amount voted in the Estimates proved inadequate." Mr. Chairman, some of our policemen went to Expos 67, and until this day there is still a lingering dissatisfaction; that is, the men were led to believe before they left here that they would have received while in Canada something like $16 Can. per day. After they arrived there, the gentlemen who had more or less engineered the whole trip told them they could not get more than $11 Can. per day, but in truth and in fact the men never received more than $35 Can. at the end of one week. This is a matter which I raise because I do not want to find our men working under any such circumstances in the future. There is evidence that they were not properly protected from the financial end on that occasion, and we would like to know that it does not happen in the future.

We come now to the question of Travelling -item 43 - $8,000. Travelling in the Police Force must in future be seen to extend beyond Officers and Inspectors as is seen here in the Note. We have got to think in terms of the Mounted Corps; it is high time that a number of horse boxes be acquired for transporting the horses. You will find that, as happened at Speights town on Friday night, when the hon. senior member was on the stage, the Mounted Corps rode from District "A" to Speightstown, an average of 14 miles, they put on a display and then rode back to District "A". If this is the jet age, or rather the space age, we have got to keep abreast of the times and a mounted man no longer feels satisfied with going to put on a display and riding back to the Station at a quarter to twelve or something like that. It is felt that horse boxes ought to be acquired, the horses driven by jeep, hooked on to the carriage or whatever it is, and carried to Speightstown; the men should be transported there as well, ride their horses during the display, and the horses should be brought back in the same manner as people who keep horses transport their horses in horse boxes. You will find a policeman at that time of night riding home, but he is sitting on the horse sleeping after putting on such a grand display, and we feel that the time has come when the men must not be required to sit on horseback, and you must get horse boxes for them; they could use the double-box system.

We come down to the question of parking tickets. I am to wonder if the time has not come when we should try to keep as much business, whether it is printing or any other business, rather than importing it. Instead of sending out money abroad to pay other people to employ other people in their country I wonder if we cannot consider having our printing of the car parking tickets done locally and employ our local people. 9.20 p.m.

Let it be done locally; let us try and employ our local people; let us print our bus tickets here. (Asides) Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item 80, Motor Vehicles, I am telling this Committee that there is a Vespa motor cycle attached to District "C", and the Sergeant attached to District "C" has been using that Vespa motor cycle for transporting two of his children and himself at the same time. (Hon.J. C. TUDOR: We will investigate that.) I suppose you will investigate it in the same way as you investigated what took place at the Government Printery!

With regard to radio telephones, will the Minister tell us to what use the radio telephones will be put? He should also tell us about these sirens. Now, you are acquiring 20 sirens for the cars of Inspectors of the Police Force. Do we really have need for these? (Asides) This is the taxpayers' money we are spending. If the hon. member wants to go home, he can do so. We see Fire Officers have them attached to their cars, but for what purpose are they using them? They are just scaring people out of the way when there are really no fires to attend to. I have re-ceived complaints from business people in Bridgetown about this nonsensical manner in which these sirens are being used. (Asides) It is all right to talk about hurrying to accidents.

I should like the Minister to tell us, in the case of people caught exceeding the speed limit, how many of them are given warning notices, and how many are prosecuted within a period of each month. I would like to know the type of people that are prosecuted, and the type of people that are sent friendly warnings. I am going to table Questions in connection with this matter. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members, not addressing the Chair, please observe the Rules!

Mr. HINDS:

Sir, we have to look into this matter of the Police and their travelling and matters connected thereto much more seriously than we have been doing in the past, You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioner of Police himself does not now worry to visit his out-stations as often as is believed to be necessary. (Asides) The policemen are workers, and the Minister must learn to appreciate that. We are concerned with the conditions under which they work. We are voting money here for Police travelling, subsistence, Band fees, C.I.D. apparatus, and for an Office air-conditioning unit. I wonder who has the unit that they are replacing. I refer to the unit from the Control Room. I wonder how old is that unit at the Control Room. Undoubtedly, the Minister will have some information on this. It is Item 99. If we can be given information on those matters, then we would ertainly be in a better position to assist the Government in the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot wink your eyes at the fact that hooliganism is the order of the day. That is what the Minister of Health tells us. I should like the Leader of the House to give us whatever information he has on the points we have raised.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

If the hon. member would give way, I should like to mention something. News has just arrived that the Reporters have pointed out that they are extremely tired. I am going to suggest that we report progress. I think that they are workers, too, and their welfare should be looked after just as the hon. member is thinking of the workers at I.S.L. and the policemen. 9.30 p.m.

I do not know if the hon. member has completed his address, but I rose to move that we do now report progress.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the pas sing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. HINDS rose

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
There are two hon. members of their feet.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can pass the other Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for $50, 123 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Oh separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th March, 1970, at 12 noon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the House's attention that it is extremely difficult to see anything at all by the light on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I could not agree with the hon. member more.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Will you undertake to have something done about it?

Mr. SPEAKER:
I will so direct Mr. Clerk.

The question that this House do now adjourn was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.36 p.m.