

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th February, 1971

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.45 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Social Welfare); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications, and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN; J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 26th January, 1971, are now available for confirmation. In the absence of any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly confirmed. There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I do not think I have done justice to these Minutes, and I would prefer that confirmation of them be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of these Minutes, I have declared them confirmed. If the hon. member, or any other hon. member, discovers any error or omission in them, I will draw it to the attention of the House and have the correction duly made. That is my undertaking.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, after they have been confirmed, no hon. member is going to worry to read them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the hon. member should still read them, and I would take steps to ensure that the Minutes, when they eventually appear, are corrected.

Mr. HINDS: I promise to do that.

COMPLAINTS *re* AIR CONDITIONER

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the switching on and off of the Air Conditioner is affecting the health of hon. members on this side. Because of the noise, it has been switched on and off from time to time, and it is not working satisfactorily. Has anything been done to rectify the position?

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member would mind having a word with Mr. Clerk, who would explain to him what has been done in non-technical terms.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I observe that there are many things that might be asked of the Chair by just going to the back of the Chair. The Chair gives Rulings in the House, and the Chair may give Rulings from Mr. Speaker's Chambers. There are many things that are said in Parliament that are perfectly out of order and are a pure waste of time. Hon. members can go behind the Chair and discuss certain things with Mr. Speaker, but to get up in the House and make a demonstration of this kind is a waste of time and is grossly bad form.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not wasting any time. I come here every week, and

I find that every 20 minutes the Air Conditioner is turned off and then turned on. This has been going on from January, and it is not in the interest of hon. members' health. I would like to find out whether anything can be done about this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have inquiries duly made.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There were certain Minutes which were deferred from last week for certain corrections to be made. I am informed that these corrections have been duly made, and those Minutes are now open for confirmation. Unless there is any objection, I declare those Minutes, as amended, duly confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the House, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at Husbands, St. James, to the Caribbean Meteorological Council.

REPLY TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 142, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now Question Time. I understand that the answer to Question No. 142 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is ready, but the hon. member is not in his place.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay the Reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member lay the Reply.

There are no more Questions, and the time has now arrived for Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 16 be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

2.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION re LOSS OF SHRIMP INDUSTRY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 16 becomes the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of

the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. When this matter was last discussed and the time for Private Members' Business expired, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was addressing the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when we were dealing with this Resolution, I was pointing out when Private Members' Business expired that when the Barbados Marketing Corporation agreed to allow Bajan Seafoods Limited to operate in Barbados, they agreed to do this after having taken certain action in respect of determining whether there was adequate financial backing for this company. I was pointing out that the Barbados Marketing Corporation had actually received a letter on 19th February from the Bank of America, and this letter advised the Barbados Marketing Corporation that there was an irrevocable letter of credit in the amount of \$U.S.200,000 established through their San Francisco Headquarters for Bajan Seafoods operation, and that they had estimated to accommodate an annual total of \$5 million turnover in shrimp production for the account of Bajan Seafoods Limited. Any organisation, any Corporation which is looking for business.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it \$U.S.5 million?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The annual turnover was supposed to be \$U.S.5 million, and this was embodied in a letter dated 19th February, 1970, to the Barbados Marketing Corporation from the Bank of America. It was also stated in this letter that additionally a current account reflecting a balance of \$20,000 E.C. had been opened with the local branch of the Bank of America, and it was at that stage pointed out that any Corporation I do not care which Corporation, any organisation or any Board, given this sort of undertaking, given this sort of guarantee from a Bank with the reputation of the Bank of America would act in favour of the Company on whose behalf such representation was made by the particular Bank; and as anybody would have done, as any other Corporation would have done, as any other Board would have done, the Barbados Marketing Corporation concluded that satisfactory arrangements were made for carrying on this type of business, and inasmuch as the business did not only deal with shrimp but with providing an adequate supply of fish of which there was a shortage in this country at the time and even today, and as a means of providing fish at a reasonable price, this new company did not state that its intention was to catch fish and dump them back into the sea, but that the very fish caught by the Company would be brought to Barbados to fill a gap to satisfy the need for local consumption, on these grounds of adequate financial arrangements, the fact that a need to the average consumer in this country would have been satisfied and that instead of paying 90 cents a pound for fish, the housewives in this country would have been in a position to get fish as low as 25 cents a pound, this agreement was arrived at.

Hon. members on the other side, who spoke, talked about dislocation of workers. On 5th February,

1970, Bajan Seafoods gave an undertaking to the Barbados Marketing Corporation that there would have been no dislocation of workers. It is alleged that the Barbados Marketing Corporation did not take the appropriate amount of caution in dealing with this matter and that they did not act in good faith. I am establishing the point that the Barbados Marketing Corporation acted in good faith, that they acted in a manner in which any group of patriotic Barbadians would have acted. So to say that the Barbados Marketing Corporation placed workers in this country out of work due to its own fault is not speaking the truth. As I pointed out and I shall repeat time and time again, the minute that the four boats were repossessed - and they were not repossessed because they were lying down in the Harbour; they were not repossessed because the Captains refused to carry them out to sea, they were repossessed by a man called Bernard St. John, a lawyer in this country.....

3.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not refer, as he well knows, to any other hon. member of this House other than by the name of his constituency.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would say how many people were employed.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am making my address, and nobody is going to tell me what I should say in this address. The hon. member had his opportunity to speak, he said what he had to say and I did not interrupt him, and he has an opportunity to speak again if he wants to on the amendment. I am saying that the four boats which were operating in this country were repossessed through the instrumentality of a man called Bernard St. John.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister says that these four boats were repossessed, does this mean that these four boats were levied on for debt?

Mr. SPEAKER: That I do not deem to be a point of order, and I shall remind all hon. members again of Standing Order 26(6): "No member shall refer to any other member by name."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to an hon. member of this House in the execution of his duties in this House, I am speaking about a lawyer called Bernard St. John, and I would call Bernard St. John's name any time because Bernard St. John acted in his capacity as a lawyer in this country, not in carrying out functions of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my ruling that if any reference to any other member of the House is made by name it contravenes Standing Order 26 (6) irrespective of whether the reference is to this member by

virtue of his membership in the House or by virtue of any other capacity. I would ask the hon. member to desist.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If that is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I bow and I will desist from calling the hon. member's name, but I am dealing now with actions taken by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition, that brought this Resolution in here, talking about somebody dislocating the workers of this country, and the person who was responsible for the dislocation of these workers was the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that these ships were operating; the owners of the ships failed to make the ships as seaworthy as they ought to be, to place them in a position where they could operate economically, and I want to say this here, that from the time that this company was formed, there was sabotage upon sabotage by people who are friends of the hon. members on the other side. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not addressing the Chair will observe the appropriate Standing Orders; let us get on with the business.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There was one ship which went under water. I want to state here that this ship was manned by one of the chief henchmen of the same man, a man called Schofield, who tried at every turn to destroy, in collaboration with certain members of the Opposition, the shrimp industry in this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the ships came here, there were four and the hon. members on the other side said that in order to fool the people that there were four ships, one was called Outrigger No. 1, another Outrigger No. 5, Outrigger No. 10 and Outrigger No. 15 and that this was done in an effort to fool the people that they had 15 ships. That is what they said over there, but the facts were that there were 11 other ships which were ordered and which were to operate in conjunction with these ships, and the four boats here were supposed to be the mother boats and Nos. 2, 3 and 4 would operate with No. 1; 6, 7, 8 and 9 would operate in conjunction with No. 5, another mother ship; 11, 12, 13 and 14, I think it was, would operate between 10 and 15. There was no attempt to fool the public, there was a genuine effort to bring an industry into this country which would have to a large extent West Indian and Barbadian participation.

I want to point out that all the time these negotiations were going on, that until certain written undertakings were given, no contract or agreement was arrived at between Bajan Seafoods and the B.M.C.; as a matter of fact it was only on 13th March 1970 that the lease between the B.M.C. and Bajan Seafoods was signed. On 24th March, 1970 Barbados Seafoods Limited was given notice to deliver up the facilities.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. Schofield made it quite clear that he was not going to do anything without a fight. After he had

slammed the door in the face of the Board, hence, slammed it in the face of the Government and the people who elected us, he went further and insulted the Board as recently as the 24th March, 1970. There was even a further attempt at a compromise, as far as the B.M.C. was concerned. The B.M.C. felt that the Shrimp Industry was an industry which could operate in this country in the interest of Barbadians, and they tried to have both companies operating simultaneously in Barbados. This is where people who are dishonest would not tell the public the true position. They would not tell the public that the B.M.C. went out of their way to persuade the Barbados Seafoods, Schofield's group, to operate in Barbados in conjunction with Bajan Seafoods. They would not say that there was scope for both companies to operate in this country, because we were not, from the Barbados Seafoods point of view as well as the Island's point of view, having the full amount of shrimp brought to this country which we could have disposed of. There was a smaller supply than the demand. It was felt that both companies could operate, provided that Barbados Seafoods were willing to meet the demands of the B.M.C., or to make a compromise in some form.

As a matter of fact, the B.M.C. even agreed to accept less favourable terms than it was their intention to accept when the negotiations for the renewal of the contract began. They approached the Barbados Seafoods and made a tentative Agreement whereby Barbados Seafoods would operate with Bajan Seafoods. This Agreement was arrived at around the 19th May, after much prodding from the B.M.C. On the 19th May, 1970, Barbados Seafoods' Legal Adviser met with the Board of the B.M.C., and it was agreed that both companies could operate, provided the fee charged by the B.M.C. was agreed to and that the B.M.C. carried out their legal obligations to the new company under the existing Agreement.

Now, the new Company decided they would process all of the shrimp brought in by Mr. Schofield's Company with Mr. Schofield having someone in the Plant to see that it was done as he requested. He agreed at first on the 19th May that they could operate together, and then he came back and said that he was not prepared to let the new Company handle his products and he was not willing to handle the new Company's products.

Mr. Speaker, the machinery at the B.M.C. was not operating to full capacity. Another Company, with West Indian interest known as Bajan Seafoods 1970 Limited, was formed. This new Company did not, as hon. members on the other side say, only have West Indian interest and American interest, but they offered 25% of their shares to B.M.C. which would, in turn, be passed on to Barbadians. They offered 25% of their shares to Barbadian interest, and the reason behind forming the new Company was that they wanted to increase the equity of the Company from \$50,000 to \$500,000 and the redistribution of this equity so as to enable the B.M.C., or Barbadians, for the first time in the history of the Shrimp Industry in this country to have an interest in the industry. The first

time Barbadians were going to have an interest in the Shrimp Industry was in 1970, and that was offered to them by Bajan Seafoods.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that during the time the Barbados Seafoods were operating in this country they made over \$12 million, and Barbadians were going to be given an opportunity to participate in an industry which had potential and scope in which they could make a reasonable profit. We have Barbadians coming into this Chamber and telling the people of this country that the action taken by the B.M.C. should not have been taken? If they were running the country and such proposals were brought before them in the way that they were put to the Board of the B.M.C., I am sure that their Board would have had to take similar action to that taken by the B.M.C. The only Board that would not have acted similarly would be a Board not interested in the welfare of Barbadians.

Mr. Speaker, there are very many points which justified the action taken by the B.M.C., and one wonders how hon. members can come to this Chamber and criticise the action taken. When hon. members criticise this action whom are they representing? Are they representing Barbadian interest, or representing the aliens?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said just now that 25% of the shares were being offered to Barbadians. Was it a public offer? 3.25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Initially the Barbados Marketing Corporation was to take it, and just as there is an agreement with the Company which comes in to process pork in which they are offering a certain percentage of the shares to the Barbados Marketing Corporation which will in turn pass on the shares to local interests, there is a similar agreement in respect of Bajan Seafoods (1970) Limited whereby the Barbados Marketing Corporation would take 25% of the shares and offer them to Barbadians, so that the point I am making would be met, that is, for the first time in history Barbadians would be able to participate in a shrimp industry which is one of the most lucrative industries in this country. Why should all the money be sent to the United States of America? Why should all the profits go there? Where is our patriotism? Why can't Barbadians share? Why can't West Indians share for that matter? You do not want them to share, but as long as a red-faced man can come into the country and carry out \$12 million in five years, you are satisfied and hon. members on the other side come here and criticise the actions of the Barbados Marketing Corporation when their consciences tell them that the Barbados Marketing Corporation acted in good faith. It is unfortunate that the industry fell through, but they acted in what they considered to be the interest of the people of this country. I am giving some more information.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the Minister is assisting us greatly, and I just want to ask him if Bajan Seafoods (1970) Limited was a private company.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member had risen on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in this new company the Barbados Marketing Corporation or Barbadians were to have 25% of the shares, a Company known as Peninsula Investments Limited of the Bahamas was to have 40% and American interest was to have 35%. On 10th September, 1970, it was decided that if by 23rd September, 1970, nothing further had developed, the Barbados Marketing Corporation would be at liberty to take whatever steps they considered necessary. On 6th October, 1970, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the legal adviser together with the Acting General Manager met Barbados Seafoods Principals in New York. I am going to say something here now which will astound hon. members. It was at this meeting in New York that the Principals of Barbados Seafoods told the delegation from Barbados that they had a management problem in Barbados. You will remember when I said earlier in the debate that negotiations between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the local representative for Barbados Seafoods, Mr. Schofield, were carried on and he even failed to make the appropriate representation to his principals. It was on 5th October, when the Corporation's delegation met representatives of Barbados Seafoods in New York that they were told then that they had a management problem in Barbados and that that problem was Schofield, and until he was got rid of, the Barbados Marketing Corporation would be having trouble with Barbados Seafoods. As a matter of fact, I am advised that the principals were interested in compromising in these negotiations, but the man on the spot was adamant; he felt that it was goal, his function and his duty to kick around Barbadians and treat them as he liked. At this meeting in New York on 5th October, Barbados Seafoods agreed to work with the new Company that was formed, and they agreed then to pay 10 cents U.S. per pound for processing green headless shrimp, and 17 cents per pound for peeled and deveined shrimp. It was agreed then that Bajans Seafoods (1970) Limited would provide all incidental services. I am saying this to show the extent to which the Barbados Marketing Corporation went to have things settled. They agreed to buy the equipment which Barbados Seafoods had installed on the Barbados Marketing Corporation's premises for \$ U.S. 72,000.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement was arrived at because the Board knew that it was absolutely necessary to have this type of equipment if the industry was to go on, rather than buying new and even more expensive equipment, and they actually purchased the equipment for \$135,000 E.C. The reason behind this is that the Barbados Marketing Corporation did not want any dislocation in the work force, they did not want any obstacles to come in the way of the continuation of this industry.

3.35 p.m.

They knew that if they did not purchase this equipment, and they did purchase new equipment and

instal it, it would take them from four to six months to have the equipment, and it means that the industry would inevitably have been closed at least for six months, so they offered to purchase and did purchase the equipment. Are you going to tell me that a Board that went to this extent to go to New York to negotiate the purchase of equipment and a continuation of the operation of Barbados Seafoods in conjunction with Bajan Seafoods is a Board that is as corrupt as the hon. members put it? Is that a Board that was not acting in the interest of this country?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order, no member on this side ever said that the Board was corrupt, it is not fair for the hon. member to say that; what we said was that the Government was corrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw that; the Government includes several hon. members of this Chamber.

Mr. CRAIG: The ruling Party is corrupt.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I think the hon. member should be made to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw the unfortunate remark and let us continue.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, which remark was unfortunate, the Government or the ruling Party? I am still saying that the Democratic Labour Party is corrupt, and they are the ruling Party of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not say that.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, the Democratic Labour Party is corrupt.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am taking offence to that, I am a member of the Democratic Labour Party and he will have to withdraw that. I am asking Mr. Speaker to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard that remark as unparliamentary and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it and let us get on.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, you are asking me to withdraw that the Democratic Labour Party is corrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, withdraw it and let us proceed.

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to allow this House to proceed, but you have asked me to withdraw that the Democratic Labour Party is corrupt and I am going to abide by your ruling, but it is still my opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my ruling that the remark was unparliamentary and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. CRAIG: I say it is still my opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore the hon. member will withdraw it.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I shall bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw it?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am accepting your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member withdrawing it?

Mr. CRAIG: How can I put it? Am I to say "I withdraw it"? I say that I stand by your ruling but it is still my opinion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member must not qualify his remark, it must be totally and unequivocally withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James should withdraw the remark that the Democratic Labour Party is corrupt. It is equally unparliamentary if it is said of either Party because each Party contains hon. members of this House. Does the hon. member withdraw it?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I said I will abide by your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw it?

Mr. CRAIG: I stand by your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore does the hon. member withdraw it?

Mr. CRAIG: I said I abide by your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my ruling that it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is very simple to say "I withdraw".

Mr. CRAIG: With great respect to you and to the hon. Chair, I say I bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that it should be withdrawn. I must ask the hon. member for the last time to say if he withdraws the remark; that is all;

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you have asked me to withdraw it, and I have decided to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, at the time when I was interrupted I was making the point that the B.M.C. in the interest of the shrimp industry, acquired the equipment for \$135,000. The equipment was bought by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for the B.M.C., and I would point out this,

that it was done at a time when the overdraft to acquire the equipment had to be approved by the Minister of Finance.

When you look at it step by step, every action taken by the B.M.C. was an action to see that the industry did not die, but as I said, the last nail was driven in the coffin. It is true that Schofield did all he could to destroy the industry; it is true that the pilot who sank the boat was one of Schofield's henchmen; it is true that a lot of mysterious things happened to those boats, a lot of rope being tied around places that should not have been tied; a lot of sabotage was taking place with the boats. Every day something mysterious happened because this industry which was employing Barbadians, was not to survive.

This is not surprising, because if a man like Schofield did not know how to treat his employers, if he had the brass to slam the door in the faces of members of the Board, if he thought it was his democratic right to fire people who worked with him before they qualified for two weeks' holiday with pay and then take them back so that the term of continuous employment would not play an important role,.....

3.45 p.m.

Any man who would do that could only be criminally minded; any man who would do that is not fit to walk on this earth; any man whose company could make \$12 million out of an industry in such a short space of time as that Company was operating in Barbados, and then treat the people who worked with them and the people who gave the concessions as though they were dogs, should be treated with the contempt with which he deserved to be treated.

Mr. Speaker, I could not come here and defend the actions of a man who treated my fellow Barbadians as Schofield treated them. Let me go a little further in this matter. I spoke of the obstacles placed in the way of the boats. I say that all sorts of efforts were made to ensure that these boats were not seaworthy. Bajan Seafoods tried to use them, and after three months they complained to the makers; they got no satisfactory response to their complaints, and as anybody would do: if you lease something and it ought to be serviced - if you lease boats; they were operating unsatisfactorily; you applied to the owners to make them seaworthy, and they paid no attention to your request, then the only thing to do is not to pay. It was not that the Company were unwilling to pay because of their financial position, but it was due to the attitude of the owners of the boats that the Company did not pay. I want to get that clear and on the record.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister state whether Bajan Seafoods have brought any case against the owners of the boats for breach of contract, or for supplying defective boats?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the other side have more information

than I have. If hon. members wanted to get that type of information, the same time they got the information which Schofield and others gave them to bring this Resolution here to fight his battle, they could have got the information which they are now seeking. I will give hon. members the information which I have before me. They are good scouts for information. They have done a lot of scouting and a lot of exploration in order to bring this Resolution here to be debated; they feel that the type of information they have will give them adequate grist for their political mill. They have a lot of information already, and I do not see why they should come here to ask poor, humble, little me for further information. They have their advisers. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: All they have to do is to get in touch with Schofield, as has been the practice, and get what information they want.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister seems to think that hon. members on this side have all the information we want from Mr. Schofield's side. Mr. Speaker, you ruled earlier that he was entitled to quote from the contract. I wonder whether he will help members on this side by giving us the terms of the contract under which Bajan Seafoods had acquired their boats, so that we would know whether or not they were justified in not paying when the boats were not working satisfactorily.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I have said earlier. It is their Resolution. If they come in here, having brought a Resolution, to ask me for information, it means that they have not done their homework. They are admitting that they have not done their homework in respect of this Resolution. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: We are showing you how wrong you are.) Mr. Speaker I am being heckled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members said that Bajan Seafoods did not have any Agreement for further boats, and that all the boats they could find were four. That is the sort of information I want to deal with. There were 11 boats. An Agreement was made between Pro Trawlers of Trinidad and Bajan Seafoods Limited for the additional 11 boats. Hon. members cannot say that there was no money, but a Bank could not give the type of written guarantee and undertaking which these people were given and then back down from it. What sort of Bank would you have operating in that manner? I have already pointed out that on the 19th February the B.M.C. was given that guarantee and assurance that money was forthcoming from the Bank of America in respect of this Industry.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. the Hon. Minister cannot try to mislead us so. The

assurance which he said the Bank had given was to pay for the catches, not to buy boats. It is something quite different.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not for one moment said that the money which the Bank of America agreed to lend to Bajan Seafoods was there to buy boats. I said that arrangements and agreements were made for the supply of eleven additional boats. These were not the mother boats; they were to take the catches from the mother boats so that there would be a regular flow of shrimp coming into the country, and the workers in the industry instead of operating seasonally would be employed continuously. This is the difference between the contract of Barbados Seafoods and the contract of Bajan Seafoods. If the hon. member did not understand the point I was making I sympathise with him.

Hon. members talked about the payment to workers. The workers were taken care of through an agreement made by Bajan Seafoods which stated that workers would have been paid weekly until the negotiations were finalised on the operation of the industry, and even if they did not have full time employment during the initial stages when the company was having trouble due to sabotage, Bajan Seafoods would take care of these workers. I should like to point out here.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, does this House still have a Rule that members should not make statements which they are not prepared to substantiate? If so, is the hon. member in a position to substantiate the allegation about sabotage?

Mr. SPEAKER: In a question an hon. member may not put anything which he is not prepared to substantiate.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When the whole issue is investigated, Mr. Speaker, the public will see that a lot of people, who are in different camps from the one I am in, are themselves guilty of sabotage. They went as far as putting a spanner in the works where the Bank is concerned. They were in complicity with plots to destroy the industry. I make that statement here.

As I was saying, these workers were paid from 8th July until the end of October, 1970, and therefore in this respect Bajan Seafoods acted in good faith. One hon. member who spoke enquired whether the contract was revoked. My reply to that is that he revoked it. I mean the hon. senior member for Christ Church. When he spoke he said that up to the Tuesday on which he spoke Bajan Seafoods contract was not revoked and that that was a reflection on someone's integrity. He continued to say then that the Company no longer existed according to the books of the Registry. Now what a nonsensical query! If he knew that the company no longer existed, why was he asking if the contract was revoked? Mr. Speaker, you cannot have a contract with a dead man, and therefore when the hon. senior member for Christ Church raised this query, he should have examined

himself and he would have seen that it was he who drove the last nail in the coffin of Bajan Seafoods Limited, because until he repossessed those boats, they were operating.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is not here to defend himself. I have sat down and listened to the hon. member making allegations that a member of this House acted in an unprofessional way. The hon. senior member for Christ Church is the hon. and Learned member; he is a Barrister-at-Law. How can the Rules of this House possibly allow the hon. member to go on and to suggest that a Barrister employed to collect money from someone, who would not pay, has acted in any way improper? It is a slanderous accusation, and apart from anything, one that can give rise to an action and damages in the Courts. How can it be within the Rules of this House if it relates to an hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the point which the hon. member has made, but the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has gone very close to the boundary line, and I am watching to see that he does not reach it or trespass beyond it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not said anything that the hon. senior member for Christ Church did not himself say in here. The hon. member in his address said that he seized the boats and he did it in a very bombastic manner of boasting. The hon. member got over there and jumped up saying how good a lawyer he was to stop Barbadians from getting work. That is my understanding.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, is the hon. member saying that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that he was such a good lawyer that he stopped Barbadians from getting work? That is exactly what the hon. member has just said.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member senior for St. Andrew said that was his understanding.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the four boats that were repossessed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church were operating out of Barbados employing Barbadians. The minute that those boats were repossessed those Barbadians were put out of work; those boats were owned by people who are not Barbadians but they were providing employment for Barbadians, and a Barbadian who is supposed to be a representative of the people of this country took it upon himself to repossess those boats for an alien company, and therefore closed down the shrimp industry in this country, therefore putting Barbadians out of employment. Say what you like, this is exactly as it was done, and I say that I am only repeating the brag, the boasts of the hon. senior member for Christ Church when I say what he said. He said he repossessed them, and repossessing them destroyed the industry, and the destruction of the industry put Barbadians out of work, therefore I accuse the hon. member of putting Barbadians out of work

and he should be honest enough to come here and admit that it was he and not the Board of the B.M.C., because the Board went even to the extent of spending \$135,000 to see to it that the Barbadians working in the shrimp industry continued in employment.

The Board even went to the extent of bending over backwards to meet or to compromise with a man who should never have been in this country if we had known of his character before. The Board went to the extent of being treated contemptuously by an alien; Mr. Speaker, do you tell me that anyone who could support that alien and who could bring a Resolution in this House to support the actions of this man as against the actions of the B.M.C. who acted in good faith and for what they considered to be the interest of the people of this country - I say that anybody who has done that is nothing but an enemy of the people of this country, especially when the people have bestowed the honour on this particular person to represent them. If you represent people how can you sell them out? I wonder if any of those people employed in the shrimp industry were from Christ Church, and I wonder what they are telling the hon. senior member for Christ Church now that he has put them out of employment. (Mr. ADAMS: They tell him he is the greatest man in Barbados.) We know different, you are not saying so with a clean heart.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We know that the hon. member could not say that with any degree of certainty, because we know differently. He is the only man that made him cry.

Mr. Speaker, I go on. The hon. senior member for St. James spoke on this Resolution and he had little or nothing to say. I suppose that in his usual parrot-like fashion he got up, fulminated and sat down saying nothing, but I suppose the reason he got up to speak on this Resolution was because he himself had a grievance and he knew that it would have been brought out in this debate, so he tried to exonerate himself. Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. James had more to gain out of this than anybody else, because I think he is the only person in this country that really benefitted financially from the operations of Bajan Seafoods Limited. It was the hon. senior member for St. James who rented a house.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are you benefitting financially when you rent a house and people do not pay your rent?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I will show you. The rent was not paid and not one of the lawyers on that side went and seized any possessions of the people.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I was instructed to go and find some of the possessions of the people

but they had nothing. I am glad the hon. senior member for Christ Church managed to get some for his clients.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, what I want to know from the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is, if he is a debt collector.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not even closely approximate to a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We heard a lot about repossessing of boats, we heard that the boats were repossessed for debt, we heard that there was other debt and we heard that certain cheques were written, and that the hon. senior member for St. James had cheques in his possession signed by Bruce Procope and Carlton Brathwaite and that sort of thing, but we have not heard that for the rents, which were not paid, anybody's body was held, anybody's chattel, even the clothing they were wearing.
4.15 p.m.

If the hon. members on the other side were as ardent in performing their functions in respect of collecting rent, and were as anxious to collect rent as they were to put Barbadians out of work, we would have heard a lot more about rent. Now, the hon. senior member for St. James benefitted more than anybody else. I would like to ask him if it is true that a house which was supposed to be rented for \$400 a month was rented for \$900 a month? Who benefitted from the inflation of the rent? Who rented out that house? How much benefit did the person get who was responsible for renting out that house?

Mr. Speaker, I say that Bajan Seafoods were taken for a ride in every respect, and that some of the members on the other side were actively engaged in taking Bajan Seafoods for a ride in an effort to destroy the Company before they had even got off the ground by charging them rent higher than they should normally pay. They tried to stop them from getting financial assistance, and they seized the boats which they were operating. Mr. Speaker, some hon. members talk about destroying the Industry. The Plant had a capacity for 32,000 lbs. of Shrimp per day. I want to point out here that Barbados Seafoods were only going to a maximum of 25,000 lbs. a day.

I would further like to point out that they had, even before they stopped operating in Barbados, begun operations outside of this country and had been sending some of the catches to Trinidad. They had also been sending some of their catches in other directions rather than having them processed in Barbados. They had been keeping Barbadians out of full-time employment although they were to direct their catches to Barbados in accordance with the Agreement in the contract. The B.M.C. was receiving smaller and smaller monthly payments from them, and they were experiencing high overhead expenses. Therefore, since the Barbados Seafoods Limited were not operating at maximum capacity; since the machinery and engineers were not fully used, the B.M.C. saw that there was room for addi-

tions to this Industry and they, therefore, tried to get the two of them.

As I have said, the B.M.C. compromised with the Barbados Seafoods in an effort to get both Companies operating together in order to satisfy the needs of the country. This was evident when they bought the equipment. I may point out here that when they bought the equipment the Barbados Seafoods had agreed to continue their operations. The Barbados Seafoods told the B.M.C.: "You can buy the equipment from us; we will continue operations in Barbados, and we will operate together with Bajan Seafoods (1970) Limited." Even there in that gentleman's Agreement they were dishonourable; even there they proved what they are. After the B.M.C. bought the equipment and expected that they would continue their operations, they looked for the boats to turn up but they did not do so. They even agreed to certain terms which were favourable to the B.M.C. After all, why should the B.M.C. operate at a loss? Why should not they make a reasonable profit when in a short space of time, Barbados Seafoods made something like \$12 million? Why should not the B.M.C. share in these profits? Why should not Barbadians share in these profits? Why should all of the profit be taken out of this country?

Mr. Speaker, we negotiated with them; they agreed that they would continue their operations. (Asides) As I understand it, Barbados Seafoods found that if they went to Trinidad they would effect certain savings. The reason they did not meet the demands of B.M.C. is that they had their bread buttered elsewhere. I said earlier that the boats were here, but the shrimps were carried elsewhere even before they officially stopped operating in Barbados. They said that the reason they were going to Trinidad is that there were great savings in operational costs. Barbados Seafoods said that they had to use less fuel in Trinidad because the journey was shorter and the fuel was cheaper. They also said that ice was cheaper over there, and that they had made up their minds to go to Trinidad, at any rate. (Asides) I am talking about Barbados Seafoods and not Bajan Seafoods. The Bajan Seafoods agreed to operate in Barbados, and the only reason they stopped operating was that the boats were sold out or re-possessed. (Mr. St. JOHN: If you do not pay your debts, you will also be sold out, too.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention that Barbados Seafoods Incorporated in Trinidad would effect a saving of \$800,000 (U.S.) per annum. That is what they said.
4.25 p.m.

Barbados Seafoods said that if they went to Trinidad they would effect a saving of \$U.S.800,000; so I want to make hon. members understand this. Whether or not we had agreed to allow them to operate in accordance with the old agreement, they were going out because nobody would close his eyes

to a saving per annum of \$U.S. 800,000, and therefore having found a means of saving this money, Barbados Seafoods Limited would have gone out of Barbados at any rate. The fact that they would have gone out of Barbados and left us to find other people to operate the shrimp industry in this country. We found those people in Bajan Seafoods, the Company that the hon. senior member for Christ Church caused to close its doors.

I would point out here, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow we are having discussions with a group which is coming into the country tonight with a view to having a new shrimp industry established. *(Aside.)* The hon. member said that I would be one of the directors in an aside. I suppose he is measuring me by his own pint pot.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have gone through in full detail all the points. I think I have not hidden anything from hon. members on the other side or the entire community for that matter. I have put all the facts to this House; I have pointed out the reason why the Barbados Marketing Corporation took the action which it took and entered into an agreement with Bajan Seafoods to process shrimp in this country. From what I have pointed out over the last three sittings of this House, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied and I know that the people of this country are satisfied that the Barbados Marketing Corporation acted in good faith and in what it considered to be the interest of the people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Private Members' Business has now expired.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes.

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

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

On resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day, and the first item stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House. Would the Hon. Acting Leader of the House intimate what he proposes to deal with?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

RESOLUTION re LEASE OF LAND AT THORNHILL, St. JAMES

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 also stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and it is to resume debate on a Resolution to approve the lease to Mr. Michael Simmons of a parcel of land at Thornhill, St. James.

When the debate last took place, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was addressing the House. He, I observe, is not now in his place.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this matter was postponed on the question of reviewing the plans and we were to see the new plans. I rise on a point of order to find out if we have been provided with them so that I can start my speech on the basis of that knowledge.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I was only giving an opportunity to those who had not already spoken, and that is why I did not rise to supply the necessary additional information. The hon. member who has raised the point may not have been in his place, and is quite in order because additional information was required. We have here a copy of the plan for the proposed beach facility and the area of land which the Government is seeking to lease. The boundaries have been checked by the Government's Chief Surveyor. I have a copy of the proposed plan, the layout of the new hotel, of the public car park and the access to the beach, and hon. members will see that the public as such will not be deprived of any access to the sea. As a matter of fact, they will be provided with two accesses, not one.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas had risen and started to address the Chair when he gave way.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Town Planning application sketch. I understood there was going to be a plan showing its relationship to the beach. I have not even seen the 1936 plot which was brought here on the last occasion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I will pass on the 1936 plot. The hon. member is not here, but the old plot of 1936 has been checked by the Government's Chief Surveyor and found to be in order, so that the area of land is identical as stated.

There is another point I would like to make. The apartments which will form the major portion of the development will be constructed on the lands of Mr. Simmons, approximately 15,000 square feet, and not on the 9,072 square feet of land which he is seeking to lease from the Government. This area will be landscaped and grassed and will accommodate a beach facility, toilet facilities and a small shopping

area. The remainder of the area will provide car parking. Access to the beach would be provided on either side of the development.

4.55 p.m.

A public road will exist on three sides of the apartments, a car park is adjacent to the western section of the road, and the pathways on that side of the beach facility lead from the car park to the beach. No major construction as such is proposed for Government land, so Government land will just be open and landscaped and used for parking facilities. As I mentioned on the last occasion, this is a Barbadian national who is investing his money in the hotel development and is providing facilities for local people and for the benefit of the tourist industry, so that a local individual is becoming involved in the hotel business and I think it is Government's duty to give him all the encouragement possible and to give him concessions even more than we give to visitors.

All that we have gone through already, and this is a case where Government land is at present unused and is creating some sort of a nuisance to the public, if I may put it that way. The fact is that it is unused land and far from being beautiful in any way. It is not that it is valuable land we are leasing for any lengthy period, it is for five years in the first instance and it will be reviewed at the end of five years. When the hotel becomes a viable proposition, which we hope for Mr. Simmons' benefit it will, the rent will then be reviewed in five years, because the land is not at all attractive in any way. Although it is a lease for 25 years every five years the rent will be subject to review, so the rental value will increase as a result of the work and labour and the expense of Mr. Simmons himself and his associates. They will transform that area of land which has no appearance at present, and a new rent will be placed on it at the end of five years. I think I have made my point clear, and if there are any other questions I think I am in a position to answer.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am now in a better position to speak on this matter. First of all, just let me say that the plans which we have been shown seem to relate to Mr. Simmons' own operation. As I understand it, we are absolutely nothing to do with Mr. Simmons' hotel and whether or not the Town Planner will grant permission.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, on the last occasion when this was discussed this was one of the requirements which the hon. senior member for the City requested. If the hon. member was not here to know exactly what the requirements were, these are they.

Mr. ADAMS: What I would have hoped to have seen would have been a plan that showed this piece of land which was so charmingly described by the Minister as rab land. If he has any rab land like that anywhere in Barbados I would be glad to take it off his hands. We would have been glad to see a plot showing where this land is in relation to Discovery

Bay and to the approved developments in Holetown whether it is in relation to the Holetown beach facility operated under the name of Surf Side, and if we saw this it would be of help. It is to my knowledge that the Inland Revenue Commissioner, in estimating for death duties on land stretching from Paynes Bay right down perhaps to Miramar, land that may have the worst possible appearance, the Commissioner says you have to pay death duties of at least \$5.00 a square foot, and I am informed by persons engaged in the business that to buy 9,000 sq. ft. of land at Holetown beach at today's prices you have to look to pay out \$10.00 to \$12.00 a sq. ft., and it is known that what you aim at in your turnover to pay bank interest, taxes and upkeep on any property that you are dealing with is a 10% return a year. \$10.00 a sq. ft., 10% per year, this rent should be \$9,000 a year, not \$1,800. It can only be regarded to give somebody a piece of land in St. James; a quarter of an acre on the sea in Holetown, for \$150 a month, is to give it away.

You can put down two wooden framed houses on it for \$10,000 and rent them out each for U.S. \$600 a month. Just to the north of this there is a small property the same size, on the same beach that was bought from Trents Plantation some years ago and U.S. \$600 a month is the regular asking price for the bigger house, and U.S. \$400 a month for the smaller house, so that is a straightforward gift to Mr. Michael Simmons, do not let us fool ourselves. In five years if this goes through and is not reviewed by a subsequent Government he will have paid \$9,000 in rent which is what he should have been paying annually. This is a commercial proposition; an apartment hotel built inland and seeking to get for only \$150 a month the benefit of a seaside property. If they want to build a hotel as a society hotel they must buy society land. It can still be bought, even in Holetown, and why I think that it is all the more reprehensible is that I also know in respect of land development in this area that a couple of years ago the facility which is run for the benefit of the public of Barbados, called Surf Side on the beach behind Holetown Police Station, that the then lessee applied to the Government for permission to put up some chalets, including one in which she herself could live, on the spare square footage that surrounds the facility. The Tourist Board recommended it because she holds a lease from the Tourist Board, and the Government rejected that. One of the very plausible arguments is that had that lessee been as high in the Councils of the D.L.P. she would not be living in a house at the back of the Holetown Beach facility which is run as a service to the people of Barbados and not for anybody's particular profit. It is not a profitable organisation in the way that hotels are profitable, as witnessed by the difficulty which the Government has had in getting lessees to run it. I think I am right in saying that there have been two lessees who have tendered for it and were unable to make it pay at the rent demanded by the Tourist Board.

5.05 p.m.

You have there somebody who is operating a beach facility that caters largely for the Bank em-

ployees, the employees at Sunset Crest, the policemen at the Police Station, and for the fishermen who go there and sit down. Nobody is ever turned back from that beach facility. You can go there any lunch time and you will see young men who, perhaps, come up from the fish market in Holetown, or those who operate on the beach in one way or another, and they are allowed to sit down there, perhaps, the whole day for the price of one Banks Beer or two Coca Colas. That is something which, in my submission, was well worth supporting, but the Government's attitude was, that even though the Tourist Board was in favour of it, not to allow the lessee to put down one or two movable chalets as well as one for herself to live in. Permission was refused on that occasion, and now the Government, a little further along the beach, is giving a big, substantial financial benefit to one of its close and dear friends.

Sir, there comes a stage when a halt has to be called in certain things. This is so flagrant a case of a subsidy to Mr. Michael Simmons that he should sit down very carefully and ask himself whether he has enough confidence in the political future of the Democratic Labour Party that he can accept it. I hope he will understand what that means. Anybody who wants to rent a 1/4 acre of land on Holetown Beach for \$150 a month to enable him to turn a block of apartments into a seaside hotel is treading on very dangerous grounds. I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would never have come before the House for any permission for a right of way to Pile Bay for his block of apartments at Black Rock. I see the senior member for St. Andrew paying attention to this argument, because I am sure that he thinks, although he may not say so, that this is something that has gone a little bit too far. The Government is not here to give people.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would never come to the House to ask for a right of way to Pile Beach, because I know that I am black; I am a Barbadian, and hon. members on the other side would object to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hardly a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was going to say that he would not come to the House for a right of way to Pile Beach, because if he wanted land down there he could buy it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member talks about the chalet at the beach facility in Holetown, and he came here supporting it because the operator is not a Barbadian but a Venezuelan, and she wanted to block off the beach to prevent Barbadians from passing there to go to the beach. He would support something like that, but where a black Barbadian is concerned, he is not to invest in the tourist industry of this country. Michael Simmons is a black Barbadian, and that is why they are objecting to it. Mrs. Marshall is a Venezuelan.

Mr. ADAMS: Well, Sir, the hon. member is inviting me to correct his facts. Mrs. Marshall is a Barbadian; she comes from Fontabelle; she is not a rich woman; she was married to a Barbadian who became a citizen of the United States and is now divorced from him, and she lives in Fontabelle with a sick sister without very much. Anyway, I am not here to go into that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not arise in this debate.

Mr. ADAMS: So far as wanting to block off the beach is concerned, the first dispute she had with the Minister of Communications and Works is when they put up a barbed wire fence across the property. She said that she was the lessee and wanted to know who told them to put up a barbed wire fence to stop people from passing through. Mr. Speaker, if all of these facts are so, why did the Tourist Board agree that the development which she projected was a suitable development? It is obvious that the Ministry discriminated against her because she was white, if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is going to get up and say that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He is representing her because she is white, and he would not represent a black Barbadian.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the reason she was not allowed to put up the chalet is that she asked for the fence to be put up to block out Black Barbadians and, therefore, we thought that she wanted a similar concession in respect of the chalet. (Mr. CRAIG: Are you going to do the dirty work all the time?)

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed with the Resolution, and later on we may have a Black and White somewhere else?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to detain you. I do not wish to convert this debate into a debate of the rights and wrongs of the Holetown Beach Facility. If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew knew that facility and went to it, I do not believe that he would have attacked a defenceless lady like Mrs. Marshall.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it is because we have driven fear in her that this is happening today. She wanted these concessions when she first started. She had to do what is being done now, because that is what we demanded. (Mr. St. JOHN: You were fired from the Government then.) I am back in now, though. (Mr. CRAIG: And very rich, too.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to convert this Resolution into any attack on Mrs. Marshall.

It seems obvious to me that they are never going to pass the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act unless they want the hon. senior member for St. Andrew instead of owing \$1/2 million to owe \$1 million in slander damages.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us not refer to any other matter on the Order Paper; let us stick to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am passing on from that. At least the members of the public have always had the right to pass through the Hometown Beach Facility. Is the Minister suggesting to us that members of the public are going to park on Mr. Michael Simmons' beach facility, or is it going to be there for the use of the apartment owners? The people who object to black Barbadians using their beaches are not people who run a facility for the policemen at Hometown Police Station and the employees at Sunset Crest, but the people who have hotels and apartments. I see no reason to believe, and there is nothing in these plans that makes me pay any attention at all to two rights of way.

5.15 p.m.

What I see is that Mr. Simmons is going to have control of an area of land. I have not yet heard the Minister say that the public is going to have a public pathway to the sea on each side.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member is attempting to distort the whole thing. There is not one right of way but two. Hon. members of the House are fully aware that this will provide a better right of way facilities than existed there, but now this argument comes up. There is even going to be a public parking place for cars which we have not got at present.

Mr. ADAMS: That is the question I was asking, whether the parking is public or whether it would be restricted to the use of the hotel. It is obvious therefore that the Government to some extent is abandoning the Hometown Beach Facility. So much spite is being shown towards the person who runs the existing Hometown Beach Facility that the public are going to be invited to transfer their business to Mr. Michael Simmons. What is the point of having public parking and a public bar in this property and still maintaining a beach facility a few hundred yards down the beach for which a lessee is paying rent? (Asides) There is a difference between having the Hilton Hotel next to the Holiday Inn and having two public beach facilities within 100 yards of each other. Would the Prime Minister be happy to see another water sports beach facility opened right next door to Mr. Jimmy Smith's and Mr. Richardson's? If I applied for that, do you know what the Government's answer would be? They would say that there is already a beach facility there and the interests of the public are adequately protected. Do you believe that if Mrs. Marshall was a yard fowl of the Government and prepared to pay for the favours which she sought in connection with the lease that anybody would allow a public beach facility to be opened a

couple of hundred yards away? Mr. Speaker, is that conceivable? If Mr. Simmons had started there, do you believe the Government would lease land to somebody else to open a facility a little way down the beach to undercut him? This is 9,000 square feet of seaside land to use to make money out of. Sir, I am sorry I have forgotten how much the rent of the present Hometown Beach Facility is, but I think that the figure of \$150 a month is also paid for it, but it is not Mrs. Marshall's to do as she likes with. The lease itself prevents the land from being used for any purpose other than a beach facility to members of the public.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No buildings are going up on this land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, it seems as though I must repeat what I said. The apartments which form the major portion of the development will be constructed on the lands of Mr. Simmons, approximately 15,000 square feet and not on the 9,072 square feet which he seeks to lease. This area will be landscaped and grassed, and will accommodate a beach facility, toilet facilities and a small shopping area. The remainder of the area will provide car parking. Access to the beach will be provided on either side of the development. A public road will exist on three sides of the apartments. The car park is adjacent to the western section of the road; the pathways on either side of the beach facility lead from the car park to the beach. The land will not be built on; it will be used for car parking facilities, for beach facilities and for the shopping area. There will be easy access to the beach, better than what we have at present, and the whole area will be landscaped and given some appearance. At present it is unused uneconomical land and is in a very bad state.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we are hearing the Government fire every conceivable gun in defence of its kindness to Mr. Simmons. Let us get back, having dealt with the Hometown beach facility, to the straightforward economic facts of the matter. Let every member of the Government look into his heart and think if he really believes that a quarter of an acre of land at Hometown should be rented to a hotel for \$150 a month. That is the simplest, most straightforward way of putting it. Nearly everybody who opens a hotel or wants beach land has to buy beach land. Goodness knows how many other people are involved with him in this matter! Goodness knows if there may not be members of the Government operating through the Cayman Islands Company who are directors of this firm.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member deal with the facts of the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, it is a fact that there are members of the Government who have announced here that a Company which is promoted in the Cayman Islands by two Bank officials, is controlled by them. (K.N.R. HUSBANDS: Members?) I apologise to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. A member. I personally heard a lot of remarks in Private Mem-

bers' Time about what was nasty and what was not nasty in one of the people's elected representatives. I personally believe it is filthy to promote a company outside Barbados and hide and shelter behind the laws of some country which we do not have here to own land in Barbados and operate a business *sub rosa* and under cover.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, that does not arise in this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Look at all the things we have had on points of order in this Resolution about black Barbadians and white Venezuelans and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: We never went to the Cayman Islands so far.

Mr. ADAMS: We went further afield. It may very well be that Mr. Simmons' Company is also registered in the Cayman Islands. I know there is at least one member of this House - I would not say which - who when he was interested in a land development in this Island, and a Cayman Islands Company was formed for him to be interested in, he said he was not going to be buying any land in Barbados for a Cayman Islands Company; there are members of the Government, and highly placed ones too.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Whether that is so or not, it is irrelevant to this Resolution. Let the hon. member stick to the points pro or con.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, there is a question that the Minister has not answered. I would be glad if he would answer it eventually as to whether this is a company to whom the lease is going to be granted, or whether to Mr. Simmons personally, and if it is a company, who the directors of the company are and who are the published subscribers to the stock. It is only by God's mercy that we were able to discover the connection of Mr. Carlton Brathwaite and Mr. Bruce Procopé with the Bajan Seafoods. I imagine that when the political rackets are being organised in future that Mr. Carlton Brathwaite will have his name rigidly kept off any memorandum of association or any document or subscription that is to be filed at the Registry.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is irrelevant to this.

Mr. ADAMS: But it may be that the directorship of Mr. Michael Simmons' company is something known to the Minister. I hope he answers it. I saw some words pass between the Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister who is dealing with the Resolution. I do not exactly know what the instructions were, but I hope they were instructions to answer the point as fully and capably as the file and the Minister's private knowledge may allow. I want to know who exactly are these lessees.

5.25 p.m.

I think it should be a part of the policy of the Government of Barbados to restrict overseas ownership of land in Barbados, and overseas ownership of

land in Barbados includes Cayman Island Companies as well as anything else, and I certainly could not vote for this resolution at \$150 a month. But even if it were a more reasonable figure; suppose you do not say that we should charge the whole \$9,000 a year, suppose we say that we should charge \$7,200 a year because this is a Barbadian trying to get into a business that not all that many Barbadians are in, but even if the rent were reasonable I would have to be assured that this is not a secret overseas company trying to manipulate the land values.

Mr. SPEAKER: But what I read here in respect of this Resolution is that the House is being asked to approve the grant of a lease to Mr. Michael Simmons.

Mr. ADAMS: It is not only the question of whether Mr. Simmons himself is to hold the lease, you have to be sure that the lease is not assignable to a nominee at the first instance or at all assignable thereafter. This should be a personal lease to Mr. Simmons, and I suppose the Minister has the terms of the draft lease available. (*Asides*) The hon. junior member for St. Thomas said he thought I was a lawyer but now he has discovered that I am a debt collector; I would really have to say that at no stage have I thought he was a lawyer, and nothing he has just said makes me change my mind in any way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I am glad to hear the hon. member say that at no stage he could think I was a lawyer; if I had to be a lawyer to associate with people like the hon. member who just sat down I do not want to be a lawyer.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: If the hon. member thinks that you do not prepare draft leases for the purpose of negotiation, and after all what we are doing here is negotiation, he is mistaken. The land is ours and you have to ask us to lease the land. It is Mr. Speaker's, it is the hon. member's, the Prime Minister's, all of ours and you have to ask us for the lease. Michael Simmons has to come and ask us. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you mean for a fee?) As far as I am concerned, if I was a trustee of anything involving land and somebody wanted something from me he is going to tell me what he wants, and I am going to show him what I am prepared to give him, and this is why we are asking to see the draft lease because I cannot imagine that anybody is coming to the House of Assembly with a Resolution to approve a lease and the terms of the lease are not before the House. I do not believe that the Minister would insult us so much as to tell us that. (*Asides*) - I know the Prime Minister has been away from the Bar for many years so he can afford to say what kind of ignorance it is. Since he has left the Bar the standard of the Bar has gone up, and if he thinks it is ignorant to expect a draft lease when you are discussing whether to approve it or not, what can you approve? Is there no letter from Mr. Simmons asking for a lease on particular terms?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, when this Resolution was first introduced about three weeks ago by the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, all that information was given; the terms and conditions the number of years, the area of land and all that. I then supplemented and assisted the Leader of the House with anything that I thought would have been helpful, and all that is on the records. It is an old matter which we deferred for a plan of the general layout of the proposed development and for the old plan to be checked that the hon. senior member for the City could say what he thought of it, and for other members who were not here to make their contribution. It is not any new matter, it is a matter on which all hon. members have spoken except rising now on points of order as I have been rising.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister is saying that the terms of the lease were given to the House, will he say if the lease is going to contain a term that it would be a personal lease to Mr. Simmons and be not assignable, as to my knowledge the lease of the Holetown beach facility is; what goes for one must go for all. Mrs. Marshall cannot assign her lease to anybody, she cannot decide she can sell the remainder of the benefit of the lease to anybody she has to carry it on. Is the Minister going to tell us whether that is one of the terms he read out to the House, or if not, whether it is a term at all?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it is a standard lease subject to standard terms and conditions, so it cannot be assigned without the consent of the landlord as the hon. member knows. It is a standard lease with no special concessions or dispensations granted, and the terms and conditions have been outlined already, but the actual draft lease has not been prepared. It is only after the House has approved that the Crown Solicitor will then get the necessary instructions to go ahead.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, obviously my point is being wasted. The point is this, that the lease should not be assignable, not only not assignable without previous consent, because if the argument is coming up that this piece must be particularly given to Mr. Michael Simmons because he is a black Barbadian, restricted to Mr. Simmons, make him return it to the Government if he wants to pack it in, do not even give the power to a Minister to give him permission to assign it. I believe, Sir, that if you examine the history of the Holetown beach facility it will be found that this same point gave trouble; the Tourist Board insisted that they wanted full control over the lessee and that nobody would be able to sell the benefit of that lease. A similar situation can arise here; suppose Mr. Simmons takes the lease, then seeks to sell the whole business to some foreign corporation, a Cayman Island Corporation, and the Minister has power to approve the sale just by putting his signature on it, I do not even know who the Minister is, but things come from Home Affairs and we do not even know what goes on in the Ministry of Home Affairs now. Jetties are built, people block off the beach, and we do not even know what happens.

This lease will disappear into the limbo of Home Affairs, I suppose it goes to the Cabinet, but we never hear about it again, we just see activity going on. Activity comes out of the Ministry of Home Affairs and we do not know what is happening, we see and we hear of the arbitrary things that the Ministry does, but we do not even have the Minister here in the House except as a spectator - which he will be permanently more or less as far as I am concerned - to question and ask why has he done this or why has he not done the next thing.

5.35 p.m.

If you put down a question about the operation of the Ministry of Home Affairs, you cannot get it answered and there is nobody here that you can press on to deal with it. That is why if there is to be a lease to Mr. Michael Simmons by Resolution of the House, in our view this is something too sensitive at this price to be left to the whims of a Minister. When you are dealing with this kind of a Resolution, you are dealing with a lot of money. Mr. Michael Simmons is well known as a man who likes a lot of money. I have not come here particularly to attack him. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, all of us like money, but some of us like to get it in certain ways and others are not so careful. The Minister is obviously provoking me into certain things.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let not the hon. member be provoked.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about Mr. Simmons. In this every Holetown area when Mr. Simmons was Vice President of Trents Cricket Club, and Maple Cricket Club was using Trents, he knew that there was an option that Maple had to purchase some of the land that is now in Jamestown Park, and not one word was said when that land was being sold and converted. I do not regard Mr. Simmons as some kind of apostle or High Priest of the interest of the black Barbadians whom the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is appearing as a champion of now. He had an opportunity of doing something for Maple Cricket Club, and far from doing it, he wilfully turned a blind eye to the Clubs' interests when Cottle Catford's interests were more closely involved. I am just mentioning that. We are not dealing with a person who, I can say automatically, for example, would have offered the Government an economic rent.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to interrupt the hon. member, but I cannot understand what is wrong with the others on this side. The hon. member not too long ago asked the senior member for St. Andrew if he was willing to substantiate the remarks which he has made. The senior member had to point out that the remarks which he had made were made by the senior member for Christ Church. I am now asking the senior member for St. Thomas if he is willing to go in a court or stand on a political platform and

make the same statement that he has just made about Mr. Simmons. If he cannot make the same statement in those places, then he must shut up and sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, which of the statements does he want me to substantiate? That Mr. Simmons is a Vice President of Maple Cricket Club? *(Interruption.)*

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think that I should have to draw your attention to the noise which I have just heard. The noise came from one particular person. Now, I have warned this person already that when he comes into this Chamber he must not get himself involved in the debates. I do not want him to think that I have something against him, but if he comes in here he must behave himself, or I am going to ask that he be put out now. I am speaking about Mr. Haynes better known as "Slims".

Mr. SPEAKER: Where is the Marshal? Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Which of these facts does the Minister believe I cannot substantiate? That Mr. Simmons was Vice President of Maple Cricket Club; that he is an officer of Maple Cricket Club; that he is a member of Cottle Catford's firm; that Cottle Catford worked in connection with buying certain land adjacent to Trents Playing Field where Maple operates and that Maple had been given a first refusal as long ago as the time when Mr. Ronald Tree was assisting in buying the land to get the playing field for them, and that the land was sold without its being drawn to the attention of the Club? Which of those facts does the Minister want me to substantiate or say on a political platform?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I very much deplore that the senior member for St. Thomas, who is a member of the legal fraternity, should so forget his professional ethics as to vent his spleen on another member of the profession unjustifiably. Since Mr. Ronald Tree, Mr. Simmons and Mr. George Carew all came to me around the same time, I categorically stated that the hon. member is not speaking the truth on the last point that Mr. Simmons kept quiet when the land was being sold. Far from that, Mr. Simmons telephoned me and sent Mr. George Carew to me, and I asked Mr. Ronald Tree to come to see me about the land. Mr. Tree was not prepared to purchase the land and Mr. George Carew came back and said that they would raise funds to have the land purchased. The sale was held off, and I do not know what happened after that. But for a member of the legal profession to come here and say what must be a deliberate untruth on somebody who is community minded and has done everything possible for his own Club when I know of the facts, then I could not sit here in silence.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, not deliberate untruth.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member assures me that he did not tell a lie deliberately, then I will apologise to him. Maybe he is just telling a lie automatically, because it is simply not true. How can anyone come in here to vilify members of the public who cannot protect themselves well knowing, and ought to be in a position to know, that what he is saying is not true, and then expect anybody to have any respect for Parliament or for him?

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is made.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have a letter in my possession from the Maple Cricket Club that I will produce to the hon. Prime Minister, and I will challenge him on that. *(Asides)* I have a letter signed by Mr. Goodridge.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am caught in an unfortunate cross-fire in this matter, and I have my information. My information is derived from the hon. senior member for St. James. First of all, if I had to choose between believing the Prime Minister and believing the senior member for St. James, I am going to believe the senior member for St. James, because I know the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is bound to believe the senior member for St. James, because he has over one thousand judgment summonses admitted. He has admitted that he owes all of these judgments, so he is bound to be telling the truth. The hon. member is only baiting me up, because he knows what I am saying is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would now challenge the hon. member, who has just taken his seat, to go on a public platform and say what he has just said in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will do better; I will bring them.

Mr. CRAIG: I would rather owe 40 judgment summonses before I would walk around with a bunch of corrupt criminals like the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to say that any member of this House walks around with corrupt criminals.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, you will not Rule, and you are inviting this kind of behaviour. You allow the Prime Minister to say a lot of nonsense about hon. members on this side of the House, and it is time to stop it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order, and nothing more about judgment summonses in this Resolution. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was caught in an unfortunate cross-fire. We are dealing with Mr. Simmons and his negotiations for land at Hometown. I

made a statement in the House which is based on information given to me by the senior member for St. James. The Prime Minister gets up, and you allow him to say that a member of the House told a deliberate lie in here, and yet you would wonder why the House breaks up. The Prime Minister is one of the most outright, deliberate, wicked liars the world has ever known.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot.....

Mr. ADAMS: I withdraw that, Sir. I apologise.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would invite the Hon. Prime Minister to pay Mr. Mackie Simmons his money; he is a poor, suffering old man.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. We must deal only with the subject of this Resolution otherwise I will suspend the sitting.

Mr. ADAMS: The point is that the Prime Minister made a statement and immediately afterwards he interpolated that he does not know whether the lie was deliberate and it might have been automatic. An hon. member cannot say that another member is a liar. I do not come in here to tell lies. It is liars who think that other people come in here to tell untruths.
5.45 p.m.

As soon as you hear a man saying that other people tell lies, it shows what goes on in his mind. That is exactly one of the tests you use to estimate a man who is fundamentally untruthful - that he accuses other people of untruths. I am not going to be caught in any cross fire between the Prime Minister's offensive remarks about the hon. senior member for St. James and the hon. senior member for St. James' comments on this matter. The hon. senior member for St. James has a letter and had knowledge of this matter with Maple Cricket Club, and the Prime Minister gets up to lend his authority in the belief that on his saying so, somebody is going to suddenly say that Mr Michael Simmons is an angel in this matter.

Let me say something else. Where it comes to believing Mr. Michael Simmons and the Prime Minister, I believe Mr. Michael Simmons, and that is saying a lot. Just let me add another thing about the legal profession, and I want the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to listen to this. Nobody would ever appeal to me to go easy on a man because he is a lawyer. Nobody would ever look at me and tell me he is a member of my profession, so I have no right coming in here and talking about it. If a member of my profession is not a truthful or honest person, I see no reason whatever to conceal it in appropriate circumstances. I am not saying this of Mr. Simmons, but I do not ever want anybody to look at me and say that so and so is a lawyer so you should not attack him. That is exactly what the Prime Minister said. He said I should be ashamed of myself to attack Michael Simmons because he is a member of the legal profession.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not speaking the truth. I never appealed to the hon. member not to attack Mr. Michael Simmons or any other lawyer. The hon. member's vocation is attacking lawyers and other people with whom he consorts. He cannot help it, but I never appealed to him to do that. I merely said I was surprised that he would so ignore the ethics of the profession as to suggest that Mr. Simmons was in Cottle Catford's office and knew of the facts which would be detrimental to his club and he did not disclose them; and I went on to say that within my personal knowledge three persons had come to me in connection with land, one was Mr. Simmons, another was Mr. Ronald Tree of Heron Bay and the third was Mr. George Carew of Holetown, St. James who had some connection with the club, and if you consult either one of those three interested parties in the club, they would tell you. When they were putting up the pavilion, Mr. Ronald Tree came back to me and said he did not agree with their putting up that ugly pavilion down there and he had no intention of spending any more money on the land. That is where the negotiations broke down. That is all I said, and I wish the hon. member will now get on with the debate, and if we are going to have a production of documents, I am sure both the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and I will be pleased to see the documents that the hon. senior member for St. James has.

Mr. ADAMS: My instructions are that what the Prime Minister says may have happened, but if it did, it happened after the land was already sold. It was after the land was already sold that Mr. Ronald Tree, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Carew then spoke about this. It was when Maple Club heard that the land had been sold that they then stirred it up and the people went to the Prime Minister. That is my instruction as to what the facts are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, let us get back to the Resolution, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is just one further point for the sake of the records that I must point out. First I want to make it clear that these gentlemen did not come to me together; they came to me individually. Secondly, it is not within my recollection that the land had been sold, but it is possible that there had been some kind of agreement to sell the land; and the third point which I want to get on the record is that this is one of the largest firms in Barbados, and the hon. member should know that what one solicitor is doing is not necessarily known to another solicitor, and sometimes a typist is doing a conveyance and the senior partner in the firm does not know. In fairness to Mr. Simmons, I think that ought to be pointed out. When Mr. Simmons discovered it, he came in to me and I am stating that as a fact. I am not involved in Maple Club.

Mr. ADAMS: I believe there was an agreement; I do not believe the conveyance had been executed. I am only too aware especially in Cottle Catford that the solicitors do not let their right hand know what their left hand is doing. I am only too aware as Mr. Simmons himself if he reads this debate and as the

hon. senior member for Christ Church perhaps will also recall, that you can ring that firm and they can tell you all too readily they did not deal with that. Anyway that is only by the way.

Sir, the money is too small for this amount of land. It is a money making concern for Michael Simmons. \$150 a month is too little; he has no right paying so little. There should be no review in five years. The review should be and perhaps will be next year. That is what I have to say about this matter. I am not voting for it. 9,000 square feet of land to be rented for \$150 a month is too little, and I am not supporting this Resolution. It is a racket.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking to be supplied with a plot. (*Asides*) That is what I asked for last time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, for the benefit of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who has just come in, it was on his motion that this matter was referred three weeks ago. The old plan for the 9,072 square feet which was originally done by Mr. H. W. Clarke on 12th June, 1936, has been checked on the instruction of the appropriate Minister by the Chief Surveyor who recently visited the area and has confirmed that the boundaries as indicated in the Survey Plan are correct. They are not marked on the old plan, but the old land marks are all there and the hon. member with his experience of land could visit this area and see that the land is intact and the land marks are easily discernible.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I got the House adjourned to get the plot. Mr. Speaker, who says I have got to get permission to speak? I was speaking and the Minister will say that I was speaking when the House adjourned. I have not got to ask permission to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member moved that further consideration be postponed, and that was seconded by the Hon. Leader of the House. The practice here is not under those circumstances to require the hon. member to ask leave when he was speaking and move that further consideration be postponed. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown did not rise when we resumed; so I take it there is no objection to the hon. member speaking. There is no objection. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person in this House to object to Mr. Michael Simmons or any young enterprising Barbadian erecting any hotel or business place in this country. 5.55 p.m.

What I asked for on the last occasion is what any reasonable man with my experience would ask for. The Minister came and said they were renting 9,072 square feet of land on the beach at \$150 a month; I saw the plan which I now still have in my hand and which is dated 12th June, 1936, and I suggested to the Minister that he with his experience must not accept any plan unless it was properly checked, and the Min-

ister said today that the plan had been checked and that nothing has been put on it to certify it was checked. I have 30 odd years experience and when one checks a plan he has to certify that he has checked this plan and that more land has not been encroached upon or anything else, I am not taking second place to anybody on this. The second point I raised with the Minister is that this is beach land.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Could I just explain something to the hon. member which I think he knows. (*Asides*) On a point of order, Sir, the plan which the hon. member holds is not the original plan, there are three such duplicate plans here on the Minister's record, what we keep by law now is a document called a terrier which is spelt the same way as the fox of the same name, and the terrier merely means a land book like Domesday book showing all Government lands. There is reference here in the terrier of this land being purchased from Mrs. Manning Wilkinson round about 1936 to 1939; the price is not stated of the land at that time but it is recorded in the terrier.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, are you satisfied that this is a point of order? Let me say what I have to say, I understand all about the land.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just wanted to point out to the hon. member that this is not a copy of the terrier this is a copy of the plan but the main plan is kept in the terrier.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something, if the Hon. Prime Minister thinks he is fooling me he is not fooling anybody, I have been dealing with land a long time. The late Premier of this House had land in Christ Church and the plan showed one thing and when he wanted to sell it, it was nearly once and a half as much, this is why you check beach land to see what you have gained.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, the proposal is not to lease to the proposed tenant, or whatever you choose to call Mr. Michael Simmons, all the land from his land or from the public road to the sea, but a definite area of land for which there are land marks, therefore all the rest of land, if any, belongs to the public of Barbados so that the fishermen and everybody else can haul up their boats.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The Minister promised us last time that he would have the land properly surveyed and bring it here to us. If you were buying this land, would you be satisfied with a plan that is 34 years old? Now you are telling me it has been checked and not a Surveyor's signature on it? If you were doing work when you were practising, like hell you would not take it and you know you would not take it too. Anybody, who would take it, would be dishonest. It must be checked, and it must be shown here, by a sworn Surveyor, and if he makes the mistake he will be disqualified and would have to pay for it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If a Surveyor checks a plan of land we expect him to put his signature on

it that these lines have been checked and that he is a qualified sworn Surveyor. What I am trying to explain to the hon. member is that this is one of three plans, copies of the terrier which the Minister has in his possession, but the terrier is a big book and if he wants it brought down, we can bring it or we can take him up there, but that the Chief Surveyor would have certified, and he has certified it, but we have not shown you the terrier, we have a statement from the Chief Surveyor that it is checked. I agree that he should sign it, but not this, the terrier.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: This House must be higher than anybody else, and we asked for it and the Minister told us he would bring it in here.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, all the talk about Surveyor's plans, both hon. members must know that when you convey lands stating it is bounded by the sea. I am a lawyer, so is the Prime Minister, he must know that, he cannot pretend he does not know that. The sea is a boundary so no matter where the line marks are, the sea is a boundary. The high water marks have been moved out to sea just north of this area, the plots to the north of Discovery Bay, Mr. Roach's land and other land around there has receded and there have been resurveys, and the high water marks have been moved out to sea and have given people more land than the old Trents' plots showed. This piece is a straightforward rectangular piece of land, cut off from a larger area belonging to the old Mannings' Estate, and if it is gone, it will go to Mr. Simmons. The additional piece will go to Mr. Simmons, no matter where the line marks are, and the duty of the Surveyor is to move the line marks. He puts them on the plot as old irons and he shows where he puts new irons if he finds a new high water mark, and the *jus accrescendi* gives the lessee in this case the land between the sea and the old line mark. The Prime Minister knows that too and he should not try to mislead the House.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: If you were still practising, would you accept this?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If a surveyor signed his name and told me that he had checked this Plan and it is correct, then I would accept it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: If Mr. Simmons had been acting for someone, would he accept this as a plot of land without having it done properly?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely pointing out to the hon. member that this is not the master plan. The Chief Surveyor has checked it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: After all we are still working under democracy.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will the hon. member give way? I do not know what Mr. Simmons has done to members on the other side. Does the hon. member want us to postpone the debate and bring in a new

plan signed by the Chief Surveyor? Is that what you want?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: That is what the Minister had promised us. I am not trying to obstruct Mr. Simmons from getting the land.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would you like to send somebody with the Surveyor to check the boundaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there are two hon. members on their feet. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: "You are now seeing that.") Hon. members not addressing the Chair will please observe silence.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. From my knowledge of this matter a Plan has to be checked every 10 years, and after it is checked it must be noted on the Plan itself by the new Surveyor who did the check that the Plan had been checked on a particular day and so on.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Is that mentioned on this Plan? You cannot use a Plan that is 36 years old. I am sure that Mr. Simmons would not have accepted this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are three plans here, would you be satisfied if the Chief Surveyor initiates one of these and signs it, or do you want a fresh Plan?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Any surveyor would be dishonest to take this up and say that it is correct without checking it. It has to be done, and it must be done. I have heard the Hon. Prime Minister, when he was in the Opposition, dealing with land in here that was being rented out and I know how he got on. I can show him chapter and verse for that. This thing must be checked and no lawyer or solicitor would advise anybody to accept this Plan. I would be glad to see people like Mr. Simmons putting up hotels, but I think the debate on the Resolution should be further postponed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I take it that the three copies of the Plan of this particular piece of land, 9,072 square feet at Holietown are distinct from the terrier, the master plan or the original plan. If the copies which we have here of this Plan of this particular piece of land are checked, and it is set out on these three copies that a check has been made and certified by a Sworn Land Surveyor, will that satisfy the senior member for the City and the Opposition in general?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in all my 22 years in this House I have never seen an hon. member sit and back the Chair!

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, what is he talking on?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order. I am drawing your attention to the fact that the hon. junior member for the City.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says that he rose on a point of order. I heard him say so.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: How could he have risen on a point of order? I do not understand this.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Within the 22 years of my experience in this House I have never yet seen an hon. member doing what the hon. junior member for the City was doing. He was backing Mr. Speaker, backing the House, and carrying on a conversation. That is gross misbehaviour in my opinion.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: When Joe Broome is there talking with Boxill nobody says anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Bridgetown will continue. I want to hear only the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. Members not addressing the Chair please observe silence.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Resolution be further postponed. I gather that the Minister will postpone it in order to bring in proper Plans. This is something, in my 25 years here, that I have been accustomed to. This is the usual practice. You must bring in a Plot to show what lands you are buying or leasing.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. member know that the Motion is seconded. I want to get things clear. The hon. member thinks that I am obstructing him, but I am trying to assist him. I want to get clear in my mind what the hon. member requires. Every time I ask him, he says that it is what the Minister promised. I want to point out to him that there is an original plan in the terrier. Does he want a new plan made for the piece of land at Hometown, or does he want it checked on all of these three plans which we will bring back in with a certificate signed by the Chief Surveyor or any other sworn Surveyor? That is all I am asking him. I do not want to come back in here and find that we have to postpone it again.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I will tell you what I want. I want the land re-surveyed from the high-water mark. It is known that one boundary is to the sea.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There might be a danger in saying that we should give someone land to the high-water mark and this being adjacent, the Government has the right to the whole thing right down to low-water mark in this case. We are giving a defined area, and if the beach goes out nobody can come and claim that he can extend his facilities.

6.15 p.m.

That is the danger that I see because we are leasing them a specific area of land regardless of high water mark. I would be prepared to lease a definite area and say that even if the sea comes in, they still have to pay for the whole amount. If the sea goes out they cannot claim that they are leasing to the sea and go back. Therefore a new plan would not be necessary.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: This says "on the side of Thornhill" in the plan. We want to know what is this area.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly the original Resolution spoke of 9,072 square feet of land, and that area represented what was owned by Thornhill deceased and which the Government is hoping now to lease to the applicant. What I believe the hon. senior member for Bridgetown means and what we on this side.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member is wrong. Nowhere in the Resolution did we state that this land was owned by Thornhill deceased. It is butting on lands which belonged to the estate of one Thornhill on two sides, the street on the other side and the sea on the fourth side. This land was brought for the purpose of putting up a fish shed from the estate of old Sam Manning, which is now abused.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister does not understand that I can read.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I apologise, Sir. I really didn't.

Mr. BOLDEN: If you would read the Resolution, you will see that it says 9,072 square feet, the same area named in the plan and is marked "All that certain piece or parcel of land situate at Hometown in the parish of Saint James in this Island containing by admeasurement 9,072 square feet or thereabouts, the property of the estate of Samuel Manning deceased; and in here this is what they are seeking to lease. What we are asking to lease here is the area of land which was represented by this plan and which would have been represented today if the owners were alive and had to sell it to somebody else.

The Resolution says "All that certain piece or parcel of land situate in Hometown in the parish of Saint James in this Island containing by admeasurement 9,072 square feet or thereabouts" - the same figures mentioned in this - "abutting and bounding on two sides on lands now or late of one Thornhill, deceased, on the Public Road and on the sea or however else the same may abut and bound."

We want to know where the mark would be now on the sea. Do not tell us that they will rent a specific portion. When the survey is made and the land turns out to be more than 9,072 square feet, amend the Resolution and come back with what you want to lease to the gentleman, and if it turns out to be less, you have to amend the figures also. Nobody wants to stop Mr. Simmons from putting up a hotel, but what we on this side want to know is the truth and the justice of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order made. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: As I said, I think the Hon. Minister is prepared to further postpone. Personally I have no other view than getting the matter straightened up, and I am going to move.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again may I ask for clarification? That is the only reason why I am standing on my feet because I really want to assist. It is a rectangular piece of land and should not be difficult to survey because there is no obstruction as far as I know; but I must point out that unless he measured inaccurately, 9,072 square feet is bound to come out to 9,072 square feet. If the House is suggesting that you should lease more than that to the lessee - in other words if we find that high water mark would add another 500, 1,000 or 2,000 square feet, we should survey at high-water mark, I do not want to have to come back in here three or four more times. The intention of the Government was to take the four landmarks that were there and say that this is what we are leasing. If the sea comes back, the fishermen can haul up their boats and the lessee cannot say that they are encroaching on his leased area. I do not want to come back in and go back again and waste the time of the Government's Surveyor. You tell us what you want done so that we understand one another. We are leasing him 9,072 square feet of land, and however you measure 9,072 square feet of land in a rectangle, it is going to come out to 9,072 square feet. But if you want all the land between the existing.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order,.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know why the hon. member wants to jump up every five minutes. I am a Government Minister and I am trying to assist the House. He is not entitled to jump up every three minutes to show off. If the intention of the House is that it is preferable to lease the land to high-water mark, it may call for putting in new irons either forward or backwards, but if they are now saying that the area of land bounded on two sides by the estate of Thornhill, deceased, and on one side by a public road, and then by the sea, it may mean.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order,.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: When the Prime Minister is speaking, anybody can rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It doesn't matter whether it is the Prime Minister or otherwise.

Mr. HINDS: I have risen on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. John rose on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: That is not the point. I have risen on a point of order, and when other hon. members are speaking, the Prime Minister rises on a point of order. The point I am making is this: the Resolution itself says that the Government wants to lease to

Mr. Michael Simmons 9,072 square feet of land or thereabouts. As soon as you say "or thereabouts", it shows clearly that it could be more or less, and that is where we want to have a re-survey of this plot.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. ADAMS: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister is saying that they are going to lease to Mr. Michael Simmons 9,072 square feet of land, he cannot say that the sea is a boundary, because for the sea to be a boundary, means as a matter of construction the high-water mark. They will have to amend the Resolution to say "the other the public beach" or some expression like that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas made the point I was going to make. It is 9,072 square feet or thereabouts. If it is less Mr. Simmons stands to lose; if it is more we cannot say anything. I appreciate the point made about high water mark and about the beach belonging to the public. This has been in the Ministry of Home Affairs for two years; so why are you rushing with this indecent haste? What is wrong with postponing it and letting us get the facts. We want the boundaries on the sea.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, we on this side are in total agreement with a further postponement in order to clarify everything to the satisfaction of the Opposition. We want to know if they want a new plan as distinct from a checked plan. In case the area turns out to be more than 9,072 square feet, instead of saying "on the sea", we will then say "on other lands of the Barbados Government". 6.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the point I have been trying to make all along. I explained to hon. members that when the plan was made the high water mark was probably on those two irons.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Do you agree that this is wrong?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We are leasing 9,072 square feet of land. If the high water mark is beyond those two irons then it would not be accurate to describe the western boundary as the sea, it would have to be described as on other lands of the Barbados Government, but what I was making clear was that what we are prepared to lease is 9,072 square feet. That is the basis on which we calculated the rent, and when I come to speak I will show you how that rent was calculated, but I want to get this clear on record that we are not leasing any amount of land so that if the high water mark went down to St. Vincent that he would have about 3,000 cricket pitches down to St. Vincent, we are leasing 9,072 square feet and what we have to do now is to accurately describe the boundaries of that land. I second the motion for postponement.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day two weeks at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the question of the air conditioning and also the public address system in the House. I would like something done so that when we return here in two weeks' time we are going to have the air conditioner - I do not see the sense of Government paying for these two air conditioners and then when we come in here we cannot use them. It beats me to see how the contractors could put up the air conditioning units and leave all the spaces between the windows like that. This idea of turning on the air conditioning units is affecting the health of members on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is affecting my health.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the hon. member in speaking about this Chamber as a whole. I have known that in any large building where they have attempted to air condition, they have always placed extractor fans to remove the foul air or air which which has been in circulation in the building. I have been looking around this room from the time I came in here and I can see no extractor fans, the windows apparently are sealed off and the doors are constantly closed. The problem is that if you, Mr. Speaker, will check with every member in this Chamber you will find that practically everyone of them is down with a cold; it means that one member is coming in here and sneezing, the germs are being circulated in this building and then everybody becomes contaminated. I do not know who the engineer is that designed the system, but I would like to say now that it is time that whoever is responsible for the work done on the air conditioning of this Chamber should take a second look.

There should, in my opinion, be at least six extractor fans in this whole building, because there is no escape for air once it is pumped into these units. The noise from the units bears down on people's ears, especially on this side, and we go home with headaches and sore throats, and I would hope that in the time we are out whoever is responsible would do something at least to remedy the situation as it exists in this Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this matter has been raised in the adjournment because I was thinking of how to draw it to Your Honour's attention. I do not think we should be too very hard on the contractors, because when you are doing a big job even though you may be spending four or five months too long on it, you still may not get it perfect. Certain

things can only be worked out by trial and error, but I would respectfully submit for the attention of the House that there have been two serious errors; one has been in the siting of these air conditioners, and the second is in the siting of the loudspeakers. Is it usual to put a loudspeaker inside where the base notes are reflected by the rather absorbent, though it may not seem so, plastic covering that masquerades as wood on some of these doors? A loudspeaker is useless behind there. I would suggest to the House to appoint a small committee to go into this to reopen the question of the microphones of the House; hon. members could not agree on what form of microphone to use when we last investigated this matter. These microphones such as the one I am speaking into are very good for broadcasting studios where you are directing your voice straight into the microphone, and they give very good reproduction for that type of purpose, but since no hon. member can be relied on to point his face straight at the microphone, and all hon. members gesticulate to some extent, we are not getting the best sound reproduction.

I would suggest the appointment of a Select Committee of the House to go into these matters; one, the sound reproduction equipment in the House, and two, the air conditioning of the House. I agree with the hon. member that you must have extractor fans in a place of this size. A large number of persons come in here and heat the place up with their bodies. This place with two or three hundred people in it can become very heated because every human body is radiating a lot of heat, more than this room can stand without open windows and a fan, and, Sir, I would ask in the interim if all three air conditioners could be turned on on Monday and get the Chamber at a temperature that one air conditioner can keep it at that temperature during the meeting on Tuesday afternoons. Today is the first day I have been comfortable in the new House, the reason being that the air conditioners were turned on early this morning and they had till 2.30 p.m. to run and therefore the House is reasonably comfortable. I would suggest that we appoint a Committee to start work on this right away, and hear from an air conditioning expert about the necessary installation and the moving of the conditioners.

6.35 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I think I may end on a jocular note. I take very seriously what hon. members said, especially the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I took his part in serious vein. When the senior member for St. Thomas directed our attention to the type of microphone we should get, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that you had better get a fixed microphone and a plastic microphone, because when hon. members get heated - I am looking at one now - they will take them up and smash them. You had better get microphones that will remain fixed and they should be unbreakable.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I could not agree with the hon. member more. In order to avoid the cutting of wires, you should hang them from the ceiling; then no wires would be cut and no

microphone base would be smashed. In all Parliamentary Assemblies that I know, they have them hanging from the ceiling. The idea of clipping on wires to members' lapels, as was formerly suggested, is only a way of destroying a lot of microphone wires.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That completes my speech, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is, "That this House do now stand adjourned until this day fortnight at 2.30 p.m." Hon. members of that opinion will please say "Aye", and hon. members of a contrary opinion will please say "No".

Mr. St. JOHN: Divide.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division has been called for.

The House divided and voted as follows:

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, and Mr. LOWE.

NOES: Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY.

Mr. ADAMS (*Seated and covered*): Mr. Speaker, a division was called for and I have heard hon. members voted, and I do not know of any precedent where a vote can be interrupted, except by an unfortunate incident of a few weeks ago. A division is being taken, and I do not know what the Government is afraid of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, please continue with the division.

AYES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG -

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to vote, because I do not know what is before the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can only speak if he is covered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, please inform the hon. senior member for St. Joseph what is the question before the House.

Mr. CLERK: The question is, "That the House do now adjourn until the 2nd March, 1971, at 2.30 p.m."

AYES: Mr. SMITH.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, what must I vote on?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot get anything from the Clerks. (*Pause*) This House now stands adjourned until this day fortnight at 2.30 p.m.
6.40 p.m.