
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th February, 1971.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANKER, Q.C., F.Z.S.,
(Speaker); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G.
FERGUSSON, (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); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P.,
(Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS,
(Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr.
C. A. E. HOPPIN, and Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45, be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

RULING BY Mr. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before Government Business is taken, I have a ruling to give. My ruling has been sought by the hon. senior member for St. James in respect of an article which appeared in the *Advocate-News* on Wednesday, 3rd April, 1971.

I have given careful consideration to the article in question, and there is not, in my opinion, any Breach of Privilege of Parliament or any other matter which would merit Parliamentary action thereof.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the last time we met there was a motion before the House that a certain hon. member be suspended for five sittings. The House broke up in disorder then, but if we look at Standing Order 36 (3) it states that whenever a member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed. At the end of Standing Order 36 we are told that nothing in this Order shall be taken to deprive the House of the power of proceeding against any member according to any Resolution of the House.

It is my humble opinion that before the business of this House gets under way, you, Mr. Speaker, ought to take action in respect of disciplining the hon. member against whom action was being taken the last time we met, and by the last time I mean last Tuesday. The position is that if disciplinary action is not taken any member can come to this Chamber and behave as he likes, disrespect the Chair, and when any attempt is taken to discipline that member, the sort of pattern of behaviour which we, unfortunately, had to tolerate and which was exhibited here last Tuesday, would continue. I humbly suggest that you now take the appropriate action to

complete the motion, because I could not feel comfortable to be a member of a Chamber where discipline could not be carried out, and if it happens that that hon. member be allowed to get off Scot-free, I feel that everybody else in the Chamber would be entitled to get on as they like, to disobey the rules of the House, to insult the Chair whenever they want to, and therefore I think that right now action should be taken in respect of that proposition that the hon. member be suspended for five sittings of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the point which the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has made. I will give it my immediate consideration, and during this day I will give my ruling. The matter has merely just been brought to my attention.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not having a meeting of this House today until that hon. member is dealt with. You cannot tell me that you are going to have a situation in here where an hon. member is going to come in here and get on as he likes, disrespect the Chair, the Chairman calls you to the Chair, you come into the House, Mr. Speaker, and during the course of your taking action to discipline the hon. member, if he was honourable at that time, he gets on with hooliganism. He and his group on the other side get on with a lot of hooliganism, and you are now going to tell me that I can sit down in here.....

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We will have a ruling today on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not saying otherwise.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: But you cannot.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not saying otherwise than that I am going to give a ruling today. I shall give it today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot give it at this moment.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We are not going to do anything else in this House today until we get a ruling.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We want an immediate ruling on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot give an immediate ruling.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, may I move that this House be now suspended.....

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: that this House be now suspended so that you.....

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I correctly understand the senior member for St. Andrew to move that this sitting be suspended?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I move that this sitting be suspended so that you can give a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: For how long?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Until you can give your ruling.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a motion for suspension I would suggest for one hour.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Are you sure you will be able to give a ruling within that time?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion,.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Your attention has been directed to the Standing Orders of this House and particularly to Standing Order No. 36 (3). If one were to read Standing Order No. 636 (3) and relate it to the circumstances as occurred in this Honourable House on the day in reference, one would see at a glance that Your Honour could certainly sit and rule exactly where you are without any suspension, for the simple reason that the Rule in question makes it obligatory on the Chairman or on the Speaker, who happens to be in the Chair at the moment of the commission of an alleged offence to put certain actions into effect, and as if such an action must be so fortified, the last three lines of Standing Order No. 36 (3) give the all clear. It says that it must be done forthwith; there must be no amendment, no adjournment, and when it says no adjournment it also means no suspension. That is what it means.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the point of order the hon. member has made, and I will take every member's point fully into consideration.

Mr. HINDS: I have not yet completed my point, Sir. There must also be no debate allowed. In other words, this Rule makes it compulsory on the part of the presiding Officer to act immediately.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard you say that you took the hon. member's point of order, but he is now making a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have fully noted the point of order, and I will give it my full consideration as I will give every other relevant and pertinent matter my consideration during the period in which the sitting is suspended. Let every member rest assured about that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you are now entertaining another Motion for suspension.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only Motion for suspension which I am now entertaining is the suspension of this sitting during which period I shall consider and determine my Ruling.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in addressing you on the question.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, The hon. member has already made his Motion. Is he making a counter Motion on his own Motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out this: the hon. senior member for St. Andrew made a Motion for the suspension of the sitting, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter rose and made a point of order. As no other member has spoken, the hon. member is now entitled to reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in moving this suspension, I want to draw.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter rose on a point of order, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew sat. Do I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, having given way, is continuing?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there is no giving way. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has already made a Motion.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker,.....
(Asides)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of this behaviour, this sitting is suspended for one hour from now.

On resumption-

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately before the sitting was suspended, I gave an undertaking that I would Rule on the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. The Ruling in process of preparation has not yet been completed, and it is a Ruling to stand or fall by posterity. This Ruling can be completed within half an hour from now, and I would say this.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point you have made, and I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 45 minutes so that hon. members can have lunch and return.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

1.35 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the sitting was suspended, we were discussing the question as to whether we should proceed with the normal sitting of the House - you are perhaps aware of what went on last Tuesday - and we asked the Speaker for a ruling as to whether we should continue our normal work today with disciplinary action pending over the head of an hon. member. We have suspended the sitting for almost two hours to get this ruling. I may say that cowards die several times before their death. However, I would like to enquire from you, Sir, what is the position with respect to the ruling which we asked the Speaker for, and whether it will be in order in the absence of a ruling from the Speaker to go on with the normal work of the House.

I know that we are going to be told that Standing Order 36(3) says that this motion shall be put and there should be no debate. I know that this is what is contemplated; but I want to say this: you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. I feel that the work of the people should go on. Inasmuch as you have taken the Chair, I should like to know whether you have the ruling for the House now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not have that ruling yet. His Honour the Speaker has asked me to take the Chair for a few minutes and apologise to hon. members.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, then I humbly suggest that we have work to do. If we continued with the normal work of the House, would it be in order to get that ruling after?

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, first to begin with, I want to start with this ruling which the Speaker promised to give. My impression is that the Speaker asked in the first instance for an hour, then the House was suspended for one hour because of disorder. The Speaker asked for half an hour and we gave him forty-five minutes. I am not particularly concerned with what transpired last Tuesday at all. The rightness or wrongness of it is left for the Speaker to decide, but this House should demand a ruling by the Speaker prior to any further business. This House should not tolerate a Speaker asking for time, being given more time than he asked for, and then hang in suspense pending that ruling. He is the Speaker appointed by this House, he is the Speaker of this House and of Parliament; he is a responsible officer, and at some time this House must respect the Speaker's word. At the moment we cannot say that we do. I for one do not, not as a Speaker, because when a Speaker has asked for one hour and is given one hour and three quarters, when it is considered that the matter was pending since last Tuesday, he should be prepared to give that ruling.

If I were Mr. Speaker, I would in the circumstances have had that ruling prepared because it would have been a wonderful exercise to begin with, and if I were not called upon to give the ruling, it would have done no harm, but if I were called upon to do it, I would have caught the House unawares and gain the respect of this House. I for one am not tolerating this long hiatus to give a decision by a legally trained person, and I am moving a further suspension for thirty-five minutes, in order that the Speaker's ruling must be presented here. If it is not presented, I will know what further motion to make.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

The question that the sitting be now suspended for thirty-five minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.25 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: I express my regret to hon. members for the delay occasioned by the fact that this matter had to be properly engrossed before I delivered my ruling on the point. The ruling is as follows:

"Standing Order 36(3) states '.....if the offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings of the Committee and report the circumstance to the House; and the Speaker shall on a motion being made forthwith put the same question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed as if the offence had been committed in the House itself.' On the second day of February, 1971 on the instant case, the motion was put by the Hon. Leader of the House and seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown be suspended from the service of the

House. The question was put and a division was called for; while the vote was being ascertained the House was suspended for fifteen minutes because grave disorder had arisen in the House. On resumption at 7.12 p.m., twelve minutes after the appointed time, Mr. Speaker, after a statement from an hon. member as to the time, which statement was confirmed by the Clerks-at-the-table, stated that the House was adjourned until Tuesday, 9th February, 1971 at 12 noon.

In view of the mandatory terms of 36(3), and further, in view of the fact that the House resumed after the appropriate time, a circumstance made inevitable by the grave disorder, the proceedings subsequent to the adjournment were therefore affected by irregularity. In the circumstances, the matter now lies with the House where all questions of order ultimately reside to be cured by its own resolution. The House may therefore, if it so desires, proceed under Standing Order 36(9)."

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was the person responsible for the first suspension, I want to say this. I accept your ruling as a member of the House, and I would hope that at this stage you will encourage no debate on your ruling. Further, I would like to believe that this is the beginning of the time when you will make rulings and make them firmly.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no ruling which I have made other than firmly or genuinely or sincerely. Rules, like Court judgments may be disagreed with, but unfortunately, unlike Court judgments, they are not appealable. May I inform the Acting Leader of the House that nothing in this ruling in any way debars the proceeding of any business this afternoon, nor will any action which may be decided as a result of this ruling be prejudiced by anything which is proceeded with.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand then that we can go ahead to complete the motion made by the Leader of the House on Tuesday, or do we have to make a new motion on that Resolution? I understand that 36(9) supercedes everything here, and my understanding is that we can continue to take the vote on that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that as far as what transpired during that meeting, no action may be continued in respect of that, but my ruling in my last paragraph is that under 36(9) a Resolution may be tabled and dealt with.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This means, Mr. Speaker, that a motion can now be moved that disciplinary action can be taken against the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: What it means is that a Resolution, like any other Resolution, may be given notice of and fully and freely debated.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders of this House are suspended, the

appropriate Standing Orders which deal with the giving of motions, notices and so on, so it would be quite in order to move the appropriate motion now and for it to be dealt with today, inasmuch as the Standing Orders have been suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree that Standing Orders have been suspended and that all notices are yet to be given, Government Notices, notices of Resolutions and so on, but my ruling is that in so far as any motion which is given notice of today, copies must be in the normal way printed and circulated to hon. members. Notices may be given and they are debatable at the next meeting of this House or as soon as possible thereafter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, at first glance I can see that we can bring another Resolution to deal with this matter. We wanted a ruling on it, and it is not our intention - and certainly not mine - to nail anybody to the cross. I feel that this House, in the absence of disciplinary action being taken, is due an apology from the hon. member for his conduct. I feel that if the hon. member offers an apology to the Chair for the misconduct, that we can get on with the work before the House, and that we can forget it, but I think that for posterity's sake we should have an apology. We all have our tempers and I think on reflection we can see where we went wrong, and if I were in the place of the hon. member, rather than have a Resolution brought, I think an apology to the Chair ought to be offered.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. senior member for St. Andrew given way?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am on a point of order, you would not have to ask anybody if they have given way, that nonsense has to stop. You cannot ask another member if he has given way, learn the rules, and I am going to quote the rules now. I am no lawyer, but I am not a fool either. The same rule 36(9) says: "Nothing" - and "nothing" in English means nothing - "Nothing in this Order shall be taken to deprive the House of the power of proceeding against any member according to any Resolution of the House."

3.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, when you adjourned the House inadvertently last Tuesday, the Mace was still there.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I cannot allow debate on the Ruling which I have given. It may, of course, be debated on a substantive Motion, but I cannot allow any hon. member to debate the Ruling on an occasion such as this, but on a substantive Motion, of course, hon. members can criticise the Ruling and tear it to pieces.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker what must I understand by this?

36(9) "Nothing in this Order shall be taken to deprive the House of the power of proceeding against any Member according to any Resolution of the House."

There was a Resolution before the House. I say that the senior member for St. James was sent out of this Chamber unfortunately, and it would only be because the senior member for St. James is not the son of a lawyer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot allow discussion on something which is not before the House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, how is it that when certain people get up to speak you know what is before the House, and when other members get up to speak you do not know what is before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: No other member had attempted to speak on the ruling at this stage.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not challenging your Ruling, Mr. Speaker. I want it made expressly clear that I abide with your Ruling in the House, but I am reading from the Rules. I did not write these Rules, and I am here to interpret them even if I interpret them wrong. I know that I am not interpreting them wrong now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: And to point out Standing Order 36(9) to you, Sir. That is the point of order on which I rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the point which the hon. member has made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I want you to rule on it now before we go any further with the Business of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we want to get on with the Business of the House. I, personally, and I think some of my colleagues are prepared that if the hon. member is willing to make an apology to the House - (Asides) Mr. Speaker, this row went on not only in the presence of the Chairman of Committees, but even in your presence there was misconduct. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the House in itself ought to have an apology. If this is forthcoming, I am prepared to let the matter drop. I do not think it is necessary to go into Committee to do that. The House is entitled to an apology, and that is how I feel. If the hon. member is prepared to do this, then we will go on with the Business of the House.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning your Ruling or anything of the sort. I have been in here for 25 years and I have been near to the brink of going over, and every time I got there I saw the wisdom in saying "when the House goes back into Committee." The rumpus took place when

the House was in Committee, and I would suggest to the hon. member to apologise for what has happened. I have done that several times, but you will agree with me that he should apologise when the House goes into Committee and the Chairman is in the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is willing to do so, he can get up get and say whether he is willing to do it and let us get on with the work.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, may I point out to the Acting Leader of the House that, so far as my Ruling is concerned, the Business of the House may proceed in any event without any prejudice to my Ruling.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we want to go ahead. Can we get some intimation from the hon. member? (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only hear the Hon. Acting Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, can we have an intimation from the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is too much cross talk.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when the House goes into Committee, it is my intention to make an appropriate statement.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Will the appropriate statement be in the form of an apology to the Chair?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, Rule 36(9) says notwithstanding - and the substantive verbiage continues - nothing can prejudice the House from by its own Resolution proceeding against a Member. It is obvious that the House and not the Committee can proceed. The Committee cannot proceed against anybody. Only the House can proceed against any Member that it thinks it should proceed against; therefore, to begin to split hairs as to whether or not the hon. junior member for Bridgetown should apologise to the Chairman in Committee or to the Chairman before the whole House is a matter of splitting hairs.

In my humble view, I think that the hon. member may as well and can as well make his apology in open House to the Chairman as he can to the Chairman in Committee. It is a matter of splitting fine hairs, and we cannot behave like little children. If anybody - I do not care who he is - so thinks that he can continue to flout the authority of the Chair or the Speaker, well this is a saving grace rule. No matter what it has been, the apparent irregularities in naming or in concluding the Motion for naming of the particular Member, that is a bygone thing and something we cannot resurrect.

The position is this: the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is willing to accept, and the House

is willing I am sure to accept an apology from the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown must realise that he is not above the authority of this House, and that this House can give notice of a Resolution, act on it, debate it, and move it into operation. It is for him to decide. There is no point in moving a Motion for Your Honour to leave the Chair and the House resume Committee, and for the hon. member to apologise to the Chairman in Committee. That is rubbish. If the hon. member wants to apologise, he can apologise to the Authority that has to deal with him and that is the Barbados House of Assembly.

3.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is made.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a privilege granted to the hon. member to make an apology. I must say, Sir, that the Standing Orders call for discipline. If the hon. member knows within himself that he has committed an offence, how easy it is to say he apologises. The shot is already out of the gun and has found its target, and the offence has been committed. Mr. Speaker, when judgment has reached its end and justice is secured, it is left to us to show mercy. If the hon. member has pride in his bosom, let him cast it away. When he apologises to the House he brings honour to himself and to the whole Assembly. I think myself that the hon. member will rise and say he apologises.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the business of the House in any way. If it is the feeling of the House that I have transgressed in some manner, then it is my intention to apologise to the House for that; but in doing so, I just want to say that I am fully aware of my responsibilities and duties as a member of this House, and I am reminded of the passage I came across when I was at school, and I think it came from Euripides Hecuba which said "For I too was once powerful, but one day bereft me of my power." With that, I apologise.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The apology is accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand from the Acting Leader of the House that the apology is accepted, and accordingly we will now proceed with the business of the Day.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed, I would like to draw to the House's attention two mistakes which appear in the Order Paper. The Order Paper has some questions in my name and a Resolution. I would like to say that this I believe is a genuine mistake as these two items were only tabled on Friday and no notice was given as such. I would like the necessary correction to be given, and that I be given permission to give notice of these same matters today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. senior member for St. Michael for having drawn to my at-

tention before the meeting started this matter which he intended to put to the House. I have taken steps, as I think the hon. member is aware, with the Clerks-at-the-Table to have the matter corrected. I apologise for the error made by a Clerk-at-the-Table, and I hope the hon. member accepts the apology.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 21st July, 1970, I am informed, have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Likewise my information is,.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I really have not read those Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest postponing these Minutes. I will ask hon. members who found errors or omissions to have a word with the Clerks-at-the-Table so that they can be corrected at the next meeting.

Mr. HINDS: I have been informed by the Clerk that these are the very Minutes to which I have drawn the attention of the Clerk; so they are now in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 28th July, 1970, have been circulated. In the absence of any objection, I will declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

There being no audible objection, I declare the Minutes of that Meeting duly confirmed.

The Minutes of 2nd February are now before the House for confirmation, and unless there is any objection.....

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see in these Minutes, there is a slight error. Mr. Speaker, it says that the Speaker took the Chair at 11.15 a.m. If I remember correctly, it was at 12.15 p.m. and not 11.15 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am more than grateful to the very few - I hope I am not being unfair - hon. members who scrutinise their Minutes with such meticulous care. That error will have to be corrected. I wonder if hon. members would do us the favour if they discover errors or omissions in the Minutes of letting the Clerk know, if it is convenient to the member, before the meeting so that the Clerks can do their research. Their co-operation is appreciated. In view of the fact that we do not want any further delay, I will not require the confirmation of these Minutes now.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Minutes of 2nd February.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to have them confirmed now. If the hon. member would be so good as to point out to the Clerks-at-the-Table the errors or omissions, there will be no attempt to confirm them now.

This reminds me of many years ago as a member of this House there was one hon. member Mr. A. E. S. Lewis who studied his Minutes with as much care as I am sure he studied his Bible.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is one point which arises out of the Minutes, and that is on page 16 dealing with the Chairman's ruling on discussion under Head 10. There is nothing to indicate in the Minutes that Head 10 was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I am thankful to the hon. member, but we are not going to confirm those Minutes now. Will the hon. member be so kind as to draw this and any other errors or omissions to the attention of the Clerk?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I would just like to find out whether this is an error or omission. As I understand from the Clerk, he has no record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, we will settle that between now and our next meeting. The Clerk will then have an opportunity of conferring with the Hansard Reporters.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement of Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the period April to October, 1970.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1971.

Also, on behalf of the Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 129, asked by the hon. junior member for St. George, is ready.
3.30 p.m.

On behalf of the junior member for St. Lucy, I beg to give notice that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 135 and 136 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter are now ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Health:-

Is the Minister aware that -

(1) There are only three nurses doing district nursing in St. Michael?

(2) These said district nurses only receive \$15 travelling allowance per month?

If the answers to the above are in the affirmative -

Will the Minister take steps to increase -

(1) The number of district nurses?

(2) The travelling allowance of said nurses?

I would also like to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS these are few land areas in the Parish of Saint Michael for large scale housing development;

AND WHEREAS many plantation owners have sold their pasture lands for private housing developments;

AND WHEREAS plantation owners generally have done nothing to improve the living conditions of persons occupying their tenancies;

AND WHEREAS the price of land in the Island is beyond the reach of the lower income group;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government acquire tenancies and other lands, where necessary, from these plantation owners throughout the Island;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government set up a Lands Committee for the purpose of developing and distributing the said areas of land to the present tenants for their purchase or lease in the first place, and secondly for purchase or lease to other citizens, using an income limit as exists in the rental of houses owned by the Barbados Housing Authority.

Mr. St. JOHN: Before we go on to Government Business, I wonder if the acting Leader of the House would inform us as to whether it is his intention today to deal with any matters of Private Members' Business.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see, we have had many suspensions this morning because of the ruling which we were awaiting for the last three hours, but is there anything urgent under Private Members' Business?

Mr. St. JOHN: We usually have two hours, as I understand it, under Private Members' Business, but in view of the circumstances I do not know what will obtain today. I do not think however that we should have a sitting without doing any Private Members' Business at all; perhaps we can continue with the Resolution with which we were dealing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member wishes to have an hour at a time to be agreed upon we will be willing to give an hour for Private Mem-

bers' Business, and of course we will deal with the Resolution with which we were dealing last week.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I understand it, I think Question Time is for fifteen minutes and then we have other Private Members' Business.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am prepared to give an hour.

Mr. St. JOHN: We will have the questions for fifteen minutes and forty five minutes for the rest.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That is agreed; the hour is from now.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken for fifteen minutes.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 129 which stands in the name of the junior member for St. George.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the senior member for St. Peter is not here, could we deal with Questions 135 and 136 first?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 135 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Were the arrangements made for the invigilation of the Barbados Scholarships Examination this year satisfactory to the candidates participating?

2. Were any of the scripts written by any of the Scholarship And Advanced Level candidates not sent on to Cambridge University and as a result some of the candidates were marked absent in at least one subject?

3. In the light of No. 2 above can the Barbados Scholarship Awards for 1970 be legally justified, if all the work of all the candidates was not corrected?

4. Will the Government consider compensating the wards or parents of those candidates whose papers were not sent up to Cambridge University and who thereby had the expense of keeping their children at school for two years in a sixth form with no resulting qualification?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker the Reply is as follows:

1-3. Satisfactory arrangements were made for the invigilation of the 1970 Barbados Scholar-

ship Examination and no complaints in this regard were brought to the attention of the Ministry. All scripts written by the candidates were forwarded to the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate. However, some scripts for one paper in History which were reportedly missing were later found in the possession of the Cambridge authorities who then reviewed and adjusted the results of the candidates concerned. The adjusted results had no effect on the Barbados Scholarship awards.

4. Does not arise.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister certain that the scripts were found by the Cambridge University body and not by the local people connected with the invigilation or with education proper in Barbados?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the missing scripts were discovered by the Cambridge Syndicate: there were 8 scripts from the Lodge School and 3 from Federal High School. I may add that only three of these papers were Barbados Scholarship papers, and they had no relationship to the award of the scholarship.

MISSING MARK SHEET AND REPORT OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 136 also standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter at page 10, right hand column.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is it a fact that the Ordinary Level French Oral examination Mark Sheet, and Report, for at least one school, in this year's Cambridge University Examination were lost and as a result the candidates of this school have experienced considerable delay in receiving or have not received any results in French?
2. What attempt has been made by the Ministry of Education to find these papers? And if they have been found, have they been dispatched to Cambridge University or have they been quietly suppressed?
3. If the answer is that they have been dispatched to Cambridge University, will the Minister give the date and any relevant postal information which should be in the Ministry's possession to help in tracing same if lost in transit? If they have been suppressed why has the guilty not been brought to justice?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:

The University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate reported in August that the mark sheet for the oral examination in French at G.C.E. Ordinary Level for candidates of Codrington High School was missing. Even though it was considered

in the Ministry that the mark sheet reported to be missing had in fact been included with the scripts transmitted to the Syndicate, a search was instituted but this proved fruitless. The required information was then obtained from the Oral Examiner and transmitted to the Syndicate. The results in French for these candidates were received on 29th September approximately three weeks after all other G.C.E. Ordinary Level results had been received.

Mr. HINDS: Who conducted the search?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say who conducted the search. I know a search was conducted by the Ministry of Education, and this is my information. I do not think it is for a Minister to ask in the Ministry of Education who conducted the search. The officers appointed should be aware of their responsibilities. I understand that a proper search was conducted in the Ministry of Education, and it was not my concern whether Tom, Dick or Harry carried out the search. The point is that a search was carried out.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister in a position to say if the search was carried out by the very person whose responsibility it was to see that the papers were properly dispatched?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it is the Minister's responsibility to see that a search is carried out. All of the officers in the Ministry of Education are employed by the Ministry of Education. You must have some confidence in the officers, and the officers like other civil servants are conscious of their responsibilities. Whether X carried out the search or Y carried it out, the fact remains that a search was carried out, and that satisfies us.

Mr. HINDS: Was the assistance of Codrington High School enlisted in this search?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not aware of that.

Mr. HINDS: In view of the fact that the Mark Sheet and the loss proper, concerned Codrington High School and it is known that people at Codrington High School have an interest in the matter, or would be expected to have an interest in the discovery of these papers, would it not have been in the interest and justice of the candidates concerned if the assistance of Codrington High School staff had been enlisted to help in this search?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have assisted the hon. junior member for St. Peter as much as I could.

ABSENCE OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AT St. GEORGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 129 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George. It is at page 9, right hand column.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that there are no recreational facilities whatever - either by way of playing fields or social amenities - for the district of St. Judes, St. George?

2. Will the Minister treat the provision of same as an urgent priority?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:

"Provision is made in the Barbados Development Plan 1969-72 for additional recreational facilities, and consideration will be given to the establishment of such facilities at St. Judes, St. George and elsewhere during the coming financial year."

Mr. SPEAKER: That completes the answers to Questions which have been laid. Accordingly, there is the expiration of the time for Questions.
3.50 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for the remainder of the period of one hour.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition indicate what item he proposes to deal with?

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion we were dealing with Item No. 16.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when I spoke on this Resolution, we were dealing with the equity of Bajan Seafoods Limited and we were dealing with the paid up capital of this company, and I mentioned then what action was taken by the Barbados Marketing Corporation to see that the company would be solvent enough to carry on its affairs. I pointed out then that the marketing of the product would have been no problem, and this was the representation made by Bajan Seafoods to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, because Ocean Garden Products had made joint representation with Mr. Bob Charles to the Board of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and checking Ocean Garden Products record with the Bank of America, Bridgetown, on the 31st January, 1970, this Bank stated that they had extended a secured credit of approximately \$U.S. 5 million to Ocean Garden Products, and that \$U.S. 75,000 were already deposited to the purchase of the first catch of shrimp.

It was as a result of this information from the Bank that the Barbados Marketing Corporation acted. As a matter of fact, on the 19th February, 1970, the Bank of America wrote the Barbados Marketing Corporation an irrevocable letter of credit in the amount of \$U.S. 200,000 and pointed out that it had been established through San Francisco headquarters. They pointed out in their letter that it was estimated to accommodate an annual total of \$5 million of shrimp production for the account of Bajan Seafoods. Additionally a current account reflecting a balance of \$20,000 E.C. had been opened with the Bank of America.

I want to get serious about this. If you had as a Board of the Barbados Marketing Corporation an irrevocable letter of credit from a Bank of the standing of the Bank of America making this information which I have just mentioned available to you, is it not reasonable to expect the Barbados Marketing Corporation to consider in favourable terms the proposition made to them by Bajan Seafoods Limited?

On the question of the workers, the Bajan Seafoods on the 5th February, 1970, gave a written undertaking that there would be no dislocation of workers. On the 13th March, 1970, a lease between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Bajan Seafoods Limited was signed. I want here this evening to let the House have knowledge of the agreement signed between Bajan Seafoods Ltd. and the Barbados Marketing Corporation and that signed between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Barbados Seafoods. It will be boring, but I am going to read them, and I am going to compare the terms of the agreement.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if the Minister is speaking at this point of Bajan Seafoods Ltd., or Bajan Seafoods (1970) Limited.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with Bajan Seafoods Limited right now. I will come to Bajan Seafoods (1970) Ltd. Mr. Speaker, I want to read for the information of hon. members the agreement between Barbados Seafoods Limited and the Barbados Marketing Corporation. It reads as follows:

"An Agreement made this seventh day of July, 1966, between the Barbados Marketing Corporation, a body incorporated by an Act of the Legislature of this Island and having its Registered Office at Princess Alice Highway in the City of Bridgetown and Island of Barbados aforesaid hereinafter called the Corporation of the One Part, and the Barbados Seafoods Company Limited, a company incorporated and registered under the provisions of the Companies Act of this Island and having its Registered Office at Cavans Lane in the City of Bridgetown and Island aforesaid hereinafter referred to as the Company of the Other Part.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is going to make this document a document of the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member learns a little more about ministerial responsibility, he would know that a Minister is entitled to read from his file. There is no question about it.

4.00 p.m.

A Minister is held responsible for any short comings or long comings in his Ministry; whatever happens in his Ministry he is responsible for it, and he is entitled to read from files as long as they have to do with the subject matter with which he is dealing.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is Private Members' Business in Private Members' time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note that point, but Standing Order 26(1) states: "A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member is not purporting to refresh his memory from anything, what the hon. member said was that he would give us the context of the Agreement between the Marketing Corporation and Bajan Seafoods, and therefore that is a document, and not notes. I am asking you to rule whether that document has to be produced and made a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding is that the hon. member is reading extracts.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said "I shall now read", he did not say he was going to read extracts from it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may read extracts and he may refresh his memory by reference to notes. The Hon. Minister would realise that he may read extracts.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have here before me a book of extracts of matters dealing with the Barbados Marketing Corporation I consider the agreement between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and Seafoods as an extract of the papers which I have here before me.

"WHEREAS it has been agreed between the Corporation and the Company that the Company would supply and deliver to the Corporation shrimp to be frozen and stored by the Corporation in storage facilities to be furnished by the Corporation and upon such terms as are herein contained;

NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that the Corporation and the Company hereby agree as follows, namely: The Company will -

- (1) From the date hereof supply and keep supplied the Corporation with a regular quantity of shrimp already graded and processed for freezing and storage;
- (2) Save for breakdown at sea, fire, unless caused by the actual fault or privity of the company, perils, dangers and accidents of the sea or other navigable waters, acts of God or arrests, restraints and detainments of all Kings, Princes and people of what nation, condition or quality whatsoever, deliver to the Corporation all catches of shrimp made by the Company with the entire fleet of boats used by the Company from time to time based and operated from the Island of Barbados;
- (3) That they should pay the cost of freezing and storing of all shrimp supplied to the Corporation at the rate of the charge contained in Clause 18 of this very agreement;
- (4) Provides that all the grading and other processing equipment should be provided and they should pay the cost of operating the same:

In the event of the Company ceasing operations locally, either purchase at fair market value plate freezing and other equipment provided by the Corporation in respect of the Corporation's obligations under this agreement, or that they will allow the Corporation to purchase at fair market value all the grading and processing equipment provided by the Company pursuant to this agreement as the Company shall require.

It also provides that if the Company is required to purchase from the Corporation the plate freezing and other equipment provided by the Corporation as aforesaid, or if the Company sells the Corporation the grading and processing equipment provided by the Company as aforesaid, then the Company is relieved of its obligations. Clause seven provides that the Company shall maintain its paid up capital in Barbados.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, on this same point as I understand it, where our rules are silent I think the practice of the House and ruling of the Chair come from May's. I will draw attention to the 16th edition of May's Parliamentary Practice at page 416 which says: "A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other State paper before the House unless he is prepared to lay it on the table. This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in a Court of Law which prevents Counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is

so reasonable that it has not been contested, and when the objection has been made at any time it has been generally acquiesced, it has also been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest."

It is rather obvious in this case that the Minister, in quoting the document in itself, is not relying on the proviso thereto referred and I would ask Your Honour to give a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the hon. member's point in reference to a despatch or State paper. The fact that a document is on the Minister's file does not necessarily make it a State paper for it to come within the category of State papers as mentioned in that well known passage of May's, and that is my view.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It continues to say that it should meet and pay all expenses incurred in and incidental to the carrying out of operations up to the point of delivery for freezing and storage and again after delivery for export. If we were to think of the provision made in Clause 9, "and not sign or transfer any of its obligations or undertakings under this agreement to any person, company or organisation without first obtaining the consent in writing of the Corporation", then it tells you what the Corporation ought to provide.

4.10 p.m.

We are told that the Corporation ought to provide freezing facilities for a minimum of 23,000 lbs. of shrimp shelled or peeled per day, and storage for not less than 300,000 lbs. shelled or peeled at any one time and that the labour necessary for operating the freezing equipment and providing and furnishing all electricity and maintenance must be done by the Corporation. The freezing capabilities of the equipment would be minus 20° Fahrenheit in the centre of the frozen product and no degree fahrenheit for its storage.

Now, hon. members are a bit concerned over the fact that I am reading the terms of this Agreement, but I am doing so in order to point out to the House how limited was the scope of this Agreement for the Corporation *vis-a-vis* the Agreement for Bajan Seafoods. I am going to compare the two Agreements. I am not reading this Agreement in order to waste time.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is not reading the Agreement; he is reading extracts therefrom, and he should be corrected in this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, they will try, but they cannot put me off my track.

Mr. St. JOHN: Let us get the document so that we can compare things for ourselves.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When you get the Government, you will get the document.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this air conditioner is making people sick.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the air conditioning unit is not functioning satisfactorily.

Mr. SPEAKER: Where I am, it is not functioning at all, except that it is making more noise than many hon. members!

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Now, Clause 11 makes provision for the Barbados Marketing Corporation providing the appropriate buildings of the appropriate dimensions to the specifications of Seafoods, and the B.M.C. was also supposed to provide facilities by Clause 12 for the transportation of all catches of shrimp from the ship to the Processing Plant, but that the Company would pay for all labour involved in the transportation. I want hon. members to note those points. The B.M.C. was also supposed to maintain all the equipment and buildings which it provided under this Agreement, and the equipment and buildings were supposed to be maintained in an efficient working order and condition from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, the B.M.C. was expected to do a lot under this Agreement. Then there were certain mutual Agreements arrived at. It was agreed that the Company would sell the Corporation and the Corporation would purchase from the Company monthly at a price to be mutually agreed from time to time up to 5% of the total poundage of shrimp supplied for processing in accordance with this Agreement, and such poundage to be either graded, upgraded or selected fresh shrimp.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to note this, because it will be a salient point later in my address. I want to compare what the Barbados Seafoods agreed to allow the Barbados Marketing Corporation to have from their catches with what the Bajan Seafoods agreed to allow the B.M.C. to have from their catches. I think we are all aware of the fact that people in this country, where you have the shrimp industry, experience difficulty in getting shrimp for local consumption. The Barbados Seafoods limited the B.M.C. to a mere 5% of the catch. I will point out later what percentage of the catch the Bajan Seafoods agreed to allow the B.M.C. to have for distribution for local consumption. Even in the very catch of shrimp the Barbados Seafoods was discriminating against the people in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, it was agreed, and this was understandable, that the Barbados Seafoods by Clause 15 of the Agreement would handle all sales of shrimp to the United States of America, and that the Corporation would handle exclusively all sales to the United Kingdom, Canada or in the Caribbean Islands if there were ever any. Under Clause 17 the Corporation could not sell shrimp under the registered trade name of the Company except with the consent of the Company.

It was also agreed by the Corporation and the Company that the rate of charge for the services provided by the Corporation for the Company would be at the rate of 9¢ E.C. per pound of green, fresh

shrimp delivered to the Processing Plant. At that time 9¢ was equivalent to 5 1/4¢ U.S., and that Agreement was valid for three years.

When we come to the terms of the Agreement with Bajan Seafoods, you will notice that the Bajan Seafoods had an Agreement not only to lease the Plant for three years, but their agreement was for a 10-year lease. It will be noted that the Bajan Seafoods agreed to pay, in accordance with their Agreement with the B.M.C. 12¢, that is 6¢ U.S. per pound for shrimp processed. What else did they offer? They also offered to pay the B.M.C. 1¢ U.S. or 2¢ E.C. whichever was greater according to the current exchange rate per pound of shrimp processed through the Plant provided that the rate of the charge therein contained in that Agreement should be reviewed at 3-year intervals from the date of the signature thereon.

4.20 p.m.

It was also agreed that freezing facilities for a minimum of 24,000 pounds of shrimp per day and storage for 300,000 pounds be provided and that the labour necessary to operate and maintain freezing and storage facilities would be provided by them. Like in any other contract, buildings were to be provided, and the proper maintenance was to be carried out on the equipment and on the buildings. The Bajan Seafoods were to have extra facilities provided, additional equipment installed for the weighing and processing of shrimp and fish at its option; and then there was a mutual agreement that the lessee would handle exclusively all sales of the product to the United States, its possessions and protectorates except those in the Caribbean area, and the lessor would handle exclusively all the sales of the product to the Caribbean Islands, the United Kingdom and Canada. This was similar to that of the Bajan Seafoods.

The other terms of the agreement gave the Barbados Marketing Corporation a better deal. Let us take the salient points in the two agreements and compare them. Whereas the paid up capital of the Bajan Seafoods was just \$50,000, there was enough security in accordance with the letter from the Bank of America and the guarantee given by Ocean Garden Products to satisfy the Barbados Marketing Corporation that this was a feasible venture. It is true that they only had a capital of \$50,000, but the paid up capital of Barbados Seafoods Limited was only \$100,000, but they did not necessarily have an undertaking from a Bank that \$U.S. 200,000 would have been provided, nor were they given a backing by Ocean Garden Products or any other company to the tune of \$U.S. 5 million and therefore on the paid up capital alone and the money available to both companies as was represented by them and the Bankers to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Bajan Seafoods would have been a better venture than the Barbados Seafoods.

Now the amount of shrimp that the Barbados Seafoods agreed to sell to the Barbados Marketing Corporation was only 5 per cent of their catch,

whereas Bajan Seafoods gave them 7 1/2 per cent. I am dealing with the agreement which was arrived at between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd., before they began to operate. If someone came in to you and you were satisfied that a case was made out and you saw in this case something which promoted the interest of your country, something which was in the interest of Barbadians, that is, more shrimp would be passed on to the Barbados Marketing Corporation for sale thereby increasing the actual output of the Corporation through which a reasonable profit would have been made from the sale of the additional shrimp, why should you turn it down?

Another salient point here is that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was only offered 9 cents a pound in the contract with Barbados Seafoods whereas Bajan Seafoods agreed to pay them 12 cents per pound. Another thing is that no utilities were paid for by Barbados Seafoods. On the contrary, Bajan Seafoods agreed to pay for all the utilities. Therefore over and above the fact that Bajan Seafoods paid a higher basic fee to the Barbados Marketing Corporation than they were getting before, they were going to take care of all utilities which Barbados Seafoods was not doing.

Another comment here is that Bajan Seafoods in their agreement contracted with the Barbados Marketing Corporation to supply fish for which there is a shortage in this country, and it is an open secret that the deep sea fish which has been brought into this country for sale on the local market got to the consumer at a more reasonable price than other fish. The maximum price charged by the Barbados Marketing Corporation for trout and other deep sea fish was 50 cents a pound, but generally it is sold at 45 cents a pound; but sometimes you may be able to buy deep sea fish, depending on the type, from the Barbados Marketing Corporation for as little as 25 cents a pound. Now do we want to reduce the cost of living in this country or not? Do we want to eat fish or not? Do we want the housewives in this country to have fish available to them at a reasonable price, or do we want them to continue with this shortage of fish where they will have to pay 90 cents and one dollar for a pound of dolphin?

The Barbados Marketing Corporation was established to assist the fishing industry in this country, and it was called upon by the Government to make available to the fishermen 140 tons of storage space, because during the lean season when not much fish is caught, the Barbados Marketing Corporation could have fish stored up.

4.30 p.m.

The same B.M.C. which was called upon to see that the people of this country have an adequate supply of fish, saw, in signing this contract with Bajan Seafoods the possibility of having cheap fish and having more fish for the consumer and for the housewife in this country if they entered into this agreement with Bajan Seafoods.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at every step and every action taken by the B.M.C. as we go along, we can see that every move made was a move made in the interest of the people of this country. In respect of trying to get more fish in our country, they went along with the agreement with Bajan Seafoods Co. Ltd. The Barbados Seafoods Co. Ltd. were not interested in fish, they caught fish and dumped it overboard, while the people of this country were starving and having to pay through their what-you-call-it for fish, and they could not get fish. An industry in this country which could ply between this country and the deep seas are catching fish, throwing them overboard when the people of this country are starving for fish; therefore, the B.M.C. saw in this fish issue the possibility of satisfying the needs of the average housewife of this country, and the possibility of reducing the cost of living.

I go further. The B.M.C. proposed to use the trash fish which was caught by Bajan Seafoods, and use the bones after filleting the fish - because all this was in the contract with B.M.C. - use the bones for producing fish meal to assist in the growth of the livestock industry of this country. Even today in Barbados there is an inadequate supply of fish meal for the farmers here. The other thing you have to look at, is that the Barbados Seafoods had an option to terminate the agreement; there was a clause which provided that if there should be any material increase in labour costs to the company engaged in the catching of the shrimp whereby they could be unable to realise a reasonable commercial profit on this operation, the company would be at liberty to revoke or to break the contract, giving the B.M.C. 30 days' notice. This was the contract of 1966, and this was the contract which the B.M.C. sought to amend when they tried unsuccessfully to arrive at a reasonable compromise in a new agreement with Mr. Schofield. Whereas he could take up himself and his company and move out of the country with 30 days' notice if he wanted to break the contract, the contract with Bajan Seafoods carried no such option.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister said that that contract had no option in it to allow Bajan Seafoods to terminate it, but Bajan Seafoods has gone and there is no contract any more, so what is the difference?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Bajan Seafoods has gone and there is no contract any more because the hon. senior member for Christ Church sold out the boats and stopped Barbadians from getting jobs. He put 500 Barbadians out of work; the hon. senior member for Christ Church, a man called Bernard St. John.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, how many Barbadians were working on the boats sold, as alleged, by the hon. senior member for Christ Church?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order, but I will remind the hon. senior member for St. Andrew not to refer to any hon. member of this House by name.

Mr. HINDS: Just on a point of order, Sir, for what did the hon. member sell out these boats? For debt or what?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: The Minister would be glad to explain, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My understanding is that the boats were sold out for political reasons.

Mr. St. JOHN: My understanding is that the boats were not sold out for political reasons, the boats were sold out for debt; D-E-B-T. Bruce Procope, Maurice King and Carlton Brathwaite did not pay the money that they agreed to pay; they were a bogus group of Directors.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: And because, as it was said, Bruce Procope, Maurice King and Carlton Brathwaite were admirers of the present Party in power, a man called Bernard St. John, a lawyer, a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party, carried politics as far as to drive Bajan Seafoods out of this country and stopped them from operating in this country because he wanted to play politics out of it.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, the hon. member knows that it is nonsense, because all they had to do was to pay the debt and the boats would have been theirs. If Barclay's Bank retains me to sell him out, I will sell him out too, so all he has to do is to pay the \$500,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the point of time has now arisen and the time for Private Members' Business, as I have been advised, has expired.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Acting Leader of the House intimate that with which he proposes next to proceed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be the first Order of the day.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

4.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 is the first Order of the Day under Government Business, and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 9 in the absence of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Acting Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with Order No. 9 standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. Hearing no objection the Hon. Acting Leader of the House may now proceed to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the General Loan Act, 1933.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple amendment to the General Loan Act. What has been happening is that there have been cases where debentures of the order of \$1 million have been issued to a single subscriber, and it was necessary to issue 200 debenture certificates and so on and have them signed by the Auditor General and the Accountant General. It is to be appreciated that this consumes a lot of time and is a useless exercise. The proposal here is that while retaining the sum of \$100, to have the debentures issued in multiples of \$100. The position is that it would be easier to sign one certificate for \$1 million than to sign 200 certificates for a \$1 million. It is a simple amendment.

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

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been before the House for such a long time that I had quite forgotten its provisions. I cannot understand how the House could spend so much time proceeding with Resolutions, go on for three or four days at a time and going into the depths of quarrelling, when something as simple as this, a straightforward financial provision to make debenture raising a little easier, could have been passed at an early stage and would never have been opposed by anybody and can go through now without a murmur, as far as the Opposition is concerned.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, that the House may go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1-3 were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate Motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS seconded by Mr. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 12 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 12 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, 1962.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew seeks the leave of the House to take charge of this Bill in the name of the Rt. Hon. and learned Prime Minister. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection leave is granted to the Hon. Acting Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, 1962.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the increased price on the houses built by the Mortgage Insurance Company was as follows: The price of a basic house is \$22,900; then there is another house to be sold at \$25,000 and one at \$26,000. Now, in the negotiations it has been noted that there was no provision whereby a man's income can be added to that of his wife's income for the purpose of this Act.
4.50 p.m.

We are here seeking a simple amendment to the Act, and as the Objects and Reasons point out, we want to amend this Act to provide for the grant of a higher maximum insurable loan calculated on the basis of a fixed 90 per cent of the appraised value of the house against which the loan is secured, and for repayment of such loan to be effected over a period of not more than thirty years. I think the period was for 25 years, but now we are carrying it to thirty years. The reason is that a person purchasing a house is not allowed to spend more than 25 per cent of his income on such purchase. This has shown that a hardship will be brought to bear upon many people who would like to own their homes, and it is

felt that we should extend the period to thirty years which will give the person acquiring a home a smaller monthly payment to make, because if he is paying over a period of thirty years, the monthly payment would be less than if he is paying for the house over a period of 25 years.

I may point out here that it is considered that the man's income be tied in with his wife's, and that we should do all we can to make it easier for the average man to own his home.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the principle of the Bill, if there is one area in which the Democratic Labour Party has failed dismally, it is in the area of providing housing for all classes of Barbadians. The Hon. Minister has said that one of the objects of this Bill is to permit a smaller repayment over a greater period of time, and this has been necessitated by the fact that the basic house at Cave Hill is now working out in the vicinity of \$22,000 odd. Let us look at that market, and let us look at Cave Hill. Cave Hill was an area which was acquired by the Barbados Labour Party; the area was frozen in 1959 pending a plan for a twin city of Bridgetown to be called the Greater Bridgetown Plan. This is 1971, eleven years after that, and up to now the number of houses that are at Cave Hill cannot amount to 200. This is a very serious thing. That area was supposed to be an area to take care of the overspill of the population problems of Bridgetown, but what are we having up there? Earlier today another hon. member had to draw to the attention of this House the seriousness of the working class housing in Barbados, in that he brought in a Resolution pointing out the need for land. There are 1,200 acres or more of land at Cave Hill; I cannot remember the area that was frozen, but I think it was subsequently acquired by Government; but if you continue to perpetuate the idea that in the context of Barbados everybody can have a single unit house, you will never be able to solve the housing problems at prices which are economic. This is a thing that Urban Development Corporation will not make up its mind on and have a policy in relation to this, although planner after planner has been drawing it to the attention of the Government of Barbados that with the land available, whether we like it or not, if we are to have agricultural land, the land available for building must be small in relation to the total population, and we have got to decide on two or three different patterns of housing development. No row housing has been built at Cave Hill in which you have a back and front garden, but you have a point of contact between the separate houses? This is easily conceived today. It is no architectural impossibility. In Toronto and in all the cities of the world with greater land space than we have in Barbados, they have decided that you have got to introduce a new concept in housing.

There is an area of people in this country who come to you and ask for help in relation to housing for their needs. They do not come within the Housing Authority because there is a limitation there of \$60 a week. What about those people who are Police Sergeants, Police Corporals and others? What about the clerical people and the people who earn \$600 a month and down. They cannot buy a house for \$22,000 unless the wife is working; but some people in Barbados just do not want to have their wives intermingle with what is their business, because they feel they would get "uppity" if you put the house in their name and your name. I bet you the hon. member would not put his in a joint name. Unless a bold attack is going to be made on new designs and conceptions in housing, there will always be this problem. If you look at the Housing Authority's houses at Gall Hill or at Farm Road, with a little more square footage - they are 760 or 780 square feet as I understand it - you can devise a house of 900 square feet build it with a unit system, terrace it, and you will be able to get a house in the \$15,000 and \$18,000 class which is a great need. The Government acquired this land undeveloped at about £500 an acre; some was acquired at £200, £300 and other prices. Cave Hill ought to be a hive of building activity. By now a lot of experience ought to have been accumulated up there, but nobody can understand what is the master plan for Cave Hill, because giving the benefit of the doubt, they have not got 200 houses there for the ten years.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member is wrong. It is not ten years. I have not been in the House of Assembly for ten years. If the hon. member is speaking of the land by the University, the Government did not acquire that until some time in 1963.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member forgets that acquisition notices went out for this land from as long ago as 1959. I give them two years to complete the acquisition which would be 1961, and they may have paid for it around 1962 or 1963, but the point is, and that this is something you do not know on that side, once acquisition notices go out the Government is entitled to take possession.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Cave Hill, that is, Husbands and Oxenards, was acquired in 1965. After acquiring the land you had to have plans drawn up. It may well be that the Barbados Labour Party expressed its intention to acquire it, but it was acquired in 1965, not when the hon. member is saying it was acquired, and I think it is a credit to us to have advanced so far.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members on the other side and their advisers do not know the facts; the land was frozen when Mr. Mapp was Minister of Communications and Town Planning. The land was acquired, the notice of acquisition of The Mount which used to belong to Mr. Haynes was published. I remember when the arbitration was done,

it was done in 1962 and you cannot have arbitration until you have the compulsory acquisition notice. What happened was that the Urban Development Corporation may have been formed in 1965, but the position was that the first intention of Government was that the Housing Authority should be responsible not only for working class houses but for middle class houses as well. Later it was decided that the Housing Authority was not the proper institution to run all aspects of housing, and then they conceived and created the plan to have an Urban Development Corporation as a separate and distinct entity. I have the facts on this, I know this by heart, I have been into this and the position is that this is a result of the tardy planning of the Government. To prove that I am right let us look at the Mortgage Insurance Act itself, and it is conceded that the Mortgage Insurance Act was passed to facilitate finance institutions to have insurable loans for the Cave Hill Scheme. This Act was passed since 1962, and this is the position, that the rate of building up there is so slow that in five years they have not built forty houses a year because there are not 200 houses completed there now.

You want to say that it was 1965, notwithstanding that you passed the Act in 1962, you still have not got 200 houses; I know exactly how many houses you have up there, not 100. You have just signed a contract with Ideal Homes to build 500, other than that you have 58 suburban homes, you have the six that were originally built on top of the hill by the U.D.C. as pilot houses so as to let the people see the sort of scheme, you have some more that were built by Rayside on contract for U.D.C. based upon the pilot houses for U.D.C., you have a few show houses that were put up by the Bruynzeel Corporation to show a wooden house, and now you have the Ideal Homes. That is all you have up there, so your rate of building at Cave Hill is not more than 30 houses a year; a shocking record.

The other point I want to make is this, that the master plan was made for Cave Hill, it was decided that it was to be an integrated and not a slum area, it was to be an area not only for middle class people, it was to be an area which all classes of Barbadians would have the benefit of living in, and you would have amenities and proper parks and things of that kind. What happened with them? You cannot tell me that you are building \$22,000 houses for them. What about the people in the \$15,000 group? I heard it said in here that the Housing Authority's units in the new developments work out in the vicinity of \$8,000, excluding the land price. If you have three to four thousand square feet of land and you charge for it at 50¢ a foot it would not cost any way near there. The Housing Authority takes care of the group of housing units in the vicinity of \$11,000, so from \$11,000 to \$22,000 is a big gap, what facilities does Government have in mind for catering for the group between \$11,000 and \$22,000? What are the Government's plans in relation to them? There are none. (*Asides*) That is when you are driving the sword right in, this is the core of differences; what are the plans of Government in relation to that? Absolutely non-

existent, because that can only be satisfied on row housing or on multi-storey houses up to a maximum of three or four depending upon the landscape. The hon. member is always talking about educating the public of Barbados; I do not care what Government is in power, the Barbadians will have to live in flats in this generation because from the 90,000 acres of land we have, when you deduct 50,000 for agriculture you are left with 40,000. Take out the roads and divide the remainder by the population and you cannot get more than a quarter of an acre a piece.

Have you ever heard about terrace houses? The Canadians call them row houses and the English call them terrace houses, but you have your houses with a common wall. You have a front garden and a back garden, you entertain in the back and you have your walk-way and your entrance in the front and your car is parked in the front. You can put up your laundry in the back, and your children can play cricket or whatever they like, you know what I mean. It is economical, and the average block as I understand it in row housing is about 3,400 square feet, whereas in an individual lot you cannot have less than 5,000 to 6,000 square feet at Cave Hill with these \$22,000 houses. They cannot afford it.

The interesting thing is that now Barbadians as a result of going abroad and having their relatives abroad the prejudice about living in multi unit houses is disappearing because the people know when they go to the big Cities of the world they have to live in these houses, and the same situation obtains here in Barbados because we just do not have the land, so therefore the Government should be thinking seriously of educating the Barbadians by demonstration. You have to educate by demonstration, and I cannot see why it is that the Government has not yet had a pilot project in the Cave Hill area for houses from \$11,000 to \$18,000, because that is the group they should cater to, because it is the foundation of the most stable group in this country. They are the people who make the most sacrifices in this country, those are the people who have to work for that amount of money and they are expected to live with champagne tastes and nip bottle coppers. There is no question about it, there is nothing being done to cater for them. They cannot buy houses in the private developments because they do not have the money to buy them, and they cannot get houses from the Housing Authority because they are above the level, and \$22,000 is too much for them, so let us decide in our minds and let the Government decide in its mind that the U.D.C. must be pushed. Do not let the U.D.C. get the idea that anybody is satisfied with their performance except the Government; only the Government could be satisfied with U.D.C.'s performance. We on this side are not satisfied with the performance of U.D.C., they have built far too few houses for the period of time in which they had the land, and we have got to be careful with this land up there, I believe the area was planned for 25,000 people, 25 people to the acre, and if we go ahead with this type of planning we will see that we are not going to get 25,000 people up in that area of Cave Hill, and this is the area to take care of the over spill and

the problems that the hon. senior member for St. Michael mentioned when he talked about his Resolution.

5.10 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, again I have to agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. member, and I must laud him for what he has said, but I must still lick him on some of the things he has said too. The hon. member is a lawyer, but how good a lawyer he is I do not know. I have seen that he has won one or two cases as well as lost some of them. The hon. member knows as well as I do that Barbados up to this day - *(Asides)* The hon. member says that the fault is mine because we are in power. It must be remembered that I am not a lawyer, but we have no condominium law here. The hon. member knows what that means but, as he has said, Barbadians have now started to acquire a new taste. When they go to England, Canada and the United States they live in apartment houses, they buy them, they keep them clean and they do not make any noise, but when they return to Barbados they find that this is something reprehensible and feel that it is lowering standards and all sorts of things. In England you do not know your neighbour unless you happen to come out one morning and see him catching a bus. The same thing happens in the United States of America, Canada and all of the big countries. There is a shortage of staff in the Attorney-General's Office, but we certainly need the condominium law here. As soon as we get the condominium law we will then be selling apartment houses.

This is where I am going to lick the hon. member. He says that we have no Housing Programme. As a politician I am going to say something even if I have to make amends for it afterwards. When the Barbados Labour Party was in power anybody who took a drive up by the Pine Workshop would have seen that the Barbados Labour Party had built houses up there without building roads leading to them. I am wondering if anybody who lives above the Pine Workshop died how people would get out the coffin. Would you roll the coffin down the hill? The point is that the Barbados Labour Party built houses for poor people and they thought that a water closet was too good for them. Imagine a man living in an upstairs house and he wanted to go to the toilet at night when the rain is falling. He will either have to get an umbrella to go to the toilet, or you will know what he has to do.

We have all done certain things that we cannot live down. The hon. member must understand that I have been in politics longer than he has been. The hon. member has forgotten the houses with no bedroom doors where a mother could see what her son was doing and so on. The hon. member has suggested that the type of house at the Farm is the type of house that we should enlarge on. As Minister, I do not accept that and I will tell you why. I believe the hon. member will agree with me when he hears why I will not accept it. That type of house is a barrack-type house, and it restricts the people's mental outlook; therefore, we want to get people away from the

idea that they are living in a regiment. The people who live in this type of house will not aspire to anything better, and they will feel that it is good enough for them. I do not feel it is good enough for them.

Now, this is where the hon. member and I will see eye to eye. Since Barbados is small and is not expanding; we do not have enough land, and since everybody wants to live in Town or the perimeter of the Town, I would have to do something which would cost a lot of money. When we come to the Legislature for the money to do the job, I am expecting the Opposition to support this measure. There are a lot of houses at the Pine which I would pull down, although it would appear as if it were a waste of money. What we should do is to build houses in circles so that there would be a common playing field in the centre, and the children would not have to play in the road and create problems for the drivers of vehicles and themselves. Everybody in the area would be able to use the playing field. These houses would be in blocks of four, and no more than four families would be living in these blocks. This is an innovation that has been suggested to me. This would be for the people we are catering for now, but we will still build another type of condominium for the more sophisticated persons.

With reference to what the hon. member said about people like policemen and teachers, it came over the air and it was also in the Press that I told the people at the Urban Development that I want them to build houses. As the hon. member said, if a man can manage, after 10 or 15 years to pay for a house costing \$8,000 or \$9,000, he may not be able to pay for a house costing \$22,000. I know what I am talking about. I said that a little 3-bedroom house like the ones at St. Barnabas with, say, 1 sq. ft. or 2 sq. ft. more in the bedrooms could cater for the policeman and the school teacher who, probably, may not reach the top. We have created a type of society here now that this is a sort of in between; the fellow is not rich, he is too poor to pay and he is too proud to whitewash. This is the whole gist of the matter. We have to cater to this type of person. He cannot go at the pipe any more with an old pants and two buckets to bring water, because people will criticise his going at the pipe for water. He cannot go at the shop with a basket and a lard-oil bottle any more; so he has to live above his means. All of us try to live above our means. Nowadays everybody is striving for higher society, and I have plans to cater to these people. Do not say that we do not have plans.

Now, there is a Company here called Bruynzeel. It is really a Dutch/Surinam Company, and they are going to put down for me a model house at the Housing Authority in Country Road. I want the whole community to go and look at this house, criticise it, and so on, so that we can make changes if necessary. This house is going to be made out of greenheart flooring, but some of the panels will be made from some kind of compressed material. I tested that material myself under water for 36 hours, and it has not changed nor warped. You can also use trowel plastic on it. This will cater to the man who has

mauby money, but still wants to drink champagne. He might not be able to use a full glass, but half-glass is better than no glass at all. This is what we plan to do.

With regard to the Cave Hill Development, it is true that that is not a restricted area for the so-called middle and highfalutin classes. We intend that everybody must live out there. I have spoken to the Manager of Ideal Homes and he has agreed that he could build a house out there for about \$18,000. It will be a 3-bedroom house, but the kitchen will be a bit compact. You will not be able to get your washing machine in the house, but you can have your car port outside. You can cut down on the gas bill, but you will have three bedrooms in the house: one for the man and his wife, one for the children, and one for a friend. These houses are fairly comfortable and will be built on something like 4,000 sq. ft. of land. I have even asked the Manager to see if the price could be reduced. If the house will cost \$18,000, then the man will have to make a down payment of \$1,800 and pay about \$180 a month. It means that his wife will also have to go out and work.

5.20 p.m.

This means that the wives will have to work, and this will put another hardship on the community because all the good typists will get married. I have always said that a man marries for security, not a woman, because he is looking for somebody that if he becomes ill, she will be able to go out and work; so the cooks will not get through too good. We can never win apparently. I appreciate what the hon. member said, but he should not say that we do not have a plan, because I have given him the plans which I have, and I am sure he will agree with me that instead of building these barrack type houses which utilise a lot more land than they normally should, we should have houses in which four families can live with a common playing field in the centre. This would provide somewhere for the children to go and play on evenings. In this area we would also build another condominium for the more sophisticated person who does not want to live in the other houses.

I will say before I sit down that this Government is unique in that it is the only Government I know of in the history of Barbados and in the history of the West Indies that has had to make three salary revisions in the nine years it has been governing. What we have to take a new look at is that when we first catered for the man in the street for these houses which the Housing Authority builds, they were working for a certain amount. (Mr. St. JOHN: It was \$40 a week.) We raised it to \$60 a week and will soon have to raise it to \$100, because the standard of living has gone up. The cost of living has gone up in Japan, in China and all over the world, but the remarkable thing here is that the standard of living has gone up. Thirty years ago ice water was something you only got on Sundays, and lettuce bush and pork were only eaten on Sundays, and you only ate a fowl if one ran across the road and a car killed it. (Asides) Today nobody wants football chicken - wings and backs. Everybody is buying a whole chicken, and

you can see the lettuce bush on the top of their baskets as they go along. I have been noticing, Mr. Speaker, that the new type of refrigerators do not allow the shedroof door to close, because everybody has a fridge in the corner and the shedroof door is wide open. Years ago when you passed and the shedroof door was closed, you would think that somebody had died or was having a baby; so the standard of living has really gone up.

In an aside, Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody talking about trying to get down to Courts at the end of the month, otherwise the things go back down. This is true; but when you look at how much some of the people who go to Courts, DaCosta's and other places owe the Housing Authority, you find it is something like \$600, and they have cars outside the houses.

Mr. St. JOHN: If the hon. member knows, that is retribution coming home because it was the Government that told them not to pay rents.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny that. What the Government said when we were campaigning was that the houses were the property of the Housing Authority, and therefore the renters must not pay taxes.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the very Government employed a man by a certain name to possess the people's furniture for the rent they did not pay.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, we never told people not to pay. This would be stupid. That is why I would admonish the hon. member when he talks about giving people things free. We knew we were going to win the Government. (Asides) How could we encourage people with this kind of nonsense. At that time there was a tax called the Occupancy Tax where if you were renting a house you had to pay taxes, and this was repealed. The Government was arguing that since the houses belonged to the Housing Authority, it was not fair to ask the people to pay an occupancy tax.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, the Occupancy Tax was abolished by a Bill in this House by Mr. A. E. S. Lewis who was not in here in 1961.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: For the hon. member's information, I am not denying that at all. It would be stupid in us or anybody to tell people not to pay rent. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Only one member I may hear now.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, people must understand that the situation in Barbados is becoming so acute with housing, but there is only one thing we can say, there is no country no matter how big or small that can solve its housing or educational problems. However you build houses, you will find that there are more people for houses than you can afford. What the hon. member has mentioned is a

very pertinent point. Since we do not have this amount of land, what we have to do is to embark on a programme of building condominium houses, say, along President Kennedy Drive, because if you build houses outside of the town, it means you are causing the cost of living of the persons living outside the town to go up, especially if they do not have cars. (A VOICE: Improve the bus service.) Improving the bus service does not help. It was discovered at Cambridge University that people have a tendency to trek towards the town. You carry facilities to the country, but you will notice that people will go from Monday to Friday at the shops in the country.....
5.30 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Minister is referring to what happens at Cambridge University. I have found that one of the basic problems with Barbadians is that they look in text books or they go abroad and what they see happening in England or America they bring it back to Barbados and tell you what is happening; there are two different cups of tea, Cambridge University and the City of Cambridge are different from the City of Bridgetown and its relationship to what we call the country districts.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member not only misquoted but he misunderstood me. I said this is what was discussed at Cambridge University and he did not wait for me to finish. The Africans were pointing out that they get the same problem, that people have a tendency to tread towards the town. I went on to say that you will see people in Barbados shopping from Monday to Friday at the little shop in the country but come Saturday and everybody has to come into town although they are not getting the things any cheaper, but this is a kind of stigma and they like to know they went to town shopping. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Only the member addressing the Chair may speak.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not understand what the hon. member is trying to say, I was only trying to point out to hon. members on the opposite side.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member said he did not understand what I was trying to say, what I am saying is I see no reason why the Government should have this housing problem because the senior member for St. Andrew is giving away houses in St. Andrew and he can give the Government of Barbados some.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order whatsoever.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member said I was giving away houses in St. Andrew, but he is jealous because he cannot do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that you always face. If you were to build

houses outside the City and ask people to live in these houses, you are increasing those persons' cost of living, because it means that those persons have to look for more money. When a man would normally walk, it means that he has then to pay for transportation to get to and from town, so you are increasing this person's cost of living and these are things one has to take into consideration. The hon. member said he lives in St. Philip, but he must remember that he is one of the lucky few; he is a lawyer and lawyers do not give receipts, with all due respect to you. We all know this, he is a lawyer and even if he makes \$5 on a case he will pay for that gasoline. The hon. member cannot relate the average person to himself because the hon. member is in the group which we consider to be middle class; he has a nice home, a car, servants and so on, but we are dealing now with the poor person like the agricultural or average worker who comes into town to work, and it does not mean that because he is poor he will get things cheaper than the rich fellow. As a matter of fact, some of the middle class people have better opportunities than a lot of the poor people because when they can buy things in bulk the poor people have to buy things from day to day. When the people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can buy a bag of sugar or kill a cow, the poor people cannot do that, so he belongs to the affluent society.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Minister belongs to the upper class, the more affluent society.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order; let us avoid social matters.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, I buy whisky now and years ago I could not even buy a pint of mauby or a pound of meat. Years ago if I bought a large glass of mauby today I could not buy one tomorrow. I meant no offence, but the hon. member is a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and you yourself know as well as I do that you have said that there are only two classes of persons as far as you are concerned, the professional and the domestic. I am not a professional so I must be a domestic. I only want the hon. member to understand not to be so touchy in these things because I mean no offence, but all the lawyers belong to the affluent society. They are better off today than the average man because they are not day to day operators.

The senior member for St. James also belongs to the affluent society; I have called for him on a few occasions and the servant told me he was in the bath. Years ago when you called for me you might have been told that I was outside with the bucket or bringing water. I say this now to the senior member for Christ Church who made some very good points when he was dealing with the Cave Hill development, but he was wrong when he said we do not have a policy as far as housing is concerned, and I hope he will not say this again because I have spelt out to him what the policy will be, and as soon as we get a condominium law on the Statute Book, a lot of these problems will be solved.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would for the sake of the records make it quite clear. Some of the hon. members on the other side mentioned that this Government in 1961 told the people not to pay house rent. Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing further from the truth; what we told the people was that we did not believe the Government should be a landlord and that people should have the opportunity to own the houses. I was appointed first Minister of Housing in Barbados and one of the first things we did was to give the people the right to own their houses. If you look in St. Barnabas or the Pine and see some of the houses that we built where the people paid down 40% of what they had previously paid in rent which was considered to be a down payment and part payment for the value of the houses, and there are many poor people today in Barbados that would never have had a house had it not been for bringing this into force in the Housing Authority. Equally as well the land; there are certain tenancies in Barbados where the people could pay 20% of what they have previously paid in land rent and would be able to purchase it out of the previous rent they paid for many years.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, the hon. member denies that the Government told the people not to pay house rent. If you go into the housing areas you will find that 95% of the people in the housing areas would tell you that the Government told them not to pay rent and that is why they would not pay any. There is a housing area in St. James and I have heard this over and over again especially when they were throwing the people out of the houses.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny that, they were never told that by anybody. What happened was that the Vestry and the Local Government wanted to collect taxes from people who did not own houses and the Prime Minister then a practising lawyer, told them that Occupancy Tax had long been abolished, and the only tax in Barbados was for ownership, and they did not own the houses therefore they should not pay the taxes for them, but nobody on this side ever told anybody not to pay house rent. How could we tell them not to pay rent when we wanted them, out of the rent, to own the houses? 40% of the rent they had paid was considered as part payment for the ownership of the houses. I started a scheme of building separate and independent houses for this particular purpose so that those persons who were living in the multiple unit houses could own the houses, and many of those people today are owning the houses in the Pine and St. Barnabas out of that scheme that we brought into force. I still say that it is the greatest incentive for the poor man in this country to give him the right to own a house.

5.40 p.m.

This Government still believes in people owning houses rather than the Government owning them, and anything we can do to create an incentive to encourage them to own houses and to help them to own

houses we will do. I would like that to be stated clear on the record.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of hon. members on the other side, I should like to point out that the delays in the construction of houses at Cave Hill were occasioned by the following facts; It must be remembered that though the better part of the land was acquired in 1965, the acquisition really began in 1963 and the land was acquired in portions. The access roads to Cave Hill were not completed until the end of 1967. When we went to Cave Hill to establish a community, there was the absence of water. We then had to build a reservoir at Lodge Hill, and install 15-inch mains to satisfy the needs of the people who would be coming to that area to live. We had the utility services installed, and all of these things took time.

As a matter of fact, what we had to do after putting in the access roads was to develop the area before we could start the Housing Development. It may seem to be a long period of time - 1965-70 that we took in getting this matter off the ground, but it is to be appreciated that not only in Barbados, but in other parts of the world there has been a paucity of architects, engineers and surveyors, and we have been experiencing endless difficulty in having our survey plans as well as our architectural drawings done because of the shortage of skilled man power to do it. Let us face the facts, the delays were occasioned by the absence of skilled men.

For example, the hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke about the master-plan, but he did not seem to appreciate that the master-plan was only schematic and it was not a detailed plan for the area. It was a question of acquiring the area without proper surveys. We had to await proper surveys before we could take possession, because some of the plans for the land were not available. We were faced with real difficulties in establishing this area, but we are now on our way. The hon. member said in one breath that we did not have 200 houses, and in another breath he said that we had built under 100. I would like to inform the House that we have 167 houses in the area: Some are completed and others are near completion. We are conscious of the shortcomings where housing is concerned, and we pledge the people of this country to do what we can to arrest the problems facing Housing Developments in this country.

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

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

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1-2 were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS seconded by Mr. WEEKES the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES, 1970-71, PART I - CURRENT OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the next order of the Day.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to supplement the Annexed Estimates of the Port Department on 4 items: Overtime, Telephones, Police Services, and Light and Apparatus. The Addendum clearly sets out the intention of this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to draw the Hon. Minister's attention to a matter which has arisen at the Port - I do not want to call names - as to a conflict between two respective Acts of Parliament dealing with powers of the Customs Officers *vis-a-vis* the Police.
5.50 p.m.

The point is whether the Police are entitled to search Customs Officers while the Customs Officers are in execution of their duties, *vis-a-vis* the power of the Customs Officers to search the Police. I do not want to say anything more. I am stating it as a broad point. Sir, there is a general provision in the Customs Act which appears to state that a person cannot be searched while he is in the execution of his duty. Now an opinion has been given by the Crown Law Officers in respect of this, but it does not solve the question because all the opinion says is that the two Acts should be worked in harmony. Well it depends on personalities. Now legislation will have to be passed to clear it up, and when the matter came before a certain place the other day, it was

clearly intimated that the proper manner to deal with this is to have legislation passed making it positively clear that nobody is exempt from the provisions of search there, because obviously if you say that one person cannot search another person in the execution of his duty, you are opening a gap. I am not saying whether the gap would be exploited or not. So if the Hon. Minister would ask for the respective opinions of the Department and deal with the respective Heads of Department, he will see that this row has been going on for three years at the Port as to the respective powers *vis-a-vis* Customs Officers and the Police.

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

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 11 be the next Order of the day,

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Objects and Reasons set out that this Bill would make certain consequential amendments to the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966, which have become necessary as a result of the proposed extension of the National Insurance Scheme to cover employment injuries.

Hon. members will remember that the National Insurance Scheme was introduced in Barbados, and when it was introduced we had said that later we would be coming back to the Chamber with certain consequential amendments in order that we could include workmen's compensation in the Bill, and we would also include self-employed people in the Bill. Now hon. members might wonder why it is that a self-employed person is not entitled to compensation if he becomes ill. The reason for that is simply this: there is nothing wrong with a person having the 'flu or being temporally ill, he goes to a doctor and the doctor gives him a recommendation. You have to put your own stamps on the book, and there is nothing to prevent this person from remaining at home and working and still claiming workmen's compensation.

I will tell hon. members on the opposite side that it has been drawn to my attention that if a self-employed person goes to an institution like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or the Mental Hospital for medical treatment and that person can verify from a doctor's certificate that he was in hospital, this should be considered. We would look into this. But at the moment we do not want to do it because we are awaiting the actuarial report. Hon. members on the opposite side who are self-employed would

realise that they pay \$2.20 for their national insurance contribution as against paying \$3.00. The reason why they are not paying \$3.00 is because the 80 cents extra that the employer is paying is to cover national insurance as well as workmen's compensation; so self-employed people pay less than the regular employees, but this is only for short term benefits, and nothing to do with long term benefits. As soon as we get the actuarial report, we will come back to the Legislature with a further amendment.

I would like to tell hon. members that what we are doing is regularising this, because this came into operation since the 4th January this year. If there are any points hon. members would like to raise, I will try to see if I can help them. Apart from that, though it is only a consequential amendment, I do not think there is anything that would create hard feelings on either side, because it is something we need to do.

The reason why we have included self-employed people is because the ILO expert has pointed out that if we did not do this, a chap would wait until he was fifty years or 55 years and then join the national insurance scheme and get the benefit, whereas we should ask people to contribute now. When the scheme has been fully implemented we have to take two looks at it again, that is, from the angle of self-employed persons getting sickness benefit, and also from the angle of unemployed persons. I am not saying that this will come about this year or next year. We have to await the actuarial report to see how it will work out.

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

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that there are still problems arising with the sixty-five year olds who go on working. I know of an instance where they have gone on working and a year has passed and they cannot claim; so they are out, whereas if they had stopped working and put in their claim within the year they would have been getting an old age grant now. It is really a serious thing. All they can get is a refund of the total contributions. I wonder if we can get over it because those that feel physically fit feel that they should be allowed to work. I do not know if we can allow them to continue on a temporary basis and get the old age grant they would normally have got, plus their contributions they would have put in with a little interest on it of course. That may be a solution, but so long as they voluntarily want to do it, I do not think we should discourage them from saving, nor do I feel we should treat them as hard as what it appears to be at first sight, because they do not feel they could claim so long as they are fit and able to work.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I just want to bring to the attention of the Minister the case where due to the wrong date of birth being given, a person

started to make contributions when in fact she was over the age and ought not to have made any contribution, and then the person died and there were \$200 or \$300 to be recovered from Government. The only way this could be done would be for the husband or some other person to get letters of administration. 6.00 p.m.

I wonder if some sort of provision could be made similar to that as is enacted under the National Insurance Act. The Minister would probably remember that at the Select Committee on the Insurance Bill we discussed this, and I do not know whether any changes were made in the law.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What the senior member for Christ Church said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is quite true, but there is somewhere in the Minutes of the National Insurance Board where I saw that they were proposing to put this up to me because it is really a hardship. There are some people at 65 who are stronger than some at 17, and I think it is really unfair, but it is not one of those things which have been created deliberately. The hon. members on the other side must remember that this bit of legislation is in its embryonic stage; all the matters that have been raised I think the Board is fully cognisant of and they are looking into these things. I think that if the person's relatives make representation to the Board they will get back the money.

I will look into this matter that the junior member for the City has raised and I will give him a full answer on this, because with \$200 or \$300 I cannot see anybody getting Letters of Administration because they will spend all their money in lawyers' and solicitors' fees, but there is a law that if money is in the Treasury from \$1,000 the Minister of Finance has the authority to waive the taking out of Letters of Administration. If a pensioner leaves anything like \$900 in the Treasury the Minister of Finance has the authority to waive the taking out of Letters of Administration and that money can be paid to the person once the Minister is satisfied. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Mr. WEEKES, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Mr. WEEKES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Mr. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION FOR THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT MEADOW ROAD, VENTURE, St. JOHN

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the House is well aware and in agreement with the policy of the Government to have rural amenities carried to as many people in as many parishes as possible. The matter which we have to deal with now is the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Venture, St. John, for the erection of a communal bath and latrine. It is about 2,610 sq. ft. in area, we have had several discussions about these things in this Chamber already, and I think that all hon. members have met with a certain measure of satisfaction with the proposals. We are not setting aside the needs of any parish where land can be acquired, and we have already voted money to provide these facilities. I beg to move that this Resolution, with which I think all hon. members would be in favour, do now pass.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

6.10 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day.

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) (No.2), ACT, 1971

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill set out quite clearly why we are seeking to amend the Pensions Act, 1947, (1947-20). I do not propose to read through the Objects and Reasons, but I am prepared to answer any questions which I can answer if hon. members care to ask them.

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

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that one of the objects in seeking to bring about this amendment is to make a special provision for the Head of the Civil Service, but the strange thing about it is that he is the very officer who is making it extremely difficult for negotiations with other branches of the Civil Service to proceed apace whereby a decision can be reached to give effect to the point that

I raised yesterday or some other day, that when a person serves in the Government Service in whatever capacity and leaves the service, then that person should not lose his or her years of service. The years of service should be kept and if the person rejoins the service, or even if he does not rejoin the service, when the person reaches the age of 55 or whatever is the pensionable age - if the years of service are 10 years - the Government should give the person a pension on those years or, in the case of some other branches of the Service, if the person puts in as many as 5 years, I understand that person would be granted a gratuity. I would certainly like to see something like that done. I have made this point, on a previous occasion, and there is not much that I want to labour about it on an occasion such as this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member's point is well taken.

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

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

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1-4 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Government pensioners, who at the time of their retirement the salary on which they had retired was very, very low and very many of them are continuing to live and despite being given increments when salaries revisions are brought into force, having retired on so low a salary scale, they are still on the border of starvation. I want to bring to mind the late Mr. B.A. Southwell. That is a case in point, and I am sure every member in this House will know that.

Mr. Southwell had served the Teaching Service in this Island at Harrison College, Combermere and elsewhere but, nevertheless, the salary on which he retired was not enough to keep him, and it is known that he was a careful liver. Nevertheless, I would not like to see, as I see happening to many Government pensioners, this sort of affairs continuing. The Government should take stock of all Government pensioners at the present moment, particularly those who have retired more than 12 or 15 years past when

salaries were very, very low and see if anything can be done to put them on a proper footing.

After all, we must bear in mind that they rendered a service and, perhaps, it was no fault of their own that they worked for a small salary on which they were paid a pension. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that the high rise in the cost of living demands that some careful consideration be given to these Government pensioners, especially, as I have said, those who retired very many years ago.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I promised the hon. junior member for St. Peter that I will draw this to the attention of the appropriate Minister.

The question that this be the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

6.20 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE BARBADOS HARBOURS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 10 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960.

When this matter was previously discussed, a motion was moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael seconded by the hon. junior member for Christ Church that the Bill be read a second time, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking, and moved seconded by the Hon. Leader of the House that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that one of the points I wanted to make in this debate was with

respect to the sale of goods, and I remember that when the adjournment was taken I was at the point where I had enquired from the Minister if he had any information about a Mr. Carlton Brathwaite taking a car out of the Harbour compound without the authority to do so. I am to wonder if the Minister would be inclined at this stage to give us what information there is to hand on that particular score before I continue.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I enquired into this matter and the car was legally taken out of the Port. What happened is that Mr. Carlton Brathwaite had permission from the Customs to take the car out, but the Port Department did not know that he had had permission, and immediately he left, they called the gate and asked that he be stopped, but Mr. Brathwaite had already gone. They telephoned him and he immediately came back down, but arrangements had been made with the officer for paying the duty. He was quite clear because he had permission to take the car from the Port.

Mr. HINDS: However, something had gone amiss and Mr. Brathwaite had to carry the car back in.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If the hon. member would give way, on a point of order, I investigated this matter myself and I have here from Mr. Brathwaite the original document from the Port which I have made a photostat copy of and which I intend to make a document of the House. He said to me in a note: "Neville, you will note that I received the car on 19/1/71 and that the gate pass is for that date." It was what I consider a genuine mistake. It was not Mr. Brathwaite's fault at all, but I think it was the people down there were annoyed that there were accusations about stealing going on and he had gone out of the gate without permission. He had permission from the Customs to go out, he had the keys for the car, the price that was stated in the House that the car cost is not true because it is a second-hand car; but on the same day that he received the car he went back. The complaint is that he had brought the car out without having the permission from the Customs for the car to leave the Harbour, but the money was already paid to the Comptroller of Customs by somebody who was looking after this business for them. He did not have to pay the money himself. I am making these papers documents of the House so that hon. members can see for themselves that there was nothing in this. The only problem is that Mr. Brathwaite brought the car out without having the little slip signed by the Customs Officer. He did not even know he had to do that, and immediately they called Mr. Brathwaite, he returned, which was on 19th January, 1971, and this is the same date that the document was signed on.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable to find that the Hon. Minister has been able to exert so much energy to investigate a case of his friend Mr. Brathwaite. I am glad he has done this. Now, Sir, this does not alter the fact that enough had gone wrong for Mr. Brathwaite to bring the car back to

Customs. We are concerned that something did go wrong and he had to return the car.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Brathwaite returned with the car, not that he had to return. He came back down to Port Contractors with the car, but when he took it away the duty had already been paid and he had permission from the Customs to take the car out, but what happened is that there are two gates through which to pass. The northern-most gate is for cargo going out and the car should have gone through that gate, but Mr. Brathwaite went out through the gate which normal traffic would go in and out, and he returned through this gate to give the Customs receipt to the Officer. That is the only reason why he had to return.

Mr. HINDS: Then are we hearing from the Minister that Mr. Brathwaite was perfectly entitled to have left his car anywhere on Cheapside and walk back and hand in this ticket and it would have been all right?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, Mr. Speaker, the car was an item like any other item. I am a Minister and when I go into the Port I make the Customs Officer search my car at the gate. If you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to hide.
6.30 pm.

The car was an item which could have come out on a lorry years ago, but the gist of it was that the car could have been driven so Mr. Brathwaite drove the car after he had been given the keys, and he drove back the car. He made an apology to the officer and went back inside where they gave him the piece of paper which I have just produced to the House, so that is all it was. He had to carry back in the car, he could not walk in by himself.

Mr. HINDS: Why did Mr. Brathwaite bring back the car? The hon. junior member for St. Michael is saying that Mr. Brathwaite was not obliged to bring back in the car.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, he brought back the car as an item that should have passed through Customs, not that he was obliged to bring back the car because the duty was paid on it. He could have come back with nothing and presented the receipt, but just to comply with the law he passed through the northern side where cargo passes through rather than through the southern where normal vehicular traffic passes.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Sir, I wonder if at the gate the items are not checked according to what information is on the receipt. If you do not have a delivery slip from the Shed to check at the gate the items mentioned thereon, what happens?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The number of packages on any vehicle coming out will be checked at the gate, not the contents. They come through a particular gate. It was not a new car with a different licence, so that the Policeman and the Customs Officer

at the gate would not realise this, but a second hand car would be something they would not have known whether it was a normal vehicle that had gone in and then passed back out.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister is labouring the point too much about the fact that it was a second hand car. What we are concerned with is that the car was an item as such, and that it had to be checked by the delivery slip or whatever one might call it at the gate. Mr. Brathwaite had passed through the wrong gate, according to the Minister, hence the item was not checked and Mr. Brathwaite was not duty bound to return the item to the Port to pass through the proper gate to be checked because the car was the item.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that an auction sale has taken place in the Port of some unclaimed articles already. Surely the Port Manager is entitled to dispose of articles that are unclaimed; he can do so by auction, but what might be of considerable interest at this time would be to learn from the Minister who the Auctioneer was in this case.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, with anything being sold at the Port or at the Customs under the law, the Customs Officer is the auctioneer under the provisions of the Act which gives the right to the Customs to sell goods and to appoint one of their officers as the auctioneer for the sale.

Mr. HINDS: I have been learning that the Minister is being brought up to date as to what is going on in his Ministry from time to time. It is really true that a Customs Officer did carry on the auction sale of the goods, but this Bill seeks to give the Port Manager a shorter period, that is, it seeks to give the Port Manager authority that if an auction sale is held on one day within 24 hours afterwards goods that are auctioned and sold must be removed from the scene of the auction. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Port Manager ought to consider a situation where people who are going to attend these auctions are business people, and an auction might very well take place on a Friday which is the day that is most likely to attract business people, but if an auction takes place on a Friday and within 24 hours after the sale, goods that have been auctioned, must be removed from the scene of the auction, when the Port closes then for its regular closing period on Saturday what is going to be the position of the purchaser when he cannot claim his goods until sometime on Monday?

We appreciate the fact that in matters of this sort Sunday will not be counted as a day, but nevertheless we still believe that a period of 48 hours would be much more convenient to the purchaser of these items as well as to the Port Manager. We do not want to see the Port overcrowded, having too much goods to handle, and especially goods that are perishable, hence the auction, but in any such case, Mr. Speaker, the Port Manager cannot be expected to have everything his way. Some consideration must be given to people who are expected to do business with him when these auction sales come off. (Asides)

The Minister's attitude is that you are making the Port another store room if it is not moved within 24 hours.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, after something has been sold in the Port it is the property then of the person who has bought it, so who should be responsible for it? If I bought something from the Port I would want it out at the same time. After I pay for it it is mine and the best person to have possession of it is the person who bought it. To leave it in there indefinitely the Port Manager might have to sell it again.
6.40 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Further to that, I would like to ask the hon. member what would be the position if he bought an item in the Port and they were to allow it to remain there for the time he asked them to let it remain and somebody stole it, who would be responsible?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is providing for goods sold at auction to remain at the Port 24 hours after the sale takes place. If the goods are stolen during the same 24 hours, who is responsible for them? That is the answer to the Hon. Minister. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has given the very best answer. Any person who goes into the Port to attend an auction sale would want to get his commodities out of the Port as quickly as possible thereafter. If that is accepted, that is my reason for making the suggestion that the person attending the sale should be given a little more than 24 hours. We must bear in mind that the person who bought the goods would want to get them out as quickly as possible, and would not be inclined to leave them there for over 48 hours.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. For the information of the hon. member, I should like to say that the law allows the Port Manager a discretion. In other words, if you bought goods on Friday and the Port closed half day on Saturday and you went to the Port Manager on Monday, I would consider that a satisfactory explanation and I am sure the Port Manager would use his discretion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we will rely on the discretion of the Port Manager.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1-3 were called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate Motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON seconded by Mr. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 16th February, 1971, at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: I beg to second that.

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

6.50 p.m.