THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 14th July, 1971.

A special meeting was held at the House of Assembly at 4.45 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker);* Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs);* Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Health and Social Welfare);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A., *(Leader of the House);* Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., LL.D. (Hon.), *(Prime Minister);* 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.; Mr. J.B. YEARWOOD, J.P., *(Chairman of Committees);* Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology);* Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER and Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have been made aware that this is a Special Meeting and it has been represented to me that it is for certain urgent business to be done.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 30, 38, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN entered the House and took his seat.

A BILL TO AMEND THE PROVOST MARSHAL'S ACT, 1904

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely provides for an increase in the scale of fees payable to each Deputy Marshal and each Special Deputy Marshal for attendance at sittings at the Supreme Court. In the case of the Deputy Marshal the fee is raised from 72 cents to $3.00 per day and in the case of the Special Deputy Marshal the fee is raised from $5.00 to $8.00 per day. The principal clause of this Bill is Clause 2 which substitutes the new words and figures for the words and figures in the original Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side have no objection to the amendments made in this Bill but I just want to make one or two comments on the question of the Marshals of the Supreme Court. I believe that some time ago representation was made to the Government about the question of a travelling allowance, because unlike the Chief Deputy Marshal the other Marshals are in a completely different scale altogether.

Mr. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

They are at present allowed a flat rate of $42 a month as travelling allowance, and I believe that anybody who knows anything about the work which the Marshals perform, would know that the sum of $42 is not really adequate to cover their travelling expenses, and I would seriously urge upon the Government to look into the possibility of increasing the travelling allowance paid to the Marshals of the Supreme Court. I do not want to suggest any figure, I believe that they themselves made representations to the Government, but I would say that it is a case where the Government may well feel that the travelling allowance paid should be increased.

Unlike the Detectives who work in the C.I.D. at Central Police Station and who are given a plain clothes allowance, the Marshals at the Supreme Court do not wear any uniform but are not given any allowance at all and I believe this may be a case the Government may consider since the work is somewhat similar and they have some protection like that given to the police, they may well feel that the time has come when a case should be made out for giving the Marshals a plain clothes allowance instead of uniform. I think that they do not want a uniform because they feel that a uniform would hamper them in the course of their duties but they do require some sort of allowance.

One last point I will deal with and that is the question of identification. From time to time the Marshals have to serve writs on people and on a number of occasions people have called on the Marshals to present some form of identification to show that they are in fact whom they say they are, but they have never been granted any form of identification and this sometimes leads to trouble. Ever so often you get cases of people assaulting the Marshals in the execution of their duty, and it may be in the interest of these people to provide some sort of badge whereby they can present it as a form of identification. They have also been getting some difficulty from the Police when they have to park in the process of serving writs, and I think this is a matter which the Government should look into because we have had occasions where Marshals have had to park their motor cars in order to serve due process on a particular person only to find on their return that they have been reported by the Police. I recommend these comments to the Government.

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

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

4.55 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 7 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, Minister of Health, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the National Assistance Act, 1969.

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the policy of this Government is to establish Homes for old people, and in keeping with that policy one such Home has been established by the Housing Authority by the former Minister of Housing at the Pine, St. Michael, and it is to be handed over shortly by the Housing Authority to the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.

The object of this Bill is merely to provide certain amendments to the National Assistance Act as at present constituted to enable the National Assistance Board to have the necessary power to deal with the running of this Old People's Home and to be duly constituted to exercise the power in dealing with such institutions. The Object and Reasons are clearly set out. I can read them for the benefit of those who may not have read them thoroughly. The Bill seeks to amend the National Assistance Act, 1969 (Act 1969-37) in order to -

(1) permit the National Assistance Board -

(a) to provide and maintain institutions for the care and protection of aged persons who are poor and needy,

(b) acting in accordance with the advice of the Statutory Boards Service Commission established by section 3 of the Statutory Boards Service Commission Act, 1969 (Act 1969-31), to appoint and employ officers and servants,

(c) to provide for the terms and conditions of employment of its officers and servants, and

(d) to make byelaws prescribing *inter alia* -

(i) the procedure for admission to and discharge from, and

(ii) the fees payable for admission and care of aged persons at, institutions maintained by it;

(2) to require that Board -

(a) to keep proper accounts and submit them to audit, and

(b) to submit an annual report to the Minister.

Opportunity is also taken, Sir, to amend an incorrect reference appearing in Section 2 of the Act.

The position is that the Government feels that in the case of the aged persons, such as couples in the various Institutions mainly who have been living together, whether married lawfully, or where a woman has been a common law wife, for a number of years that something should be done to maintain that family life and family spirit. The object is to try to remove the

couples who are willing to be removed to such Old People's Homes so that they would be more comfortable in their old days than they are at present. We are trying to relieve some of the pressure at some of the District Hospitals. We have now separated the ones who are ill from the ones who are well. In other words, we have separated sick patients from the others. We are hoping to improve standards generally and to give the National Assistance Board the opportunity of dealing with these Boards more effectively. That is the Object of this amendment to the Act. If there are any questions, I am quite willing to answer them.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point on which I would like to speak. The hon. Minister in introducing this Bill made mention of Old People's Homes. Looking at the Bill and comparing it with the original provisions, my understanding of the position was that the National Assistance Board hitherto was only an Advisory Board; it had no executive authority and no management functions. Now, as I understand it by this amendment, the intention is to confer certain powers of management on the Board.

I heard the Minister speak only of Old People's Homes. What is the position with respect to those buildings which were formerly known as almshouses which at the present moment still contain aged and destitute people? Is it the intention that those buildings should be handed over to the National Assistance Board so that we would have one administrative authority dealing with all of the various types of accommodation provided for people who are old or destitute? The way the hon. member spoke, it would appear as though you are only dealing specifically with the Old People's Homes and not with the others. I want to get that very clear.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency there is one, and I think it is generally felt that the intimacy of contact which formerly existed, and the interest which formerly was paid to the administrative running of the Institution when it was under the Local Government is no longer there, and that the Institutions could be improved if full authority were given to the Board over these Institutions.
5.05 p.m.

I would like to know whether it is the policy of Government to have two separate patterns of administration in respect of this. I want to find out what is the position in relation to this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The position is simply this: The eleven institutions which were formerly called almshouses have been reduced to five which are now known and run as district hospitals. We have had a survey conducted by one of our senior medical officers of health, and the object is to divide, as I explained a few minutes ago, the sick patients from the ones who are well. We want to go a step further by removing the ones who are well to these old people's homes to be established in various parishes as we go along, but the point is that the institutions to which the hon. member referred are in truth and in fact district hospitals. The object is to upgrade as far as possible and to remove the ones who are well to these old people's homes, and this is the first step in a series of steps to achieve this.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister not long ago say that Government is moving step by step in matters pertaining to the aged and in some cases the very unfortunate senior citizens of this country. He did mention also how they are separating the sick from those who are well, but what is very puzzling to me is that they are given a small amount of money when they are outside. I think it is $2.00 a week, but I speak subject to correction and hope that the Minister will give this information. I wonder if the Minister can tell me what are the amounts given as national assistance to those people who are destitute. I daresay these are the people who are not yet qualified for old age pensions, but for some reason or other they are unable to work and depend on the Government at the end of each week for a small amount of money. I would like to know how much money per week is given. I think the Minister said it is $5.00.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I will give a straight answer. In very destitute cases it is as much as $5.00 a week.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid this does not come under Clause 2. If you are to read Clause 2 carefully, you will find that the question and answer do not apply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is just a matter of giving some latitude. The hon. member has posed a question, and if he thinks it a good opportunity to seek further information, with your permission I will give it, but it is really not relevant as such.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I welcome you back to the Chair not having seen you for a long time, but I do not believe you are following this carefully. The

Clause says "to provide and maintain institutions for the care and protection of aged persons who are poor and needy." I am therefore trying to find out from the Minister.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, we have only got as far as Clause 2, and I think he is referring to Clause 3.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, you said that I was doing the wrong Clause, but I do not think so. All I am asking the Minister is whether he can tell the House what amount of money is paid these poor and needy people at the end of each week. The Minister is saying that it is as much as $5.00 per week, but how does he arrive at that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2(a) says "to provide and maintain institutions for the care and protection of aged persons who are poor and needy;"

Mr. CRAIG: I am trying to find out from the Minister what money is paid per week to these needy people when they are not in the institutions, because he said that they are dividing the sick ones from those who are well. I say this is not relevant to Clause 2.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am going to sit down because I can understand that you do not feel very well these couple of days.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with Clause 2.

Mr. CRAIG: Please do not shout at me. I am trying to debate this and if you rule me out of order, I am prepared to sit.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, we are dealing with the Bill and not with the Objects and Reasons.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative wihtout division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, under Clause 3, I wonder if the Minister would be able to say how many people received national assistance and what is the amount paid per week.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member should know that better than I do, he being a specialist on national assistance matters. Some 12,000 received national assistance, but of that amount some qualified for old age pension as well. The ones who get old age pension do not get $5.00 per week; In some cases they get as much as $5.00 per week but it is normally $1.25, $2.00, $2.50 or $3.00 in accordance with the needs and circumstances of the case.
5.15 p.m.

You know the procedure and if you have any questions you should table them in the usual way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Clause 3 deals with the keeping of proper accounts and that in my opinion is irrelevant, it has nothing to do with what per week one gets.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this deals with the accounts and you can only determine the accounts by the amount of money that is paid to these people. I would like to know from the Minister by way of the accounts we are dealing with now how many people are getting so much money. What am I hearing at all this evening? Do you mean I cannot ask anything about the accounts? I would like to be able to determine how much money is paid out to how many people, and the Minister is ready and willing to give the answer but you are prepared to interrupt the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I interrupted the Minister on irrelevance and I rule that that part is irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: Do you mean I should sit down?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say that that part is irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to think that it is relevant and he is willing to give me the reply; are you ruling the Minister out of order for giving information to this side of the House? As the Minister suggested I will table a motion to this effect and I will sit down because I know you are the Chairman of the Board and you may find yourself in an embarrassing position.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, because money has taken such a dive it is but relevant that I enquire of the Minister in a matter of this magnitude what are the numbers of persons, and I thought when I first came in that I heard him giving amounts, but roughly you could help. The Chairman of the National Assistance Board who is Chairman of Committees of this House could very well give some assistance or be courteous enough to give the Opposition assistance, and I am sure no one in this world in his senses unless he is steeped in mad power would attempt to suggest that it is irrelevant to ask in a Bill of this sort for this information, and therefore it is obvious that any hon. member seeking knowledge would attempt to ask such questions, and knowing the Minister in charge of this as I do, he has never in my 25 years in here had anything to hide and I am sure he would, Mr. Chairman, if it is at all possible ,give us that information. If he does not have it he will give us an undertaking that he will get it and give to the members of this House.

I do not see, Mr. Chairman, that subject to the approval of the Minister to make the bye-laws providing for National Assistance that it would be impossible to raise the amount because as I pointed out in my

opening remarks money has taken such a tremendous dive that what a dollar would have bought at one time it would take three dollars now to buy it, and this is why I would ask the Minister to shed a little light on it and I am sure there is nobody in the House of Assembly who would attempt to tamper with the Minister's manners, not if I know him well.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one brief question, and it is this. When the accounts are submitted, I wonder if the Minister can tell us that there is a possibility of its being revealed upon examination of these accounts that some of these poor and needy people receive as little as 50 cents a week.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, I have nothing to hide in this matter but I said on two occasions the amount was $5.00 a week for Old Age Pensions, and the policy is to increase it even more in accordance without resources. The question of the means test, for example, increased it to $7.00 and it may be removed altogether, so the policy of the Government is to assist as best we can, the needs of the poor and needy.

In answer to the questions which were raised specifically in so far as National Assistance is concerned, as I said it is as high as $5.00 in some cases but normally it is $1.25 or $2.00 and it does not go up to $5.00 except in very poor and needy cases. I think there may be one or two cases where it is 50 cents, and the hon. member has raised this question already because as you remember we came here with a Resolution for supplementary provision as recently as December of last year when all the facts were given, so it is not to say that members are unaware of the position, every member in this Chamber is fully aware of this particular matter but if you want to get the last word on the final position as it is today I would suggest that you table a question in the normal way or table a Resolution.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister for his explanation, but I want to draw to his attention that when the Old Age Pensions Officers, who, I understand now, are National Assistance Officers.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the hon. senior member for the City of Standing Order 44(1) which reads as follows: "Any Committee to which a Bill is committed shall not discuss the principle of the Bill but only its details."
5.25 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: What am I discussing, Sir? You have not given me a chance to speak; I am not discussing the principles of the Bill; I am just drawing to the Minister's attention the fact that you will find a retired pensioner of the Government getting $40 a month; his wife is suffering from diabetes or high blood pressure and so on; both of them are over 70 years of age, but the Inquiry Officer refuses to make a National Assistance recommendation to give the wife assistance because the husband is getting more than $7 a week. There are several respectable and responsible persons in this country who have worked for years with the Government of Barbados and they get $12 a week as pension, and I am asking the Minister to see what can be done to help such people. The medicine is expensive and some people cannot afford to buy it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To see that the accounts are being kept; to see that a statement of accounts in respect of the financial year is being prepared, and to make sure that within 3 months after the end of the financial year it is given to the Minister. That is what is in Clause 3.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, I should like to give the assurance that the policy which he is enunciating is the policy which has been adopted by my Ministry in that when the pension is small, and where the man has his wife we couple them together and we still give assistance. That has been the policy quite recently.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, surely you cannot stop the Minister from explaining that. You cannot catch at these little things, Mr. Chairman, if somebody is trying to co-operate with the Minister. I am going out of here voluntarily, and I have been in here too long to lose my temper now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for allowing both members to speak at length. Some of us will go out cermoniously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with Clause 3.

Mr. CRAIG: You are going out uncermoniously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member persists in irrelevance, I will ask him to take his seat.

Mr. CRAIG: I will persist in this: I wonder if the Minister would be able to explain - it is not me to beat or deal with; it is that bird. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: "Who is a bird?") Barrow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will withdraw that word immediately.

Mr. CRAIG: What word, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said: "It is not me to deal with; it is that bird." You went on to say "Barrow".

Mr. CRAIG: Who is that bird or Barrow in here? I mean Nigel Barrow, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with Clause 3, and I am asking you now, because of your irrelevance, to discontinue your speech.

Mr. CRAIG: I will discontinue my speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what I am particularly worried about is that the Minister tells us that the accounts to be presented would of necessity show that there are something like 12,000 persons receiving national assistance. I said earlier, and the Minister has since admitted, that a number of persons receive only 50¢ a week. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us that more than 10 per cent of the 12,000 are in the 50¢-a-week bracket.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, when I referred to 12,000, it was with reference to the old age pensioners. I cannot give the hon. member off hand the actual figures or the number of people receiving national assistance, but there are not quite as many as 12,000.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Hon. Minister would be able to tell us if, to his knowledge, any of the needy citizens draw less than 50¢ per week in some cases. The Minister quoted $5, $3 and $2 in some cases. Is he aware that some people draw as little as 50¢ a week? *(Asides)* The Leader of the House is telling him to say no. Would the Minister be able to state what is the minimum paid to these people weekly? He does not want to be advised; he is a Minister of long standing and repute.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As I mentioned quite recently in this same debate, whenever we come here with our Annual Estimates all of the information is given to you. We then come with supplementary estimates all the time, and we never can assess properly the amount needed. In this case we are really not dealing with National Assistance as such; we are dealing with something to enable the National Assistance Board to run these Old People's Homes properly. Do you want to initiate a big debate on national assistance generally which will last the whole night? Is that the intention?

Mr. CRAIG: I am asking the Minister to tell us what is the minimum paid to these people.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The answer is that normally it should be $1.25 per week, but if in some cases in the country districts people are getting 50¢, that is wrong. I will look into the matter. I am appalled to hear that sort of thing still exists.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear what the Minister has just said. I am in a position to tell the Minister that a sick mother with four children in St. Peter.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing that. I would like hon. members to read Clause 3 and to discuss Clause 3. We are discussing the preparation of accounts and the time in which they should be submitted.

Mr. HINDS: I am discussing, Mr. Chairman, what Clause 3 is likely to reveal. Clause 3 deals with accounts, and we are discussing how the accounts should be made up. I am saying that $1.25 a week is being paid to a sick mother with four needy children.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see nothing like that in Clause 3.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is you who mentioned to the hon. member the question of discussing the details.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing about details in this Bill. Clause 3 speaks of keeping proper accounts and adequate financial and other records.

Mr. HINDS: What Clause 3 tells me and tells hon. members who can understand what it is all about is that if the accounts submitted came to $1 million you should go into the details as to how the $1 million has been arrived at, and all we are saying is that in the breakdown of these accounts these are the details.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the breakdown I referred to in this Bill will not be with reference to the money spent in national assistance as such; it is in relation to the running of these old people's homes. This is a Bill dealing with the establishment, running and giving of power to the National Assistance Board to carry on these homes.

Mr. HINDS: What the Minister has just said amounts to the fact that the home is to be established for old people but what we are asking is what you are going to give to the needy when they are not in the home. We are trying to point out to the Minister what has been happening in the past with a view to warning him that a similar situation does not obtain in future, so that when you come to make up the account we do not want to be told by the Minister that this 50 cents business has been going on any longer. The accounts refer to money and it is money that you are going to give to people, so that in submitting your accounts you are leaving yourself open to be queried as to how the overall sum has been arrived at. Nobody would for a single moment like to get away from this.

This Clause, Mr. Chairman, says that accounts should be submitted within three months after the end of each financial year. Now we come here from time to time and enact legislation with this kind of stipulation, but how often is it adhered to? There is no point in our legislating that within a certain period something must be done and it is never done. We found ourselves quite recently being presented with reports from the National Assistance Board and some other departments for 1968 and 1969 on the same day. What more shocking disgrace could there be to have accounts for 1968 and 1969 presented at the same time. If the 1968 accounts had been tendered within three months as laid down by law, what could have taken place in the following year and three months after that to have the reports delayed? Both of these reports were presented in 1971.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What report is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. HINDS: The Statement of Accounts accompanied by reports. We are warning that we do not

want to see this happen with the National Assistance Board. Now Clause 3 opens what we call new vistas. Subclause (iii) says "submit to the Minister a report on its activities in that financial year." Now when we read that sub-clause and see that a report on the activities of the Board.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, which Clause are we on? So far as I know Clause 3 has not been passed yet and the hon. member has gone on to Clause 4.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what Clause 4 is the Minister talking about? If his Bill has Clause 4, we should stop at this juncture and let the Minister move in Clause 4. The Minister has not got any head blows yet this afternoon. Hon. members on this side do not have a Clause 4 and we should be favoured with a copy of Clause 4 to which he is referring. *(A pause.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member finished addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: How could I be finished when I am standing and you were in conference with the Deputy Clerk? My parents taught me manners.

If a report on the activities of the Board is to be presented to the Minister, undoubtedly the Minister would have an entirely new definition to give us as to what the activities of the Board mean, as these might mean members of the Board journeying from here to there, and no Minister wants that.
5.45 p.m.

I would like the Minister to give some consideration to substituting another word for "activities"; perhaps the word "business" could be substituted, so, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to hear what the Minister has to say before I go further.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I do not see anything wrong with the word "activities", it only refers to the general functions and not only to the financial side so I do not see any necessity to attempt to substitute any word in the drafting of people who have been better trained than any of us.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, when I was addressing the Chair earlier on Clause 3 the Minister hinted that I had gone to Clause 4 and I made a suggestion that the Minister should read Clause 4.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, there seems to be some sort of misunderstanding here, not by us because I have the proper Bill before me. I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 10 be taken as the next Order.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 10 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1971. Now, when this matter was last discussed on the 9th July, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works was speaking when he gave way to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who moved, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed; therefore, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works may now resume.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1971

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the postponement of further consideration of this Resolution was moved after hon. members on the other side asked for the Regulations. Only yesterday these Regulations were laid. Due to some error, after the papers had passed the Cabinet, they were not laid before, but they were laid yesterday. I think that copies were circulated to hon. members yesterday.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I have not yet received my copy.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, some hon. members have not yet received their copies.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members are now satisfied with the Regulations.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister replying? On the last occasion we had some difficulty when we were in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with what happened in Committee.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you must be concerned with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. I am not concerned with what happened in Committee, because I do not preside there.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I want to clarify this point, Sir, because the Order Paper states that on the 9th July the hon. Minister - it is all right, Sir.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, since hon. members now have the Regulations, I want to know if they are satisfied. This Resolution was postponed due to the fact that hon. members had not received, or had not been able to find, the Regulations that I stated had been laid. The Regulations were only laid yesterday.

Now, that hon. members have received the Regulations, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think I am right in saying that the Hon. Minister in introducing this Resolution stated that it was with a view to limiting the number of taxis that should operate in this Island. I want to place the Minister in this position: Firstly, let the Minister picture those young men who have been washing cars along the streets, in garages, public places and otherwise for a number of years, and those car washers dreaming of the day when they would wash no more, but that they would in turn become the owners of taxis. In other words, they wash cars today, but some day they, too, would become the owners of taxis.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Minister, in introducing a Resolution such as this, seeking to do with people who have had that experience? He is now telling those persons that there is no hope for them. *(Asides)* They cannot own a taxi! This Resolution, according to the Minister, is seeking to limit the number of taxis that will operate in this Island. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: "Only yard fowls will be able to own them!") People who have been car washers for years and have dreamed of being the owners of taxis will not be able to own one.

Mr. Speaker, let the Minister tell us how many taxi owners have gone out of business during the past 20 years. In other words, if the taxi business is not paying, then the people would have to go out of business. It is not for the Minister to be listening to the Chairman or the President of some taxi operating body who wants to seek his name in the newspapers, and is taking the Government to pamper to the whims and fancies of those people by limiting the number of taxis. This is the biggest joke in the world. The Minister does not know what he is doing.
6.05 p.m.

The Minister says that there are scooters and other vehicles that are hired out and that Government had no knowledge of the number of vehicles in this exercise. Are we to understand that the only way Government can find out what is being done is by limiting the number of taxis that are operating in this Island? We are satisfied that the Minister cannot produce any figures to show how many taxi-owners have gone out of business because the business was so poor and unprofitable. You will find that the police are busily engaged in hounding down some private car owner who has been doing everything that is possible during the week and on Friday and Saturday he still cannot make ends meet, so he gets a little car and decides to sell snowball or something from the trunk of it. The police have been hounding down persons who use their cars to make an extra penny in this way to help them eke out an existence. How is it that the same police cannot round up those people if there is any illicit trading? How is it that the Minister cannot use the Treasury where these people have to take out licences to determine the number of vehicles that are licensed to ply for hire in the various categories? Upon what is the Minister's proposal to limit the taxis based? Is it mere sentiment? The Minister has not produced any figures because he says he has none; so I cannot for the life of me understand what the Minister could be pretending to be protecting. We have got to be very careful in a Resolution of this sort, because really and truly we are now placing the Ministry of Communications and Works in a position to register whom they will. I suggested on the floor of this House that we really need a Licensing Authority and it is high time that such an authority be established and function along guide lines where kisses will not go by favour, but this Resolution seeks to make it so. As evidence to bear out what I am now saying, there are persons who now own these minibuses, and if one were to look at the way they have been considered by the Ministry of Communications for carrying passengers, one must come to the conclusion, and you Mr. Speaker have a right to know, that the Ministry of Communications and Works has not been discharging an honest duty in awarding licenses.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, I am Minister responsible for Communications and Works, and the hon. member has said that there is dishonesty in carrying out the licensing of the minibuses. A directive was issued granting all the minibuses that were operating illegally up to 28th February licences to operate. The only change I have made as Minister is that if an owner wanted to change his vehicle for a new one, he was granted a license for the new vehicle and the licence for the former vehicle was cancelled with absolutely no right to operate it as a pickup any longer. In other words, there may have been instances where one may have had a vehicle carrying eighteen persons, and if that owner bought a new vehicle to carry twenty, he received a licence to carry twenty, and the vehicle carrying eighteen could not operate any longer as a passenger carrying vehicle; so I object strenuously to the hon. member saying there is corruption and dishonesty.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Hon. Minister what I have done in this respect. A pick-up owner who is known throughout the length and breadth of this Island as a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party was given a licence to carry a small number of passengers on his vehicle. I instructed him to go to a Senator who would like to contest a seat for the House of Assembly and he would get what he wanted. He did so and the owner of the pick-up was called back in and the number he was allowed to carry was increased. Isn't that corruption? Do you want to defend that? If you do not know about it, sit down.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I am saying on authority that when a new licence was issued, the old one was discarded, and my Parliamentary Secretary can verify that. I do not believe in playing politics where something belongs to somebody and you give preference. There must be a standard and we give justice no matter to whom the vehicle belongs.

Mr. HINDS: I appreciate what the Minister is trying to do. In the first place the Minister is telling this House that he knows about the case to which I am referring. Secondly, let the Ministry try to deny that a minibus or pick-up of the same weight and size is allowed to carry eighteen passengers and a corresponding one is allowed to carry 22 or more passengers. It is not that all those pick-ups that weigh 2 1/2 tons and have the same accommodation are allowed to carry a fixed number. Some carry 12, some 14 and some 16 and that is what is causing all the confusion, and I am saying that it is one of these same people who felt he was being discriminated against because he was known to be a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party. He went to Senator Asquith Phillips on my instructions and the number of passengers he had been allowed to carry in the past was increased.
6.15 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if a letter was written to the Ministry to me as Minister by Senator Phillips in his official capacity as a lawyer representing a client, I want to make it quite clear, I would have no say in the measurement of the vehicle, there would be an Inspector to determine the number of passengers. The Inspector himself would have to take the number of passengers, I would know nothing about it, but the point was whether as Minister and responsible for it a new vehicle could be granted a licence, because the Order was that no new vehicles bought after the 28th February would be in a position to operate, but if you were changing the vehicle it was a matter for my discretion.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I do not want the Minister to travel too fast because I will read out the letter for him.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if the hon. member would read the copy of the letter to see if it is a copy of the same letter that I received. This has not been the only instance where a person has changed a vehicle possibly for a larger vehicle, but the regulations I have laid down specifically state that the former vehicle should not be used. In other words, a man could not have a vehicle, purchase another one, get a licence for that and still operate the vehicle he was using before; this was made clear to them, and all those who were operating illegally had a right to come in and not be hunted down by the police.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the more the Minister talks the more we are seeing. The Government until this day, as far as I know, has not published a notice to the effect that no more minibuses will be allowed than were operating at the 28th February, this Government is dishonest to the nation and the Government in doing this has not taken into consideration the number of people who are still standing by the bus stops. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, until today vast numbers of employees, people who work in the City of Bridgetown and elsewhere, people who have been depending for all the years on these pickups are still on the streets, and Government has taken a decision that there will be no minibuses added to the present fleet, but at the same time the Transport Board's fleet is broken down, three and four buses on the same route in the course of a single day. It is common knowledge that the bus service tendered by the Transport Board leaves much to be desired and all of this, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers have to pay for because the same people who have got to go and pay to drive these pickups have also got to pay taxes to subsidise the fleet that is operating by the Transport Board. When one seeks at this stage to limit the number of minibuses, Government is doing this without taking into consideration the number of persons throughout this island that are depending more so upon the service rendered by the minibuses and by the taxis.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should realise this is just the very reason why we have allowed over 40 or 50 pickups to run; there were only 10 of them operating legally, all the others were hunted down by the police and this Government felt that if they were performing a service they should be allowed to do so, and it is for that very reason that we did this. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Members not addressing the Chair.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there were only 10 of these minibuses operating legally, all of the others were operating illegally and being hunted down by the police and prosecuted, and to save these poeple from being prosecuted the Government allowed all those who were operating at the time to operate legally.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I cannot see this at all.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking. This is a delicate matter in which discretion will have to be used, otherwise the concessionaires will find themselves in trouble or the very owners operating the minibuses will eventually be in trouble. The Transport Board by the end of this year will have at least 41 new vehicles on the road; by next month there will be at least 23 new vehicles coming in for the Transport Board. The Government is now allowing duty free chassis for 18 more to come to this island to give the concessionaires some assistance so as to build up the standard required by the public.
6.25 p.m.

We came here for the money to guarantee it, Mr. Speaker. There will be 23 new buses plus 18 chassis that will be available in a short space of time being built by Acme Bus Company. Now 23 and 18 will make a total of 41 new vehicles owned by the Transport Board. As an inducement to bus owners to build up their fleet of buses, the duty has been taken off the buses to carry over 40 persons and the chassis are now coming in duty free. If these people with the small pick-ups were granted freedom to bring in as many vehicles as they like, then within a short space of time some of those very people would be having vehicles on their hands which have not been paid for and they would be unable to operate. These are things we have to bear in mind for the good and welfare of the very people we have been trying to help and protect.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Peter may continue.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot proceed yet. A point of order was made when the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,....

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not said anything yet.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: He said, "Mr. Speaker."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter is addressing the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has now taken us much further afield than anyone of us has really thought of going.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister must be rather careful when he says that something is illegal, when he knows that the judiciary of this country felt that the taxis were operating legally. You know this as well as anybody else, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be illegal when the Judge says it is legal.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown has not yet spoken, and the whole House is looking forward to hear the hon. member's views on this matter. Let the hon. junior for St. Peter continue his speech without interruption.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we are saying that as in the case of the taxi owners, so it is in the case of the operators of the mini buses. How many of those operators of the mini buses have gone out of business during the past 10 years because the business was not paying? *(Asides)* I am being heckled by the Leader of the House, Sir. I do not know how a person who is not a member of the Government could have put any mini bus operator out of business during the past 10 years! I do not know from where that person could have got the authority, Sir. I do not know what the Leader of the House is saying.

You will find, Mr. Speaker, that there are persons who are very closely associated with the Government - almost a blood relationship between themselves and the Government - who have an interest in taxis. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: "Do you mean Morgan?") What the Government is doing is not to protect the mini-bus operators and taxi owners from themselves, because they have not been going out of business during the past 10 years. According to the Minister, it is because so many are rushing into the business. It is a paying concern, Sir. Why does not the Minister leave the people to themselves, once the public is being served? Do you believe that a man who has been washing motor-cars for all of the years is going to accumulate money and buy a taxi when he hears the people for whom he is washing complaining day in and day out that they are going out of business because it is not paying? There is much more behind all of this than the Hon. Minister has put before the House.

Mr. Speaker, you will find, as the Hon. Minister has said, that people prefer to get into a pickup and drive to work or drive home rather than get into a bus that comes up at the same time as the pickup. I have seen people driving in a pickup with one person sitting in the lap of another and making other people uncomfortable. Ask the Minister why that is so? Has he carried out an investigation into this matter?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When you overload a vehicle, is that not dangerous?

Mr. HINDS: Overloading a bus is dangerous; overloading a pickup is dangerous, and overloading human beings is dangerous, too. Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear from the Minister how many taxis are operating at the present moment. I should also like to know from the Minister how many self-driven cars are operating in this Island. I am sure there will be no suggestion about tabling a substantive Motion or Questions to get this information. *(Asides)* We would like to hear from the Minister how many self-driven cars are operating in this Island for hire; how many motor-cycles; how many motor-scooters and how auto-cycles. There must be a record somewhere of these things. Let us hear from the Minister how many of each class of vehicle is operating. When we have heard from the Minister how much of each class is operating, we shall then ask the Minister what statistics or figures he has to bear out his argument. Let him tell us what percentage of the travelling public is clamouring for the self-driven car; how many people the taxis are catering for, and how many people the motor-cycles are catering for. When we have received those figures from the Minister, we will then ask the Minister whether he has any information as to the number of persons still suffering for transportation at peak hours. Let him tell us how many people are left by the wayside not being served at peak hours. They

ring ten or eleven garages and they cannot get a taxi on some occasions.
6.35 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, we would like to know what were the answers to the questions which the hon. member is now asking when in an editorial written in the *Truth* some years ago an attack was made on the then Minister of Communications for only giving licences to ten persons.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to know what type of licences the Hon. Minister was referring to. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The permits.) Mr. Speaker, if I attacked the Minister for not giving permits or licences to those minibuses to operate, I am today willing to cut off the head of a Minister who tries to stop them from operating.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of stopping them from operating. What we have done is to allow them to operate legally. There were only ten who were operating legally when we came in in 1961, and it is only since 28th February this year that as Minister of Communications and Works I have decided to grant a permit to all those who were operating illegally. Formerly they were operating at the risk of being hounded down by the police.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister to whom I referred was the then Hon. Ronald Mapp who was Minister of Communications and Works. He only gave ten permits and there was an editorial in the *Truth* which attacked the fact that he had only given ten permits. Today we have given forty.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister in deciding to give forty after ten years taken into consideration the growth of the population and the demand upon the services of these minibuses?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, a recent census indicates that the population of Barbados today is less than it was ten years ago.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member mean that we have less vehicles on the roads today than ten years ago?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, there are more vehicles on the road, more people own motor cars and therefore there is not as great a need for public transport as there was ten years ago, because more people own their vehicles independently, and added to that we have increased the number of permits by over thirty.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Minister will eventually agree that limiting the minibuses to forty is doing a disservice to the travelling public.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, according to what the Minister said just now, it is unnecessary therefore to have more buses, yet the Government is buying more buses.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the Government is buying more buses to replace old buses that are unserviceable today.

Mr. CRAIG: According to what the Minister has just said about there being less people than there were ten years ago, you should not replace the buses. You should have less buses according to his argument.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Not according to my argument, according to your standards.

Mr. CRAIG: I know my standards and your standards, and I know your standards very well.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, as the hon. member will recall, there are three concessionaires that have been granted permission to run buses and it must be done on a viable and profitable basis. We fully appreciate the fact that the minibuses serve a very useful purpose in that they drop people right at their homes and serve as the small man's motor car, and by virtue of that we have increased the number of permits to give a better service in that direction; but the interest of the concessionaires must also be protected. We have ordered about forty new buses, some of which are the small Toyota buses and other larger buses, and the other concessionaires are spending money in replacing their buses also. We cannot allow the minibuses to go to 120 or 140 and cause the persons who have been granted concessions to lose money in operating.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I wonder if this is the reason why this Government has restricted the importation of minibuses into the country, so that even a family who requires a minibus for its private use is not now permitted to import anything called a van or a bus.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter resume.

Mr. HINDS: With respect to the buses, we learn from the Minister of Health that the interest of the concessionaires must be protected. With respect to the taxis, whose interest is being protected? What I am saying and the Minister cannot deny this is that every owner of a fleet of taxis is prepared with every dime he can put his hands on to increase his fleet because of the demand for the service, and if the taxi owner has courteous and polite chauffeurs and is rendering a worthwhile and up-to-date service, the demand is greater than he could perhaps be able to meet in years. Why then are you limiting the number of taxis that are operating in this Island?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, the hon. member has touched on something very

tender. He has mentioned that over the last ten years the number of taxis in the Island have not run out of business because it is a lucrative business. This is one of the reasons we have got to have this protection, otherwise due to the tourist industry big business would monopolise everything and run the small taxi owner completely out of business.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the taxi business is a lucrative business, but to whom?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: To the owners of the taxis.

Mr. HINDS: And is it now a case where the Minister has to operate a closed shop and that the few people who own taxis must get all the sweets and nobody must come in to enjoy the lucrative business that the Minister is telling us about?
6.45 p.m.

Why does the Minister not set about, since the business is so lucrative - and remember, it is only lucrative because the taxis have people to transport?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the Minister has clearly pointed out that restrictions are placed on the number of taxis to be allowed to run in this country by legislation and that the discretion rests on the Minister in accordance with the amendment. I like to be brutally frank; hon. members are aware that this House passed a Resolution some time ago to stop a large concern from coming in here to stop Barbadians from getting bread, and the whole idea behind these regulations is to stop this.

Mr. HINDS: This concern was owned by foreigners.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no duets.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is to point out to this House that the Minister is given the discretion to issue licences so that Barbadians will be able to get their licences to operate their taxis, but we are not interested in allowing foreign interests to come in here and stop Barbadians and this is what we are asking for in this amendment which is to give the Minister this discretion. We do not see why Hertz should come in here and stop Barbadians.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, let the Government be honest about it, let them come down and legislate against Hertz.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we cannot legislate against a person, the Minister must be able to exercise his discretion bearing foremost in mind that his interest is in seeing that the taxis up at the Flash 'N or any other place are not pushed out of business by Hertz or by any other big Corporation. The point is we are protecting Barbadians, this is what it is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter may continue his address.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, if what the Minister of Agriculture is saying is true, that this legislation is intended to protect Barbadians from foreigners coming and setting up companies and operating taxis, what would be better would be to draft the legislation in such a way as to give to the Minister power in respect of foreigners coming to Barbados. It is the basic principle which any West Indian Government should hold in respect of aliens coming into Barbados and owning land.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had to say, I do not believe.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, is the hon. member calling me a liar?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to say he does not believe it.

Mr. HINDS: When I began my address I tried to place before the Minister's mind the case of a humble car washer who had dreamt of becoming the owner of a taxi some day and the Minister could simply have risen to say, as long as the car washer is a Barbadian, his interest will be protected but until this hour nothing like this has dawned upon the Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order, the Minister has not yet replied.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the hon. member that this is a lucrative business and that strangers can come in and monopolise it. You can look at the bus stand and see the increase that has taken place over the years, but we cannot legislate personal legislation against people. It should be remembered in this island that this Party in 1961 stopped Pairavicino and Dear's Garage from monopolising at the airport; not one taxi driver could be seen at the airport for Mr. Dear.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, only yesterday the Prime Minister said Dear's Garage has 80 cars and the others have 20; they are still monopolising.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the Prime Minister said that Dear's Garage has 20 cars whereas the taxi owners have 100 taxis; it is a question of five to one, get the facts straight.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, what the Minister must go on to say is that even thought that may be the number it still works out on the basis that Dear's Garage gets the most work.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I have a point of order to make, Sir, under the Public Order Act.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is the member on? He cannot be on a point of order and making a speech like this.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: How can he be on a point of order when I am on a point of order? Make him sit down and learn manners.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Make him sit down, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I decide that and nobody else. *(Asides)*

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works said....., *(Asides)* I cannot continue under these conditions, Sir, and I will sit down.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for the City mentioned something about the tours. That is one of the reasons in 1961 why we had to protect the taxi drivers. They said that they were at the Airport; the tours were originated in the United States and so on. We demanded that they have a share in the tours even down at the Harbour. The United Taxi Owners Association and the others all share in these tours. *(Asides)* I was the Minister of Communications and Works when it was organised in 1961-62. In 1962 they shared in the tours, and they still share in the tours up to now.

Mr. St. JOHN: They do not share in the tours.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I just want to find out from hon. members whether their speeches are likely to take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. HINDS: I will take more than 10 minutes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Item be now postponed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was dealing with Item No. 10, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1971

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Mover of this Resolution has made out a case for an increase in the number of taxis as well as for an increase in the number of mini buses, because as in the case of the mini bus, so in the case of the taxi. It is lucrative business, and it can only become lucrative if more people are making use of the service. It is all based on demands for the service that these taxis or mini buses render that make it lucrative. It is not lucrative to the persons travelling. When the Minister says that it is lucrative, he means that it is lucrative to the operators of the business.

If, therefore, it is a paying concern, we feel that the Government, apart from seeing that the laws relating to the operations of the taxis, that is, that they are licensed according to law; that they do not carry more people than they should carry; their fares are regulated, and in the case of the mini buses, we do not see why Government has to be worrying itself about the matter. We feel that the Government ought to concern itself with assisting those businesses that cannot pay. The Government should try to provide them with know-how, and make available to them easy credit facilities so that whatever is their sphere of business they, too, would find themselves in the process of time in an exercise that can be regarded as lucrative as the Minister tries to make us believe is the case of the taxis and the mini buses.

With regard to the question of protecting local people from the foreign investors, we are still going to find that the foreigners will remain in the background and put up the local people as front men and get their business through.
8.05 p.m.

That is what the Minister has to consider; so what the Minister of Agriculture tried to inject into the debate was only a red herring. It could not be true that this Resolution is a move to stop the foreigner from putting the local man out of business or giving him too much competition, because in the case of the minibuses I do not think that there is any evidence of foreigners as such entering the trade.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, no reference was ever made in connection with the minibuses and the taxi service. This make specific reference to taxis. As far as the minibuses are concerned, one has to take transportation in general into consideration, but there was no comparison in this debate between taxis and minibuses in the same operation.

Mr. HINDS: We are not trying, Mr. Speaker, to make any comparisons, but all we are saying is that the heavy hand of Government has come down to stop the increase of the minibuses, the same heavy hand

that Government is now bringing down to stop an increase in the number of taxis. That seems to be Government's policy now and that is what we are concerned with.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, this Resolution is strictly concerned with motor vehicles, and the reference is made in the Addendum to taxis, and motor scooters. Nothing was mentioned about minibuses, but minibuses have crept into the debate.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it has some bearing because we are showing that Government all quite suddenly seems bent on protecting somebody who needs no protection, because if the business is lucrative, what are you protecting? It is not a case where the Government is saying that the business is becoming lucrative because the minibus or taxi owners are overcharging the population and they are making regulations to control the price. It is that these people are conducting an honest business and are thriving, and Government now feels that only so many should thrive and prosper.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, the hon. member is a businessman and he knows that there is a limit to the strain to which any business can be put. You can say that something is lucrative, but it can only be lucrative with a certain amount operating at a certain standard. The hon. member must remember that the concessionaires have got to run routes, schedules and at specific times, but the minibuses run at any time they like. During the midday when there are no passengers on the route the minibuses can go off, but the concessionaires have to continue whether or not there are passengers according to the schedule.

Mr. HINDS: Now, Sir, the Minister is not suggesting for a single moment that the limit that has now been put on the number of minibuses is due to the fact that they are offering unfair competition to the bus concessionaires. It is not based on that at all.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, the hon. member possibly would not know that the concessionaires have been complaining that they have not been earning sufficient money on specific routes due to the minibuses operating ahead of them. Following the flood on 2nd October when lots of buses were out of commission, I was satisfied that the minibuses were performing a service to the public without materially affecting the concessionaires, and this is the reason why we have granted extra licences; but as I mentioned already, there has to be a limit because the minibuses can operate at the times and hours specially suited to them while the concessionaires must operate according to their agreement.

Mr. HINDS: Well, then, Mr. Speaker, this now brings us to another point. We are all very glad to learn from the Minister that the October floods did not flood out the minibuses because according to him the travelling public would have been left stranded. The buses operated by the concessionaires were in a great measure out of business, and in the hour of crisis the minibuses came to the rescue of the travelling public, and as a result the Minister is now saying that no more shall be added to the fleet than those operating on 28th February. That is the price the owners of these taxis are asked to pay for rendering a service to this country that they did during the time of the flood.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that had the Transport Board and the other two concessionaires a sufficient and competent enough fleet for the transportation of people in this Island, the small people would not have ventured into the business at all. It is because the transport system was not good enough to perform the service that these individuals got in, because on several routes people were left standing. We on this side discovered that they were performing a service, and that is why we granted them a licence because we felt they should not be hounded down by the police for rendering a service to the people of the country.

Mr. HINDS: That is wonderful on the part of the Minister. The Minister is telling us that the minibuses have been rendering a service; he also goes on to tell us that the reason why their service must be regarded for what it is worth is because the fleet of the concessionaires was not up to standard. The Minister has also told us that the Transport Board is getting an addition to its fleet. I do not know whether it is an addition to its fleet or whether they are getting replacements for some that have been broken down prior to the October floods; but the Minister also admits that you have the Rocklyn Bus Co and the Elite Bus Co., and it is not a case where the Government has seen that the Transport Board is getting a fleet of new buses and has taken steps to limit competition which the Transport Board will get in the future. Government has not done that at all because the Minister has not been able to tell us that the Elite Bus Co. or the Rocklyn Bus Co. are also getting additions to their fleet. 8.15 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned here in the debate that duty has been taken off for 18 months on chassis of the size that carries 40 passengers to give an incentive to the other two concessionaires either to bring in large sized chassis or to bring in buses. I mentioned this already and I know the Rocklyn Bus Company brought in new buses and used to good advantage the incentive the Government has given them.

Mr. HINDS: But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister must realise that the Rocklyn Bus Company has been bringing in new buses without this incentive that is now being offered. We are glad for the incentives being offered and I believe it is being offered as a result of representations I have made on the floor of this House from time to time that in the same way the taxpayers have got to subsidise the Transport

Board something should be done to assist the Elite and the Rocklyn Bus Companies.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, it is not that the Transport Board operated under a different concession, they had to pay duty on their vehicles when they came in, but now neither the Transport Board, the Elite nor the Rocklyn Bus Company pay duty; they will be free to bring in chassis of that size free of duty.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, do you know what the Minister has just said? That they have done absolutely nothing. The Government has not done anything for the Elite or the Rocklyn Bus Company because the Transport Board, the Elite and the Rocklyn Bus Company were all paying duty, but in addition to this the taxpayers were called upon to subsidise the Transport Board to the tune of millions over a period of years. That subsidy did not reach down to the Elite or the Rocklyn Bus Company so when the Government sees fit now to remove the duty on chassis for all three concessionaires and will go on to subsidise the Transport Board, in other words they have done nothing, absolutely nothing.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, the Transport Board has never been subsidised by this Government, what we did was to guarantee the loans for the Transport Board prior to 1962 all the loans by the Transport Board, and you will see in the Estimates an amount of $150,000 or $300,000 every year for subsidising the Transport Board, but it has never been subsidised by this Government, we have guaranteed the loans as we do for other statutory bodies.

Mr. HINDS: When the Transport Board cannot repay the loans what happens? It is the same situation with C.B.C., Government guarantees loans from the bank for the Transport Board but when the Transport Board cannot repay the principal what is done about it? Mr. Speaker, we maintain that this Resolution ought never to have come before this House, the Minister challenged me when I made mention earlier about corruption but I would not like to associate the Minister with this corruption. When I have related to this Hon. House what did take place with respect to the owner or operator of a minibus and the Minister, I want hon. members to tell me what it really is.

I well remember that the operator of a minibus was annoying me, every time this House met and I went down those stairs, that he had not been given a licence to carry as many people as his vehicle could accommodate, and I fell on a plan and told the operator, who told me he had gone to the Minister time and time again and the Minister told him there was nothing he could do about it, that if the Examining Officer had given him a licence to carry X number of people that was all he could carry. I told the operator, and he agreed to wait till one afternoon till the Leader of the House had gone down the stairs, and he enquired from the Leader of the House what was the subscription to become a member of the political party to which the Leader of the House belongs, and he did ask the Leader of the House in the courtyard downstairs.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point or order, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is saying is tantamount to saying that if somebody made an application to me as Minister the decision rests with whether that person was a member of this party. I am a Minister of the Government of this Island, and as long as any person comes to me with a case they have the right to the justice due to them. Whether a person is a member of this party or not would have no bearing at all on the justice he would get, and I never would even go to ask him what his feeling was. In my official capacity as a Minister I carry out my duties in accordance with the facts before me and this is something I will always do.

Mr. HINDS: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, the operator of the minibus did go and join the Democratic Labour Party; he brought back his membership card and showed it to me, and I agreed with the operator that at the next meeting of the House and the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works should come to the House he should seize that opportunity to let him see that he possessed the membership card. I do not know what took place after that, but I know that the operator reported to me at a later date at my office with all the glee in the world on his face that he had succeeded; the number that had been allotted to him previous to his possessing the D.L.P. card had been increased.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, is the hon. member insinuating that the Minister of Communications and Works gave permission to run a pickup because the man was a member of this Party?

Mr. HINDS: All I am saying is that after the operator got possession of a membership card, his passport, he was able to have the passenger capacity increased for the same vehicles.
8.25 p.m.

It was not a larger or a smaller vehicle. That is what I am prepared to swear to. I am not saying that this Minister authorised the increase of the numbers. I am not saying that. Even if it is so, I am not saying that. (Hon. J.C. TUDOR: "Even if it is so, you are only advertising the Democratic Labour Party.") We are advertising the Democratic Labour Party's corruption. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Have you ever told anybody to join the D.L.P.?")

Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Government to give this Resolution further consideration. We cannot support any Resolution that seeks to limit the number of taxis, especially when we know that it is lucrative business. If the Government finds that Supermarkets become lucrative businesses, will the Government limit the number of Supermarkets? If the Government finds that law is a lucrative practice, will the Government limit the number of barristers? What is the Government trying to do? If the Government finds that

dairy farming is a lucrative business, are we going to limit the number of heads of cattle that a dairy farmer should keep? If the business is lucrative it can take care of itself, and the Government does not have to intervene. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter for the noise on both sides.

Mr. HINDS: After all, we are satisfied that the Government is doing something and that it is not prepared to tell the Opposition ..... *(Asides)* Mr. Speaker, I am being heckled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members on both sides are to be silent. I would like to hear the hon. member. Will hon. members bear the appropriate Standing Orders in mind? Hon. members may go into the Lobby and have their private conversations. *(Asides)* Hon. members who are not addressing the Chair should remain silent. I do not know what either hon. member is quarrelling about.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister said somewhat in an aside that he was in possession of figures to bear out his argument, that is, with respect to the number of taxis operating and so on. I would certainly like to hear the Hon. Minister on this point, because I am sure that I am not going to be given the opportunity to reply to anything the Minister has to say. I am prepared to give way at this point and let the Minister tell us about the numbers. If we can be convinced that there is a very good case for limiting the number of taxis and mini buses, then we would be willing to support the Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have not got with me the number of taxis, but all vehicles are registered. The only vehicles that are registered and we might not know what fields they are operating in would be vehicles like motor-scooters, motor-cycles and auto-cycles. They are licensed normally, but they can still be hired out. I do not think they carry any extra licence. A car that is licensed for hire carries some indication on it. The motor-cycles and the motor-scooters just carry on ordinary licence plate, and there have been a lot of operators today in this City specifically through the tourist industry. I do not, honestly, think that the attitude we have adopted in this Resolution for the protection of the poor man, the car washer, who hopes to own a car one day, is not a good one. We have brought this Resolution to give some people the necessary protection. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is telling us that, due to the increase in the tourist trade, there are several operators of motor scooters. Now, there are itinerant traders in this Island particularly amongst the East Indian community. When the Government discovered that many of them were operating without paying their appropriate tax, the Government found a way of collecting from these people what it felt was the amount they should pay into the Treasury. The Government did not set out to limit the number of itinerant traders.

Mr. Speaker, we believe, as the Minister very well knows, that they have been carrying on a lucrative business. What is the Government getting after now? The Government can very well have a Traffic Fraud Squad as a branch of the Police Force specialising in frauds by traffic users, and the Government can very well come down on all of the operators of these motor-scooters.

8.35 p.m.

If it is found that a scooter is licensed for private use and it is offered for hire, the law courts are there for dealing with that; so you do not have to limit the number of scooters, nor is the answer limiting the number of taxis, because the Minister has told us that it is a lucrative business. Why then interfere with it? We are satisfied beyond a shadow of doubt that something is being hidden from us.

Again, Sir, newspapers were operating in this Island for many years. Government felt the time had come when they must pay $100 a year to the Treasury if they must operate; they did not seek to limit the number of newspapers that were published. Government decided that real estate agents were doing a lucrative business and put a tax on them and they must pay a registration fee. They did not seek to limit the number of real estate agents that could operate. When the fee was put on real estate agents, would the Minister have said that it was a lucrative business and he was protecting the real estate agents from themselves? If Government really and truly want to protect the local people from unfair competition by the overseas investors, Government has the remedy in its hands, and the remedy is not to limit the number of taxis, but to deal specifically with the overseas investor who wants to come and deprive the local operator or get a slice from the local operators or take the butter from the bread of the local operator. The Government is opening the door for a lot of private cars to become involved in this. I would not like to go further into this because you have the small man who owns a private car and the occasion may arise for him to take people to a funeral. They may decide amongst themselves not to pay the car hire because it is a private car, but they may decide to tell him to draw up at the first gasolene station and put their hands in their pockets and fill up the tank. That is the way I think it might be done from time to time. I do not want to see Government do anything to stop that fellow. We are satisfied that the Minister responsible for moving this Resolution is not armed with his facts, because how can the Minister come here to debate a Resolution such as this and not come with the relevant facts as to how many taxis are now operating, how many people travel by taxis from the big garages and from the small garages over a period of months, how many calls and requests have been made from these garages and total them together so that we would know what the traffic is like?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has merely said that this is a lucrative business based on the same assumption that I have, that is, that none of them have gone out of business over the past ten years or so, and instead of going out they are trying to increase. The Minister may in the same way look at the bus

concessionaires and say that because they have not gone out of business it is a lucrative business, because he has no facts or figures by which to be guided. This Resolution is not backed up by information that would shut the mouths of hon. members on this side of the House. The Minister is doing more guess work than anybody else in this matter; he does not know what it is all about, and if he knows he is not telling us. We are satisfied that it is not fair and it is taking all the incentive from the poor fellow who has been operating one taxi for all the years and now he sees an opportunity to increase his fleet because the business is lucrative, the Government is coming down on him and saying there will be no more registration of these taxis and they must apply here and there.

Mr. Speaker, the Government very well knows the service that must be rendered to any political party at election time. Each and every political party must make use of the taxis and we believe that this is a move by Government to support certain taxi owners very well feeling that these taxi owners will throw their full weight into campaigning to keep this Government in power. This is a vote catching stunt more than anything else. The hon. member should be bold enough as to tell himself that in introducing a Resolution of this sort he should have before him the type of information that we on this side of the House have been asking for. He should not proceed to have a Resolution such as this forced through this House without supplying any information that is germane to the issue. We are asking the Minister upon what is he basing his proposal to limit the number of taxis.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, hon. members have been told the specific reason for this Resolution, and that is, to give protection to people of this country and not allow foreign investors to come in and monopolise a business that our poor people have built up during the hard days. It is a thriving and prosperous business today and there is therefore the incentive to come in and take over. The hon. member has been told this not only by me but by other hon. members, and it is for him to believe it or not. We on this side have absolutely nothing to hide. A Resolution came to this Chamber to stop Hertz from monopolising the car hire industry in this country by hiring cars and taxis, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew hid absolutely nothing. Our interest on this side is to protect the average Barbadian and the small man from the business being monopolised by big enterprises.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: But, Mr. Speaker, how strange it is that the Addendum does not tell us any of these things that the Minister is talking about; the Minister himself did not say this, another Minister had to come to his rescue and tell us this, the Addendum does not say anything about this.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: If the Addendum stated everything there would be no reason for any Minister to say anything, the whole thing would be set out in a Paper rather than in an Addendum.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it does not appear to us to be true that the reason for this Resolution is merely to protect the local taxi owner or operator from the foreigners who want to come in and monopolise the situation. It is not based on this assumption at all; as I have said, the Minister has limited more than these taxis, and we are at a loss to know on what the Government is basing its proposals and we cannot support it, Mr. Speaker.

We feel that the Minister in all earnestness would try to have put before us the figures for which we asked and we are appealing to the Minister not to proceed with the passing of this Resolution until those figures have been made available to the Opposition. It is just a reasonable request we are making of the Minister, after all, any business that now appears lucrative is in danger as from the date of the passing of this Resolution because it seems to be Government policy that wherever you have a lucrative business to clamp down on it so that no more people can come in. Look at the number of rum shops you have about the place.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, what the hon. member then is saying is that the small people of this country should have no protection and that the big businesses can come in and monopolise them. He is saying that you should leave it free so that people who had absolutely nothing to do with the building up of this business can come in and get the rewards, and we on this side will have no part of that whatsoever.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we have building contractors in this island whom this Government did not seek to protect, it did not seek to assist them in any way that they could equip themselves for the type of work that is now being carried on, no protection whatsoever. We have small quarry owners and the Government has given them no protection, we have people operating small hotels and guest houses in this island, what protection did the Government give these people? This Government is making sport.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order. the hon. member is talking something he knows absolutely nothing about. When Bagatelle was being sold the Government did everything in its power to get all the small quarry owners to buy Bagatelle.

Mr. HINDS: I would like to respect this Minister. The Minister said when Bagatelle was being sold, but when was it for sale?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Does this Resolution have anything to do with quarries, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I want the hon. member to let us try to stick to the subject matter.

Mr. HINDS: It is Government policy we are discussing in this Resolution, it is a question of whether Government did not protect where protection was necessary. The Bagatelle quarry was operating here putting all the small quarry owners out of business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made that point very clearly; let us proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Government to re-examine all that has been related here today about this Resolution; we are asking the Government to let it be seen that they really mean to protect, if protection is needed, but we do not see that protection is needed in the sense that we are satisfied the Government is prepared to stop the overseas investors and to stop some of the local operators as well or people who would venture into the business; that is what the Government is going to do. The Government is not only going to operate against the overseas investor, let the Government give us the assurance here and now that no local operator, no poor man, no poor person who raises enough money to buy a taxi tomorrow will be debarred from running it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I am not the Minister and I am giving that assurance.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful attempt by the Minister to put a red herring across the trail; when the time comes the Minister of Communications will say he never gave that assurance.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: If the hon. member does not like the assurance given I will give the assurance because I will tell him that if it was not for the small operator in this country this Resolution would not be before us, it is simply in the interest of the small Barbadian operator and I can afford to give that assurance.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, let the Minister tell this Hon. House that no Barbadian who raises enough money tomorrow to purchase a taxi, whether it is his first or whether it is to increase his present fleet, will be debarred from the taxi business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anyone in this Hon. Chamber who would know that better than the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

8.55 p.m.

This is due to the Resolution that came here to stop people from operating up there and taking over the business of this country.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is this same Government that organised the Barbados Seafoods Limited front men.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no, no!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, It is the policy of this Government that we are debating in this Resolution. It must set out clearly what is the Government's policy in keeping out foreigners. In other words, you can keep out the foreigners and then have Carlton Brathwaite doing the work. The Government very well knows that Carlton Brathwaite will be venturing into this taxi business. They are protecting Carlton Brathwaite, and in truth and in fact it will be foreign money involved. Let the Government give us an assurance that we on this side will have an opportunity to lend some measure of control in a matter of this sort. Mr. Speaker, I have made my contribution in this debate.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, whatever the motivation of the Government in bringing this Resolution, I have no doubt that it is the real motive to which the Hon. Minister referred. It is to give the Government power to ban people from coming into this business such as HERTZ and other large overseas operators. There is such a great crisis of confidence in the probity of the exercise of discretion by the Government that today any unlimited discretion which is granted to the Government must be looked upon with suspicion. That is the cause of all of this debate. It is well known on this side that there are many examples where discretion is given and where in order to have that discretion exercised favourably, one will have to go through a particular channel. That channel is via the D.L.P. passport, via certain specified gentlemen of the law, or through certain specified favourites of certain people. That is the whole purpose of the contention of this House.

Now that the assurance has been given - and I hope it is in the records - that no non-Barbadian taxi operator, who is interested in entering the taxi business and who has the requisite amount of money and the vehicles are up to the requisite standard, will be permitted to operate, we will see how things are going to work.

Mr. Speaker, the proper method of dealing with foreigners is for the Government to do what they do in States of Africa, and it is to have a trade law which states that certain types of businesses are banned from foreigners and only Barbadians or West Indians can carry them on. This Government is afraid to do that, but we will do that. We will pass a law that certain types of businesses can only be operated by Nationals. If there was a simple law in Barbados which said that only Barbadians should participate in businesses set out in the Schedule, then we would just have to add the taxi business to the Schedule and that would be the end of the matter. *(Asides)*

I do not worry about "Joy" far less "Peanuts". Our position is quite clear. That is the position we want to see clearly established. It is a wide policy. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of experience in this matter. You may say that all Barbadians can get it, but that does not prevent persons who have to administer the law from holding you up. There are certain Town Planning Officers in this country who can hold you up and tell you that the application has to come through a certain route, and the only way in which it will get the Minister's signature quickly is if it comes through that route. *(Asides)* That is true, but I am not saying that you uphold it.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that whenever we have this general, wide discretion in something like this, then there is the possibility that somewhere in the

administrative chain you will find people who can exploit it. That is our experience, and that is why we do not want to see it as wide as it is.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I sat for hours listening to the hon. junior member for St. Peters.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir. There is nowhere in Barbados by the name of St. Peters. It is St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: St. Peter's parish is the hon. member's constituency.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, when I have finished speaking tonight, he will either go crazy or stand up and cry. I have not interrupted him, but he is interrupting me. With regard to the Resolution before the House, I have heard quite a lot about taxis, mini buses and so on, but I have heard no one talking about the buses. The buses have the concession to run on the various routes, but the mini buses have no concession. *(Asides)*

Mr. Speaker, look at Standing Order No. 29(6). You have the iron in your hands and you have the ship to be guided. Do not let the ship go off the course any longer. The bus owners have complained divers of times to this Government for allowing the mini buses and the pickups to rob them of passengers, but this Government still maintains the right to help every man. The mini buses and the pickups are getting a slice off the bread. We are trying to help everybody, so it is impossible for the hon. junior member for St. Peter to say that the Government is corrupt. He does not know what he is saying. This Government is trying to help every living creature in this Island, and if the hon. member lifts up his eyes to righteousness he will see the goodness that this Government is doing.
9.05 p.m.

I know that election time is near and you have to make your position strong, but you will not make it strong by saying that this Government is corrupt. We have a contribution to make and we are making it. We are doing our job faithfully, truly and justly and we intend to carry on even to the end. If the bus owners for instance come in and say that the taxi drivers and minibuses are robbing them, what is the hon. junior member for St. Peter going to say?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I would ask them to bring the fleet up to date and there would be no need for these minibuses.

Mr. CORBIN: I know the hon. member cannot sit down, and he will have to rise again. Do you know what the toothpaste told the brush? Squeeze me and I will meet you outside. *(Laughter)* The more the hon. member squeezes me the more I will talk. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that every man has to live. The bus owners are always in bankruptcy. No one lends them money unless they go to a solicitor or they pawn what they have to get money. They have a concession to run and complaints come against them, but no complaints come against the minibuses or pickups because they are their own free agents and run as they like picking up passengers wherever they like, and they are killing the bus trade, yet the Government has given them licences in order that they may get a slice off the cake; so it is not good enough to say that the Government is corrupt and not doing their duty. It shocked my modesty when I heard the hon. member say that the Government is corrupt. If the Government is corrupt the hon. member is corrupt too.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member to withdraw that immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not ask him to withdraw because he said "if the Government is corrupt."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this question of "if and "if not" only obtains when you are in the Chair. When the hon. junior member for St. John is in the Chair I am called upon to withdraw many a remark which I do just to accommodate his ignorance.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard a remark proceeded by "if" as unparliamentary, nor do I regard the use of the word "ignorance" as being unparliamentary.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your justification. I am not here to destroy anyone, but I am here to see that everyone does justice to the other. That is my philosophy and policy. *(Asides)* I will not be moved off my course because I am sure I am on the right latitude. The important thing is that we are trying to help the taxi drivers and prevent foreigners from coming here to oppress them. There are men in this country who are willing to bring in outsiders because their hands are full, but the poor man must be helped and we intend to do that. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not addressing the Chair, please listen to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. CORBIN: You know so much that you will work yourself off the course.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the Chair?

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, you know to whom I am referring. Anyway I am sure that this Resolution is not to destroy the taxi drivers or anyone in Barbados. It is to prevent outsiders from coming in to oppress Barbadians, and therefore I think the Resolution is in order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if this Resolution has been brought before the House only for the reasons which have been expressed by the Minister, I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church

that this is the wrong Resolution. It is not only the taxi drivers in this country who need protection. There is no doubt that the taxi trade is a lucrative one, but what I would like to see the Government do, and I am going to challenge the Government now, is to withdraw this Resolution and bring down the Resolution which the hon. senior member for Christ Chruch has mentioned. What we need in this country is the sort of Resolution which delimits the activities in which non-nationals can participate, in this country. If you go to practically every hotel in this country, all the receptionists are expatriates; the front desk men are expatriates. At Seawell you have an accountant brought here from the United States by I.S.L. and he is operating a Government institution which is a cafeteria at the airport. Now the Minister cannot justify before this House that taxi drivers need protection to the exclusion of other Barbadian nationals.

I heard the Prime Minister yesterday in this House talk about the Flash'N, and if our memories serve us well, the previous owner of the Flash"N was the man who runs the cafeteria at Seawell and he had to leave this country to go to the United States simply because an expatriate had deprived him of an honest living in his home town. You cannot tell me that this Resolution is to protect taxi drivers or to prevent Hertz from operating. The issue is bound up in an association which operates outside of Barbados and if you really want to protect taxi drivers, you should bring down a Resolution giving the Minister power on application by anybody in this community to delimit or prohibit certain activity being carried on by non-nationals.
9.15 p.m.

I had a client recently who applied to the Industrial Development Corporation for assistance and pioneer status to carry on a certain operation in this country and he was told that the Government's policy is to entertain expatriates who do not require assistance from the Corporation. There are certain operations in this country where Barbadians can profitably be engaged in to the exclusion of persons from outside. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture knows my personal situation where there were several Americans in this country trying to jump in after I spent three years investigating what was going on, and I challenge the Government tonight to be bold enough to withdraw this Resolution and bring in another Resolution, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church suggested, which sets out that non-nationals cannot operate in this country. I know you are not going to do it because it will hit squarely on the Industrial Development Corporation.

The small man in this country needs incentives and he needs guidance, and as long as the Government will sit down and do nothing to show him how he can chip in on what is going on in this country, he will always remain poor. I agree that the taxi business is a lucrative business; Insurance companies accept the fact that if a man's taxi is damaged they pay him $20 a day as compensation for loss of earnings because he makes that in a day. One has only got to look at the months of November, December and January and you cannot get a taxi for hire in this country. Taxis are being hired out in this country at U.S. $150 a week in the months of November, December and January; it is perfectly true. I agree that you do not want Hertz coming in but you should not create a law that the average Bajan who can make a dollar out of taxis should find himself having to go to the Minister only to hear that representations have been made by another taxi driver therefore he cannot allow him as well.

There are not enough taxis in this country but if the Minister comes down and says that certain things cannot be done by expatriates then you will see whether or not the Act is right, because I believe healthy competition between the nationals of this country is good for the community and nobody can then point a finger at anybody and say they received business because they hold a particular Party ticket. One has got to understand this, whether you are black, white, pink or blue and you are a Barbadian national, you belong to Barbados, you cannot go from here to America, Canada or England, and the Minister should not say that the Act will help to protect the large concerns like Dear's Garage, Parravicino or anybody. If you are a Bajan you are a Bajan whether black, white, pink or else, but if you are going to stop taxis operating by expatriates put it in legislation so that everybody can look up in the schedule and see who can operate in this country. I challenge the Government to be bold enough to do it. I can stand up here now and list the number of operations that expatriates should not be running in this country; give them three or four months and let them know that at the end of that period enough Barbadians could be found in that field. That is the legislation you should bring down here tonight.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this debate has developed into a very interesting one from different points of view. This debate which was a debate on a Resolution to give protection to our locals to operate taxis and so on has been the subject of criticism from the other side that the Government is not doing exactly what the Government sets out in this Resolution to do. The Government is not giving enough protection to local investors, and it is for this reason that we have brought this Resolution to this Chamber.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, who has just sat down, has raised pertinent points but to this moment he has not said that the Government has refused to give protection to Barbadians, he says that the Government should bring in legislation to show that protection is given to Barbadians and that expatriates are going to be kept out of certain types of business in Barbados. Let us be fair and reasonable, which Party in Government has taken up and directed its Development Bank to divert $500,000 to encourage the small investor to invest in this country? That was done as recently as this year.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question of the Development Bank does not really touch the issue that I mentioned. What I am saying is

the Development Bank is there to help the small investor but it does not prohibit a man who comes from outside, let us say, an American whose dollar is worth twice as much as ours, from coming in and buying 75 motor cars and registering them overnight. I agree with the Development Bank and with what the Government is doing for the small investor but I am saying there should be a statement in one single Act and a list of operations which cannot be carried on by expatriates.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, let us face facts, all of us came here with a Resolution and we debated a Resolution which called on Government to take positive action to save local taxi owners in this country from the hands of expatriates; this is only carrying out the instructions of the House a few months ago when the House passed a Resolution calling on the Government to take the same action which we have taken here today. We have come down here, and because somebody wants to play politics he is going to criticise the actions of the Government when this Government is carrying out the instructions of the House, but I feel we should have some sort of reason about us, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is the person who mentioned the Development Bank. I am now taking up from where he left off and I am saying that we ought to be fair enough to the Government to say that there has been no discrimination as far as investment among Barbadians is concerned in the help which we get from the Development Bank.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the Development Bank.
9.25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member did not do is to say that we are practising fair, just and upright methods in giving assistance to local investors. We are encouraging them, and there is absolutely no discrimination. There is a clear-cut, unadulterated policy carried out by the Barbados Development Bank, and as long as the experts are not politicians they go into the applications which come into the Bank. There is an Economist; there is a Manager who is also an Economist, and these experts advise the Government on the feasibility of the situation. You are asked to produce a feasibility study to the Development Bank. If you do not have a proper feasibility study and you are a small investor who cannot afford it, the hon. member knows that the officers in the Bank will assist that person in preparing his feasibility study, so the small man will not be denied of an opportunity to invest locally.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government is clear in this respect. We have just announced - I think that later this week we will be dealing with another Resolution which makes it crystal clear that Government is interested in uplifting the masses. We have offered assistance financially, morally and otherwise to local investors to come into cooperatives and invest in this country. That is where the small man has an opportunity even if he does not have the wherewithal to establish a business, he can join a co-operative. We are strengthening our Co-operative Department. It is not fair to say that the Government has fallen short in its policy as far as helping the small investor in this country is concerned.

On the contrary, we have been bending over backwards to help small investors and we shall continue to do this because we know that the only way for the masses to share in the economic progress in this country is for them to be given a helping hand by the Government. That is what the Government is doing. If you are talking about taxis, let us talk about taxis. When this Resolution was brought here we were doing exactly what we were told to do.

I should like to remind hon. members of a Resolution which was passed in this Chamber on the 23rd June, 1970. It reads:

"Whereas the foreign-owned car rental firm known as HERTZ has declared its intention to operate in this Island;

And Whereas car rental services in this Island are well supplied by Barbadian-owned hired cars and car rental companies;

And Whereas the presence of HERTZ is certain to cause hardship to these said Barbadian operators;

Be it Resolved that the Government of this Island intervene immediately to prevent HERTZ rental service operating in this country."

What we have done today is to respond to the cries of the people which are represented in this Chamber on the 23rd of June, 1970. I do not see what the row is all about. If hon. members want us to give further consideration to the matter, we can tell them that we are on the ball in this respect. As far as we are concerned, Barbadians come first and anybody else afterwards. I hope that my humble contribution will be of some assistance to hon. members.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken already, and I am asking for your Ruling, or let me break up the whole thing.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no record of it, but I am still awaiting the Clerks-at-the-Table and their record. I am informed that the record agrees with my notes that the hon. member has not spoken.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am very grateful to you, Mr. Speaker. Even if some time ago the House approved a Resolution preventing foreign operators from coming into Barbados, it seems to me, having read the proposed amendment to the Regulations, that it is far too wide to meet the purpose of what is suggested in the Resolution. The power given here exceeds that which is intended or necessary to prevent foreign operators coming into this country.

I would have thought that in amending this, Sir, as we did with the Public Order Act where we differentiated between the Barbadian speakers and non-Barbadian speakers where you would have to give their names under the Public Order Act - you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that originally the Bill was drafted in such a manner that you would have had to

supply the names of all speakers. However, the Government accepted an amendment by the Opposition that you would only have to put down the names of non- Nationals who were going to speak. This would have been a clear example of limiting this Regulation to cover the position of non-Nationals coming to this country to operate.

What do we find, Mr. Speaker? It has been pointed out that we on this side are very concerned that this legislation would be used to prevent certain people from obtaining permits to operate taxis. As was indicated earlier by the junior member for St. Peter, the example he has given leads us to believe, and from the way this discretion has been operating in the past, that this could be used against people whose political views are not favourable to the Government.
9.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of industrial development promotion, it is strange to hear the Minister of Agriculture after ten years say that the Government of this country realised that it is necessary to have machinery available to encourage and promote small businessmen in industry. I do not want to say very much more on this at this stage, except that this is based on an attempt to woo foreign investors to invest in Barbados, but experience has shown that these people usually come here and exploit the situation of the tax holiday, but there are avenues of production such as the garment industries and the paper bag industry that if the Government at the time when these industries were set up had carried out any sort of investigation, they would have been able to advise small businessmen in this country to invest. However, I hope that the Government will go further and not only provide monetary assistance, but also advice from the point of view of management, accounting, production and marketing as these are very essential.

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

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971, RECOMMITTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be recommitted. It has already passed the second reading and is now in the Committee stage.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, a new Clause 2 is to be inserted to read as follows:

"Section 2 of the National Assistance Act, 1969 hereinafter referred to as the principal Act is amended by deleting the words "section 9" appearing in the definition "Appeal Committee" and substituting the words "section 10 (1)".

I beg to move that this be the new Clause 2 of the Bill.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 of the original Bill be renumbered Clause 3.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 of the original Bill be now renumbered Clause 4.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a new Clause 5 be inserted to read as follows:

"The principal Act shall have effect and shall be deemed always to have had effect as amended by section 2 of this Act."

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, I wonder if what we are doing here is proper. The Bill I have in my hand has none of the words which are being inserted, and as I understand it, the hon. member is moving that these words form part of the Bill which we are passing.
9.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would not let us have the whole Bill recommitted so that we can have this properly arranged because the whole thing is wrong; they have something over there and we have something else. I think we should have the whole Bill recommitted; let the Chairman report progress and let us have the whole Bill recommitted so that we can have a second reading and go on from there.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in truth and in fact, this does not deviate from the principle of the original one which we considered; hon. members spoke at length then, they exhausted themselves.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, we spoke at length on the wrong Bill, but this is now a new Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has pointed out in the second reading of the Bill that the principle behind this Bill is to enable the National Assistance Board to administer the homes for the elderly citizens of this country. That is the principle of the Bill, and as all the lawyers on that side know, or ought to know, the principle of the Bill is dealt with in the second reading; the Objects and Reasons do not change and the clauses of the Bill are our concern in the Committee stages. We have already thrashed out the principle of the Bill; you cannot have your cake and eat it too, the same hon. members who are now talking about recommitting the whole Bill are the same members who when we go into Committee stage want us to take out clauses and amend clauses to Bills. All we are doing here is to put in a clause 2 which was not there, but if it does not change the principle of the Bill, so what nonsense am I hearing now about recommitting the second reading of the Bill? Wait until you have yours and you can recommit it but we are not recommitting this.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making in this, that when the Bill is passed by this House in Committee, what is passed in Committee should be inserted in the Bill which has been circulated to us. None of what the Minister says is what has been circulated to me, he is reading from a file which is different from what I have here.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, when this Bill was first discussed I read from a file and it was pointed out that your copies did not tally with mine; since then we have given you a Bill which reads exactly like what is on the file, what more do you want now?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Instead of asking hon. members to write in amendments, what has been done is that the Clerks had a completely amended Bill prepared embodying the amendments but it is the same Bill. You can cut out Clauses or add Clauses in Committee, so this does not alter the principle of the Bill.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, my section 2 reads as follows:

> 2. Section 2 of the National Assistance Act, 1969 hereinafter referred to as the principal Act is amended by deleting the words "section 9" appearing in the definition "Appeal Committee" and substituting the words "section 10(1)".

Is that the one we passed?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The next one is that section 5 of the principal Act is amended, and there is nothing here about renumbering; if that is to be passed it should be in the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I made it clear that Clause 2 of the old Bill will now be numbered Clause 3 and I moved that that should be done. Clause 3 became Clause 4 and the objection only came when the Bill appeared to be going through and somebody jumped up and objected to Clause 5. 9.55 p.m.

Do you want us to start this all over again, whereas the principle of the matter has already been agreed on?

Mr. ST. JOHN: If there is such an amendment by this Bill that Clause 3 in the original Bill is to be now clause 4, then it must appear in this Bill. The Clerk says that he has no such note. We are now passing Clause 2 of this Bill, which is the one I have read. The next Clause will be Clause 3, which says: "Section 5 of the principal Act is being amended."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That will be the new Clause 3.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The Clerk does not have it so. The person who has to keep the record should get the matter clear.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This matter has been vetted already by the Clerk who has to keep the record.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Ask him if he has it clearly?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I had an extra copy of the Bill here which I gave to the Clerk and he has everything in connection with the matter. The two Bills are identical, and the Clerk has an identical copy of the same Bill I have before me. I think everything is *ad idem* now.

I beg to move that the new Clause 5 be inserted.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, before we reach there...

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is no question of reaching there; it is what we are dealing with.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 in the first Bill which I have.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have already passed Clause 2 and 3 in the Old Bill, and we have been asked to renumber them as Clause 3 and 4 in the new Bill.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have a new Bill and Clause 2 begins with the words "that section 2 of the National Assistance Act....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has already been passed, and we are now dealing with Clause 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 is now before the Committee I beg to move that the new Clause 5, as circulated, form part of this Bill.

These areas are in dire need and I am looking forward that some of this money will be spent in some of these areas I have mentioned. I think it is time that these people get some of these services that other parishes are getting, and I hope the Minister will take this into consideration and try to help the people of Wood's Alley, Rock Hall and Applewhaite's to get these services because they are badly needed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, without doubt I think any person who lives around this island would appreciate the amount of work that is being carried out by the Waterworks Department; we have been concentrating heavily on all the roads where we have carried out repairs to make sure that mains, even if they are small mains, are run in these areas. We have done it in conjunction with the roadways programme, because one of the heavy burdens of finance in this country is due to the repair of roads, and it happens that after a road is repaired it is often dug up again to put in various utility services, and we have been going around asking all the people who are interested in getting in water to put it in at the same time the road is being repaired so that the road will last for a reasonable time.
10.25 p.m.

I am perfectly sure that in my programme for next year a lot of those areas that have been mentioned will be included. For the information of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I should like him to know that a total of 1,000 feet of 1 1/4 inch main was laid at Vaughan's Land already this year. The installation of water mains at Lammings Housing Area is the work of the Housing Authority, and they have to contact us as soon as arrangements are made with the Waterworks Department to put in water.

With regard to St. Joseph, it is a part of Barbados where the soil is very unstable, and it is being looked after by the Soil Conservation Department. We cannot go into a land-slipping area and put in roads until we get the O. K. from the Soil Conservation Department, because it would be useless spending money on land which is slipping. As soon as we get the O. K. from the Soil Conservation Department that the land is stable we will put in the roads, otherwise we may put in a road today and tomorrow it may slip away. That is the trouble we are having with St. Joseph and St. Andrew, and we do not want to throw money down the drain.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this kind of argument by the Minister. This would mean that the people in St. Joseph are condemmed for life from having water and roads. From 1966 to 1971 I have been talking about the road to Fruitful Hill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When the hon. member was saying that Vaughan's is not in St. Joseph, I just mentioned to him that over 1, 000 feet of water main has been installed at Vaughans this year. I am not an expert, and I have to work on the advice of the experts regarding the stabilisation of the land. If they say that the land is not stable enough for us to put in roads and it will slip away, then what can I do? I am no expert in that field.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, that is the whole problem. You have certain experts who are not prepared to get up and do a reasonable job. The road to Fruitful Hill was broken down in May, 1962, that road has not moved since that day; it is now overgrown with all kinds of grass, etc.; the water is shut off practically every hour of the day; nothing has been done on the road since 1962; no water has been reconnected, and it was in that position from 1962 to 1971; Now, the 1,000 feet of water which the Minister speaks about at Vaughans will only accommodate one side of Vaughans. The other side has never slipped and nothing has been done in the matter.

With regard to Lammings, I can tell you that I have a letter in my office from the Light & Power Company about the situation at Lammings. The Light & Power Company say that they have a plan from the Housing Authority which shows one particular development. After my constant ringing of Light & Power Company they sent a man to Lammings to look at the situation in respect of water, roads and electricity. They wrote me a letter stating that the houses at Lammings were now placed different from what was shown on the plan first sent to them. Only last week we have said that they have just received a new plan, so it means that as long as the Housing Authority sits down on the job, the roads will never be done, the people at Lammings will never get water and so on. That is the situation in St. Joseph.

There is the question of Dark Hole. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew knows about Dark Hole. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "What did Adams do about water 30 years ago? Did they not want water then?") You were not in here at the time. If the experts have made no report in respect of St. Joseph and there has been no road programme going on since 1963, then it means that the Minister will do nothing. The only solution to this is what I would not like to do, that is, to tell the people in St. Joseph to refuse to pay taxes and have a National Crisis.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. member has been in the Agricultural Department and it is closer to his profession. Being trained as an agriculturist, he would have some idea of what is stable land. A part of that area has water underground; rivers running, and after you get a good rainfall, days and weeks afterwards the water penetrates through fissures in the ground; come in contact with impermeable soil and, eventually, the whole area will slip away. The water forms a kind of lubrication along clay-borne soil and soil where the water cannot penetrate to go to the sea-bed, and the whole of the top area slips away. What the Soil Conservation Department has been doing is tapping wells and running underground pipes in order to take off the water and stop the

erosion. I am no expert in this matter, and I can go only on the advice of my technical people.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak in support of certain statements made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I am not speaking now as a Minister, but I am speaking as a representative of that area, which the hon. member has mentioned. *(Asides)* It is not a question of castigating the Government. You know me quite well; if I have to curse anybody, I will curse him at at any time and do not care anything afterwards. Now, this is a question of how long we must continue to depend mainly on the advice that we get.

I have had no representation in my Ministry from the Ministry of Communications and Works to carry out any drainage programme at Fruitful Hill. I know the area very well. (Mr. LOWE: "you have seen the files.") I have a similar situation in St. Andrew at a place called Rock Hall. Rock Hall has the same problem as Fruitful Hill in that the Soil Conservation Board has reported that it is a very funny type of soil and drainage work would have to be carried out before you can do anything about roads.
10.35 p.m.

Contrary to the advice which we have been given, I have been able to get the Ministry of Communications and Works not to put down a solid expensive road, but to put some marl fill in the road to make Rock Hall road passable. We know we cannot spend $100,000 to fix a bridge or road at Fruitful Hill, because this would be a waste of money, because whenever there is a rainfall that road is going down the drain. To carry out a comprehensive scheme of soil conservation work in the Scotland district it is going to cost something like $100 million, and I do not think it can be done in our time or whilst I am alive. We do not have the money to do it, but I think that what we can do in the Scotland District and at Fruitful Hill is to carry out an experiment as we have done in the Rock Hall area. It is not as easy in Fruitful Hill as in Rock Hall where all we did was some filling in, because the drop in Fruitful Hill is deeper than the drop in Rock Hall. If we can have it graded off, I think that road can be made passable, but to put it in an expensive road would be wasting money. We have to put down something that when the rains come in October and November and wash it away, we can go back and replace it cheaply. Rock Hall was there for a lot of years and you could only pass at certain times. When the rain comes you cannot pass any longer and you have to put in more gravel fill, but to carry the barbergreen equipment to Fruitful Hill would be wasting the taxpayer's money. I think the hon. member would agree with me that we should look at it to see whether we can grade it off and use some gabions and marl fill rather than put down an expensive type of macadamised road.

Mr. Chairman, I have myself had a look at the Fruitful Hill road because I have constituents who live in that district of Cane Garden. Just as you have the Mount St. Peter and the Mount St. Andrew, Boscobelle St. Peter, and Boscobelle St. Andrew, Hillaby St. Andrew and Hillaby St. Thomas, you have Cane Garden St. Andrew and Cane Garden St. Thomas, and my constituents find it inconvenient to get from Cane Garden, St. Andrew to, say, Sugar Hill. Most of the people there go to shop at the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and people from Cane Garden go to the doctor in St. Joseph rather than to the doctor in St. Andrew. I know the path that these people travel, and they have complained to me that they cannot pass. I am no expert, Mr. Chairman, but sometimes a little commonsense can prevail because experts cannot always be right. They may be right to some extent, but there is a limit to which you can depend on their advice, and I think the time has come when we can have a further look at the road and see whether we could not do a little grading off with a D6 or D9 to make it passable and protect one side with gabions. I do not think it would last very long if we have a heavy rainfall, but it would make the road passable and it would save the impression that we are abandoning the people there.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has agreed with my proposition that it is not always that the experts are right. I am no expert in roads nor in soil movement, but I have been having a careful look at the land in St. Joseph and I think that the problem with St. Joseph has been that practically all the roads which move from year to year do so because every one of them passes over a bridge where the bottom of the bridge is left open to allow fast moving water to move under the road. Obviously when you get heavy rains in September, October and November and you get water going down a gradient, it is going to cut away the two sides of its banks causing the road to collapse. Let us take Fruitful Hill which the Hon. Minister speaks about. In my opinion it is very easy to cure Fruitful Hill. That road collapses because there is some sort of opening under it and the water passes under the road. There is now a drop of about five feet between the old Fruitful Hill road and the part which has collapsed. If Soil Conservation can take a look at that road, all they have got to do is to use the simple principle that you always turn a fast moving stream at right angles to reduce the speed of the water and then turn it back again. Go into Mellowes and see that that is what is eating away the land, because the water comes down the road and every time it gathers speed it cuts away the banks and the roads collapses, and nobody has done anything to stop it going directly down-hill. If you take the streams and cut them at right angles to reduce the speed, you can build back all the roads, in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. Go into Fruitful Hill and do that and I guarantee you that in the next rainfall it would not fall. I challenge any expert in St. Joseph or St. Andrew to tell me that it cannot be remedied, because they are dependent on the principle still of running the water down the hill and straight under the bridge and then tell you that the roads would not stand up. Ask them why they do not look at the principle of cutting off the speed of the running water.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in this report I have a complaint very similar to that of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Now if one would look at what was done in the parish of St. Peter, one would see Highway 2A Mile and a Quarter, Warleigh, St. Peter, but we have a much more difficult problem at Rose Hill in St. Peter. The Rose Hill/Sunbury Road needs being examined, and thorough drainage is required at Rose Hill because much of the top soil is washed away because of heavy down-pours of rain.
10.45 p.m.

As I have said here quite recently, you are next door to a reservoir and do not get a supply of water, but at Rose Hill the surface of the road need to be raised and the Sunbury Road has to be rebuilt altogether, it is the worst thing anybody can see in any part of the island.

We turn over now and we see that Queen Street t Speightstown is to get additional roadworks carried out there. Just at the point where Archer's Lane touches on Highway 1 you need a culvert to take off some of the water which collects there; I tabled some questions in this House and in reply the then Minister of Communications and Works said that nothing could be done because the owners of the land on the sea side of Queen Street were unwilling to give up their land for a culvert to be erected to take off the water that settles at the Archer's Lane junction. Since then the people continue to suffer; people going into Archer's Lane and people using Highway 1 continue to suffer, and Government apparently has no intention of doing anything in the matter. We do not think that this is good enough and when we see that additional roadworks have been done to Queen Street we feel that the same thing should also be done at the point where the condition is worse and merits your spending the money. Nothing like this has been done at the Archer's Lane junction with Highway 1.

Consider the road leading to the Coleridge-Parry School. The Government has admitted seeing the necessity for widening this road; that is the reply I got from the Government to questions asked by me, that the necessity has been seen for widening the road but nothing has been done and we see here that our additional roadworks include the road to the Coleridge-Parry School. The road is in dire need of repair in order to accommodate the heavy flow of traffic using that road, and especially when we know that a number of school children have got to be travelling on buses on these roads we have got to do something as quickly as possible. We have had cases of vehicles passing each other on that road and running off the road because the road is not wide enough to accommodate the traffic, and this road needs urgent attention. I sincerely hope that Government will do something without further delay.

We see that something has been done at Burma Road East-West, but there is a portion of Burma Road that is still in need of rebuilding; why is it that the work at Burma Road has been stopped? I understand that it is on the programme for this year, but we would like to know exactly when it is to begin or are we going to see that the money will lapse? Similarly, we have a situation at Indian Ground where the Government said that people have been unwilling to give up the lands and I have since informed the Government that all the persons interested were willing to give up their lands. I understand that they went up there and carried out a survey but how far they have got no one seems to know. The rainy season is now approaching and the people at Indian Ground have got to pay their taxes like everybody else but they are suffering. The road at Indian Ground is definitely one that should be attended to without any further delay.

Mr. Chairman, as for water mains, we are glad that the people at Benn Hill, St. Peter have been able to have water installed, but the people at the Mount are still being supplied water by the Zeppelin. When I first spoke in this House about the problem at Benn Hill I was told that it was an engineering problem and we thought it was an engineering problem of such magnitude that it could never be overcome, but Mr. Chairman, what we are saying is that at the Mount, St. Peter, Government should initiate a programme which can cause a ready flow of water to be available to the people. You need a booster on the Castle road that leads on to the Rectory to pump the water through Mount No. 1 and pipe it through a sufficiently large main that when water is being drawn the level will still be maintained inside the main. I quite agree with what the Hon. Minister said some time ago, that Government cannot continue to rely on all the advice it is getting from its advisers. In this matter particularly of road building and the laying of water mains they need good advice and I am satisfied that advice is available that would help the people of the Mount to get an adequate supply of water; I am not in doubt about that. If a proper road is ever constructed to connect Mount No. 1 to Mount No. 2 - I do not know why there has been so much delay, because the field staff has been at work to find the replies to the questions that I tabled in this House, and I thought we would have had that advice already. I am sure this is a scheme that could be embarked upon to relieve the people at Mount No. 1 and Mount No. 2 with water, a good road and lights at the same time.
10.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Water is controlled by gravity, and it cannot go up a hill.

Mr. HINDS: That is what I am saying; you need a booster. At Mango Land a 4-inch main has been laid. At Ashton Hall you cannot get water; next to the reservoir you cannot get water. At Cemetery Lane the water main goes as far as Mr. Pickering's House, and it would be a good thing if the main were extended to accommodate the people at upper Cemetery Lane. These are things that the Government should look into. When you supply water to half of the people in the lane, it means that those persons who live at the upper part of the lane and need a water supply at their homes will have to go to the main highway and lay

their own 1-inch or 1 1/2 inch pipe and this, Mr. Chairman, as has been found in many cases, is beyond the financial reach of many people. That is why it must be appreciated that when work like this is done and only half of it is executed, the people, have a just cause for complaint. When you serve half of a village and leave the other half to eke out an existence, it must leave a bad taste in the mouths of some people. I hope that the Minister, in the very near future, will see what can be done in the matter. *(Asides)*

Well, the Black Belly Sheep and the pigs will be castrated. *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, I am being heckled; I crave your protection at this hour. Now, Gay's Road, St. Peter, is a road that I have asked this Government time and time again to build. This road leads to the Boscobelle Boy's School. I understand that something is now to be done about the Gay's Road. How are they going about this matter? *(INTERRUPTION.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the Marshal will ask the members in the Lobby to keep quiet.

Mr. HINDS: Gay's Road is now to be repaired. I have tabled questions in this Honourable House about Gay's Road. Now that they have seen the necessity for doing something to Gay's Road, the way they go about it is by carrying down the candidate of the Democratic Labour Party and advertising him with the road! *(Asides)* I had a good laugh at the whole matter, and the people at St. Peter are laughing at the matter. *(Asides)* I am one member who is never protected by this Chairman when I am on my feet.

Mr. Chairman, there is also the Four Hill/ Lonesome Hill Road, and there is the question of a water supply for Lonesome Hill. You will find that there is one standpipe to supply Lonesome Hill proper, but it does not afford the residents along the Lonesome Hill Road to have a water service in their homes. We are saying that there should be a main large enough to be tapped to give these people an opportunity to have the water service in their homes. That is exactly what is needed in a place like Lonesome Hill.

I do not propose to hold up this Committee much longer on this, but I am satisfied that there is nothing approaching enough that can be said to have been done for the parish of St. Peter, and even in the projected works for the future there is nothing that anybody can say has really been done for the parish. I am sure that it is a very much neglected parish. *(INTERRUPTION.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There happens to be too much noise outside this Chamber. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Since I have in some measure drawn attention to the appropriate Minister of the suffering of the people - for instance, at the Risk, St. Peter, the water main goes to the 18-mile stone, but no attempt has been to carry it beyond the 18 - mile stone at Boscobelle as far as the Risk to accommodate the number of people in that area. I should like the Minister to take a note of these things. It is for me to bring the suffering of the people to the attention of the appropriate Minister, and that is what I am essaying to do at this stage. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When an hon. member is speaking all hon. members shall be silent.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Government carry out a survey of all the roads in the parish of St. Peter as well as the roads throughout the Island that are in need of repairs. It is after the condition of each road is known to Government that the Government can then decide to set up its list of priorities as to which roads should be given preference over other roads. We do not believe that this has ever been done, because we cannot see how a road like Major Walk in Speightstown - part of Major Walk is being used by the Government buses..... 11.05 p.m.

Now one must appreciate that a road that is being used by the buses should be always be kept in A-1 condition, but that part of Major Walk roadway where the buses turn off to go into the Speightstown Girls' School yard is shameful. I just cannot understand how a Minister of Communications and Works can allow that type of situation to exist, and now that the rainy season is approaching, one can imagine what is going to happen there. We are glad to see what has bee done at Scantlebury Bridge at Six Mens, but something should be done about the Six Mens road.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I got this report before and therefore I was able to scan through it, but I do not agree with the Minister of Agriculture because if the suggestion of the Minister about wasting money was adopted fifty or sixty years ago, or even during the time of the Barbados Labour Party or the Conservative Party, you would never have had any roads or water in St. Andrew. At Fruitful Hill which I visited with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, all you have to do is to drop some stone. You do not have to have any fancy barbergreen road, but you should make the road passable for people. As to the argument by the new-fangled experts, you would never have had water if you had to provide mains there for the simple reason that they are using plastic tubes today and they put the pipes on top of the ground. St. Andrew and St. Joseph are parts of Barbados and if you have land slipping there and the pipes are broken, you just have to put them back as one of those recurring things. All this talk about $100 million to do this in St. Andrew, Barbados would never be able to afford, but you must fix the roads and make them passable so that people can get to and from market with their produce. While we should not be parish pump politicians on the floor of this House, I should certainly like to say that in going through the work for 1971-72, had it not been for the fact that St. Lucy and St. James had been left out, I would say it does not include anything in the

city area and that there had been favouritism, but nothing has been done for St. Lucy at all. I would like to say in passing how nice it is for the Government to say they are taking over Alleyne's tenantry and the Housing Authority has a tenantry in Chapman Lane and people cannot walk there if you get half an inch of rain! How nice it is to see that you have not got a hydrant there if a house catches afire! Isn't it lovely that in the 1971-72 programme you are going in St. John from Cliff to Kendal to do a road, and right in Chapman Lane where the Housing Authority owns land there is a road where people cannot get out! You would not even put a load of marl on the road so that the people can pass. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: We have plans for that.) You have plans but not for 1972. What are the plans? Just to let them live and die there? Because of what? You have another thought coming. Are you going to move them out and put them in high rise housing areas? After all this is right in the heart of the city, but I took the Prince of Wales across it in the mud and carried him into the house.

I do not agree with the Minister in charge of this. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Agriculture that you can put something for these people to pass and still give them water. While on this I would like to say that you are doing this within the entire upper Bank Hall/Bush Hall area where nobody between 6 o'clock and midday cannot get water to have a bath. I am sure that complaints must have come to the Parliamentary Secretary. What is being done about this? The Minister of Agriculture says that they have plans for Chapman Lane area. Do you have plans and would not put in a hydrant? You bought the land, you are renting it out, you have raised the rent....(Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Where?) You raised the rent of the house spots and still would not give them comfort. If a private individual had raised the rent, you would demand that they get better comfort.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Have they raised the water rates? We are dealing with water.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Who told you so? Of course the water rates have been raised because the taxes have been raised, and water rates are dependent upon the taxes you pay. I am shocked that the Chairman did not know that. Anyway, Sir, have your way, but not for long.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. senior member for Bridgetown showed so much indignation at the failure of the Government to carry out any sort of development in the city of Bridgetown, because in the short time in which I have had the honour to represent the city, it has become increasingly obvious that the Government has absolutely no intention of providing any sort of facility in the area of the City.
11.15 p.m.

I would recall that some time ago I had to ask questions in here on this, but I was looking at the list and I see that as regards roads within the last two years the one road which has been fixed in the City is the Woodside Tenantry and that, Sir, obviously was as a result of questions asked by me in this Chamber.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for water mains, and all I can hear about is roads. I do not see that we can discuss roads when the Resolution before us is for water mains.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point noted.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I mentioned that looking at the list provided by the Government, that would seem to be the only positive thing done by the Government as regards the electoral area known as the City of Bridgetown, and I think I am right in saying that as regards the Dunlow Lane area, that was given water recently and that was a result also of questions asked by me in this Chamber. I do not want to carry on this debate for any length of time because I am fully satisfied that this present Government will not do anything that is within their power to alleviate any sort of hardships that are suffered by the people of Bridgetown. It is rather obvious to me they are not going to do anything unless they are placed in an embarrassing situation as with the case of the Dunlow Lane and Woodside Tenantries, because that was an embarrassment to the Government.

There is just one avenue in New Orleans that I believe is still without a water main and that is the 9th Avenue, and I recently asked a question about it in this Chamber.

The question that the Resolution for $134,490 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think at this stage we are all feeling very tired, and I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until Friday at 4.30 in the afternoon.

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

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

11.20 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am most grateful to the hon. member for drawing my attention to the fact that there is no quorum. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and reversion thereto now takes place.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

A Resolution for the sum of $327,700 was called.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 1

Head 20 – CIVIL AVIATION – was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended we were discussing Head 20.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we were told that there is in operation at Seawell Airport at the present moment something in the region of 100 taxis; 80 of these taxis are in the Co-operative group, but outside of this group there is in operation another body of cars managed by Dear's Garage and the number of the cars is 20. Now, it is something very strange that we find the Government trying to foster and encourage the Co-operative Movement, and here in the taxi business you find one of the largest taxi operators in this Island, Dear's Garage, being allowed to operate 20 cars without being in the Co-operative Movement.

We were also told that from the sum of $3 which is going to be charged for an occasional permit in the future, the Government will be receiving 50¢ and that $2.25 will be going to the concessionaires. We ought to be told if Dear's Garage, which operates an estimated one-fifth of the taxis at the Airport, will be receiving 49¢ out of the $2.25 that will be going to the concessionaires. If Dear's Garage is to benefit to that extent, then we would like to know on what it is based. Why should you ask a taxi owner to pay $3 to get an occasional permit to ply for hire at the Airport and out of that, 49¢ or thereabouts, has to go to Dear's Garage? We would like to know if Dear's Garage is to benefit from this.

Now, the situation as it stands makes it incumbent upon a taxi operator, who wants to apply for one of these occasional permits, to have to journey from, let us say, Pie Corner in St. Lucy to Seawell Airport. As far as we know, the Manager at Seawell Airport does not have an office or sub-office in Bridgetown or in Speightstown. It would mean that a person would have to journey from Pie Corner or from the furthest part of this Island to Seawell Airport to make application for the occasional permit, and then have it decided whether or not he should be granted a permit.

4.40 p.m.

Now I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anybody could suggest that unless there is some administrative machinery that is to go into operation to ease the situation that this could be considered fair, because after all, taxis do not run on water alone, and the taxi operator's time is as important to him as yours is to you or mine is to me. We cannot for the life of us see exactly how this could work out as it may appear on paper here to us. What we do see is that Government is inviting trouble in seeking to bring this into operation because it may well be that private motor vehicles will in future be used for entering upon the airport premises proper and bringing out these passengers and transfering them to a taxi that is waiting maybe a quarter of a mile away from the airport. In that case the taxi would not pay the three dollars, nor would the private car have to pay. In our view if this system is to come into operation, two gates are really needed for entering Seawell Airport: one gate to accommodate private motor vehicles, and hired cars and taxis that are subject to paying the $3.00 tax or whatever is finally decided should be entering through another gate and should be called upon to pay a toll. In doing this we are further suggesting that the operation now carried on at Seawell which consists of the amalgamation in part of Dear's Garage and this South-end taxi group be done away with. You should open the doors to all taxis on the Island to go into Seawell Airport, but let them go through the gate specially provided for taxis and there be called upon to pay a toll. It could very well mean that you could find some taxis going into Seawell four or five times in the course of a day depending on the number of calls or the volume of business that a particular taxi is doing, and I am sure that the toll system could be so arranged to make it sufficiently beneficial to Government that Government would not lose any of the benefits that are now derived from the operation of the present taxis. My view is that with an increased number of taxis being able to go into Seawell Airport, there can be no loss of revenue by Government. This aspect of it, I feel, ought to have been investigated long ago, and had this been done we are confident that we would not find Seawell Airpot the type of closed shop that it happens to be.

After all, Mr. Chairman, there is no denying the fact that Seawell Airport is the taxpayers' Airport, however one may look at it, each and every taxpayer must be called upon to make some sort of sacrifice when it comes to building such a structure as Seawell. It must mean therefore that we should see no attempt whatsoever to provide as the Minister told us lucrative business to be enjoyed merely by 100 persons and hundreds of others are being left to scratch as best they can be here and there to eke out an existence. Even to look at it from what we have been told by the Minister, we are satified that even those who are outside the paling of Seawell Airport are living reasonably well. If that is the case, why not allow all? Do not make a super grade of some taxi owners and a lesser grade of the others, because after all they are all taxi owners who have got the same expenses in operating their vehicles, they have got to take out the necessary insurance coverage, they have the same maintenance and wear and tear to contend with. In other words, a taxi that is plying for hire at Seawell Airport has got to be subjected to the same examination by the Ministry of Communications and Works as the taxis which are not now allowed to go there, and it is our view that Government must take every step possible to review the double standards that we see in existence today.

Now, Sir, we have been hearing from the Prime Minister that when this permit cost of $3 has been

paid by the taxi operator that on the journey out from Seawell the $3 can be tacked on to the fare charged.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, no Prime Minister in his right frame of mind and one who has given us to understand that he has been throwing his full weight in this taxi business at Seawell to get it to go right would say, well knowing that the fares to be charged by taxi operators coming out of Seawell to go to any part of the Island are scheduled fares, that the extra amounts charged can be called a tip. We are not concerned with a taxi driver being given a tip whether it is a million dollar tip or a dime; that is his business, and we believe that Government ought to show itself better able to deal with a situation such as this. Look at it in this light, taxi drivers we think, are called upon to make out income tax returns like anybody else, and if a taxi operator does a job for $X and he gets a tip valued at $Y we can only come to the conclusion that in making out his return he must account for every penny that comes in his possession. He must meet his expenditures, he must account for the money he is spending, so we see that already there is provision for recovering from the taxi owner a reasonable percentage by way of taxes from his income, hence we do not see the necessity for Government putting itself in this position by imposing this $3.00 permit charge on any taxi operator.

From all we have heard so far we are convinced that all is not well at Seawell. We have seen that there is a definite case for a thorough investigation into the operations of all vehicles that are licensed for running public services in this Island, because the Government seems to have little or no knowledge of what is actually taking place. It is quite good for Government to set about trying to earn as much revenue as possible from any particular source of development or operation, but in doing so we find that the Government is certainly out on the wrong foot. Limiting the operations or seeking to prescribe limitations on the operations of taxis is not in our view in the best interest of the public that needs to be served, and in the case of Seawell one very well knows that many of our people abroad send home to their relatives merely stating their time of arrival and the relatives here are the people who are going to hire a taxi to go to Seawell, but it is at Seawell that they learn that this taxi will not be able to enter because the Airport Manager does not accept that this is a genuine request but that it is an infringement on the concessionaires now operating at Seawell Airport. In such a case the taxi that has been hired by the relatives of the incoming passenger has got to pay, but the passenger still has to be transported to the home of his relatives, so you will find that this can be a source of much distress to persons travelling as well as to relatives and we would like to see that something better is devised by the Government to accommodate whatever traffic there is.

Since everything is being done with the same taxpayers' money to promote tourism and to increase the volume of traffic that must flow through Seawell Airport, we feel that the Government should go further in this respect. It is not a case where we have reached our highest peak in tourism, we are hearing each and every day that our Tourist Board and our hotel owners are conducting campaigns to encourage more tourists to come to Barbados. The Government in itself is doing everything possible to help in this situation, and it all amounts to seeking to increase the volume of traffic flowing through Seawell Airport.
5.00 p.m.

If we are increasing that volume out of the taxpayers' purse, is it not fair then to seek to accord equal rights and equal status to every taxi owner in this Island who has paid his just dues and complied with the requirements of the law for the operations of a taxi? We feel that the whole scheme needs further and better examination than Government seems to have applied to it up to the present. I would like to hear from the Minister exactly how many taxis we have operationg in this Island. In other words, since we are closing our doors at Seawell Airport to accommodate 100 taxis, in doing so how many are we shutting out doors against? I think that is a reasonable request to ask of the Minister.

On the other hand, it is only fair for Government to seek to make comparisons with the income of a taxi operator at Seawell Airport as against the income of a taxi operator who is not allowed inside of Seawell Airport. It is not that you pay one scale of fees or insurance premium if the vehicle is not going to enter Seawell Airport. There are in no double standards in taxation. We would like to see any attempt to do this removed. In other words, we would like to know that no taxi owner has any reason to say that he is being discriminated against by legislation passed in this Honourable House. We think it is beastly unfair for the Government to be pursuing its present course with regard to the problem of providing transport.

We have it, Sir, before us that a taxi operator applying for a permit has to provide not only proof but valid proof. It means, therefore, that the Airport Manager, or whoever he delegates authority to, will be performing the role of a judge. In other words, the proof has to be the satisfaction of the Airport Manager or the person delegated by him to issue these permits. Sir, you and I very well know that everybody who wants to make application for these occasional permits will not be in a position to express himself as well as some hon. members in this House will be able to express themselves. The application will have to be in writing. Although it is only a question of $3 for a permit, the difficulty a person applying for a permit has to undergo could very well be another way of telling taxi operators not to worry to put themselves to the trouble of applying for a permit. We do not see that this is right

The Minister has been able to tell us not so long ago that the taxi business is a thriving one today. You, Mr. Chairman, will know that it will have its lean periods as well as any other form of business. In such a case, we are seeking to have all taxi owners in a position to ply for hire freely wherever they are

passengers requiring such a service. When we say plying for hire freely, we are not concerning ourselves with private hotels or on the private premises of hotels. We are dealing with public places like Seawell Airport or any of our public stands including the Bridgetown Port in this Island.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a very sore and grievous contention for very many years as to the freedom of movement allowed to the personnel of Dear's Garage in and out of Seawell Airport and in and out of the Bridgetown Port, and the very severe strictures applied to other persons engaged in the same business.
5.10 p.m.

We want to admit, Sir, that the Dear's Garage group has been able over the period of years to have its name so placed on the world's travel map where the traveller originates as to ensure a fair slice of the travel business, and when passengers arrive at Barbados, Dear's Garage has had its share cut out well in advance. If that is the case, we are satisfied that the small taxi owners perhaps for their lack of trust in each other have not been able up to this point to have themselves established that they too can be guaranteed a fair share of the travel business arriving at Barbados. What would have been the position if the United Taxi Owners' Association or any other group of taxi operators were to set about even now to have their names placed on the world map on the other side so that travel agencies would accord them the same measure of confidence that is now reposed in Dear's Garage Limited? What would have been the position then if the concessionaires at Seawell excluding Dear's Garage had taken the advice given them years ago and had so succeeded in enjoying not necessarily equal status, but a status to be reckoned with in travel circles? Would we have found the type of operation as is now conducted at Seawell? Would it be the same as it is today? If not, why not?

After all, Mr. Chairman, a taxi operator may start off with one car and dependent on the success or failure of that first venture, he looks forward to the future, but the taxi owners, even those who had been lured into this almost meaningless association now operation at Seawell Airport, are not all satisfied with the conditions under which they are called upon to operate. They find the rents they are called upon to pay extremely difficult during some months no matter how lucrative the business appears to be. This year for instance, is a testing year for a taxi operator, because nowhere is it seen that they are as active as perhaps last year or the year before, and it would mean then that the increase in the number of taxis in future years would be conditioned in very many respects by the return either favourable or unfavourable to the taxi owner or operator during the present year. There is already a crying out here and there that the hotel business of this season has not been what it used to be in the past three or four years. The laying off of hotel staff is in itself indicative of the service that taxi owners or operators are called upon to provide, because when the hotel rooms are filled undoubtedly taxi owners expect an increased number or cells that bear some relation to the number of guests in the hotel. In the same way the hotel staff in whatever category are employed according to the number of guests in the hotel rooms; so if there are no guests for the hotels, it would mean a falling off of the taxi business. All this must be taken into consideration. We therefore bring ourselves down to the point where we cannot take one or two years of success and come to the conclusion that the taxi business is a lucrative one. That is why in discussing another matter I particularly asked the Minister to tell us how many operators had gone out of business over a ten-year period.

Now we believe that ways and means other than via this occasional permit route ought to be found for grappling with this problem, because whatever is done it is not to be expected that a way will be found that will be satisfactory to everybody, but we feel that the most equitable way of approaching it would be to throw the doors of Seawell Airport open and allow all hired cars and taxis to enter on the payment of prescibed toll so that a taxi may turn around and be called upon to pay one never knows how many times in the course of a day. We would like to see Government give this some sort of consideration, and then let us hear if Government has lost any of its anticipated revenue from this taxi business. We could hardly believe that this could be so.
5.20 p.m.

I feel that I have covered enough ground on this particular item, and I feel that Government could very well take into consideration what has been said particularly with respect to providing two entrances to Seawell Airport for vehicular traffic, one through which a toll must be paid and the other for private vehicles. If that is done I feel that there will be an opportunity provided for removing much of the discontent at Seawell Airport with regard to the handling of this passenger traffic.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the fact that the small taxi driver who gets an occasional licence for the sum of $3.00 is going to be subsidising the other two paying concerns is not fair. As I understand it, once the licence is sold for $3.00 the Government is going to retain 50 cents and the other $2.50 is going to be divided between the Cooperative and Dear's Garage. I think this is wrong because the idea of having to pay will be all right as a source of revenue, but if you charge 50 cents that should be all right, but to go further than that and charge the taxi driver $2.50 to be given to Dear's Garage and the Barbados Cooperative Taxi Association is wrong. I am against the principle of taking $2.50 and dividing it between Dear's Garage and the Barbados Transport Cooperative, because the small taxi drivers are subsidising the two concessionaires and I think it is wrong in that respect.

If you argue that they come in with a letter from somebody abroad and they come to collect that person and have to pay for that, I do not agree with that. Dear's Garage has only 20 cars as compared with the Transport Cooperative which has 80, and I am certain that the volume of work which is done by

Dear's Garage is more than what is done by the Co-operative because Dear's Garage has the coupons for the tourists from Canada. People come here and have already paid the taxi fare from Canada because they pay everything when they purchase the ticket, so that in actual fact the present setup is paying a lot of money to Dear's Garage. Some people suggest that the Cooperative could get coupons in the same way as Dear's Garage, but Dear's Garage and Johnson's Stables are organised concerns and they have connections with the tour operators in Canada which the Cooperative does not, so that obviously Dear's Garage will get the bulk of the work. I do not know whether the Government can assist the Co-operative group by allowing them to take a representative to Canada and other places on the Bonanza team who would see about the tours, because it is not fair to allow a situation to operate at Seawell whereby the bulk of the work is given to Dear's Garage.

The same thing applies to the crew of the aircraft, so that the present setup still operates unfairly against the concessionaires. When you take into consideration the fact that Dear's Garage is paying for the concession at Seawell, the principle here that because somebody has written from overseas and asked an independent taxi man to come to Seawell to meet him he has to pay $3.00, 50 cents of which goes to the Government and $2.50 is divided between the Cooperative and Dear's, then I think you could extend that principle that if somebody comes from overseas and has a coupon for Dear's Garage, then Dear's Garage should be made to pay part of the money they are getting from that coupon to the Co-operative. You apply the principle right through if you are going to divide it, but do not allow Dear's to operate with coupons form overseas which in fact are letters and get the whole amount of the money. I am not against a charge of 50 cents as a fiscal measure, but I am certainly against the Government charging money and then taking that money to pay Dear's Garage and the Transport Cooperative.

5.30 p.m.

In spite of the Prime Minister's off-the-cuff legal opinion on Tuesday that it would not be illegal for a taxi driver to add the additional $3 to the fare. I think it would be illegal. The Prime Minister is saying that it is legal for a taxi driver to charge a man coming from Canada the additional $3, if he has requested a taxi from outside the Co-operative. In the Schedule the fare for taking a passenger from Seawell Airport to Bridgetown is $7.50. I do not know if the Minister of Communications and Works has had a legal opinion from the Attorney General's Chambers on this matter.

The position of the Opposition, as I understand it, is that if a person is coming from New York and he writes here and asks an independent taxi driver to meet him at the Airport, the taxi driver has to pay $3 to get into the Airport to pick him up. Can the taxi driver pass on that $3 to the person he is meeting and charge him $10.50 to bring him to Bridgetown or does he have to charge $7.50? If he has to charge him $7.50, he can only make $4.50 on the trip. Now even though Dear's Garage get their coupons or letters from overseas they can get the full amount of money. Unless you are going to make it absolutely clear by bringing legislation to the effect that so long as a taxi driver pays $3 to get into Seawell Airport for the occasional permit he is still entitled to charge the full fare of $7.50 to bring a passenger to Bridgetown, then there will be confusion. I would like to have this matter made absolutely clear.

Now, I do not want to find that we agree to this or pass legislation in here, and then a taxi driver charges somebody $10.50 to take him to Bridgetown only to have a number of tourists writing back here complaining about the expensive rates of taxis in this country. For instance, a tourist who may have visited Barbados last year may have arranged with his taxi driver to meet him at the Airport this year. He may write him to let him know what time to meet him. The tourist will be confronted with the knowledge that, instead of paying $7.50 to take him to Bridgetown, he is being asked to pay $10.50. He will immediately ask why has he been charged so much money.

We know that there is always the charge, and in certain instances it is justifiable, that the tourist trade in this country is pricing itself out of existence and out of the market. We do not want to pass anything that would be a burden either on the taxi driver or on the tourist to the extent that the tourist will have to pay $3 more for a trip to Bridgetown. I want to have this matter absolutely clear before we vote on this. I would like to get an absolutely clear statement from the Minister.

Basically, Sir, I entirely disagree with charging a taxi driver $3 for an occasional permit. It is far too much money. If he cannot pass on the $3 to the passenger and he can only charge $7.50 to bring him to Bridgetown, than you are asking the taxi driver to pay roughly 40 percent of the fare from Seawell to Bridgetown for an occasional permit. If you allow for the cost of gasolene and something for depreciation as well as the time involved, then the taxi driver would be spending an outlay of $3 plus another $2. In actual fact, the taxi driver will be getting a return of $2.50 on his investment. If you compare him with the Co-operative taxi driver and Dear's Garage, they are going to get the full $7.50 allowed for gasolene and depreciation of the motor-car. I find that charging the taxi driver $3 for an occasional permit is too high. If you want to charge him 50¢ it would be fair. Even if he passes on the 50¢ to the tourist or to the passenger coming to Barbados, he would still be getting $7 for himself out of the trip.

I want to find out from the Minister whether it is illegal for the taxi driver in these circumstances, having paid $3 for an occasional permit to go into Seawell Airport, to pass on the $3 to the intended passenger, or whether it is intended that the $3 must form part of the total fare fixed in the Schedule. I would like to find out the position from the Minister before we vote on this matter.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my contribution to this debate. I do not know whether it is due to the time of the year that people say things because they have mouths, or if it is due to the fact that people just say things when they are on the run. When we were last debating this Resolution, the Prime Minister stood up in this Chamber and said that valid proof from a taxi owner who is not the Co-operative Movement, or in Dear's Garage, or in one of the other large organisations, would have to be produced as evidence. When I questioned the Prime Minister as to the kind of evidence, he said "Maybe a letter."

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine my mother, sister, wife or my girl friend is abroad; she is coming to Barbados, and she write me a letter which covers a fairly wide span. She not merely says: "Please come to the Airport and pick me up." It could be:

"Dear Love,

How are you? I did not get home last night; I worked for two hours."

All of these intimate things are in the letter. The Prime Minister is saying to this Committee that I would have to produce this letter to somebody at the Airport to read it to be satisfied that it is enough proof to allow me and a small taxi owner to enter the Airport to pick up a passenger. I can only conclude that the Prime Minister - as was done with the Post Office Resolution recently - is trying to find out exactly what is going on between individuals.

Mr. Chairman, now that you are no longer running for St. John; you cannot run for St. John; you are my friend; I am a small taxi owner; so you send me a letter from Brooklyn stating that the Prime Minister is a vagabond; that he is no good; you are bringing down some buttons for me; that Mildred says Hello, and that you saw the Prime Minister wining and dining with the Mafia Group. All of these things will be in the letter from you, Mr. Chairman, to me, because you would then have to be anti-Prime Minister.

5.40 p.m.

I have to take this letter and carry it to the Airport for people like God Dog and Gittens to read my personal business before I can be given a permit to pick up somebody at the Airport. This could only be the act of a madman, because the note says "The Airports (Amendment) Regulations, 1971, enable the Airport Manager to issue occasional permits to taxi operators other than those authorised to operate under concession at Seawell Airport. These permits will allow the taxi operators to whom they are issued to collect arriving passengers on valid proof that they had been commissioned to meet them."

Now the Prime Minister said that proof could be given through a letter or cable. My colleague has just asked what about a telephone message? Imagine that you telephoned me from some part of the world and asked me to come and meet you at the Airport. Do you mean that the Airport Manager must come and listen to the telephone call to prove that this is valid? This is nonsense and you tell me you are doing this to protect the small taxi operators. I know the Prime Minister cannot bring any *Hansard* of 18th March, 1971, that has not been printed yet and read it to me in the Market Square.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with the permits to be issued at Seawell Airport.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear your voice until I came in here. Are you commissioned to send me out? You will never have that opportunity again. If you tell me to sit down, I will drop down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am here to make sure that every hon. member is relevant with respect to the debate.

Mr. CRAIG: I watched you sleeping just now and I did not say a word, but as soon as I started to talk, you woke up from sleeping. I am developing a point and I am entitled to do this. I cannot come and pick up the Resolution and say taxi, taxi, taxi. It is not me to fight, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to deal with Head 20.

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with Head 20 where the note says I must have valid proof, and I am saying that I cannot go in the Market Square and hold up a document which has not been printed to say that this is valid proof to go to the Airport to collect a friend. All evening you were there nodding and all of a sudden you have awakened.

When it comes to the question of the $3.00 charge, I heard the Prime Minister say in dealing with the Resolution that taxi owners are dishonest, that when they tell visitors that the charge from Seawell to Bridgetown is $10, the visitors pull out $US10 and give them because they do not say whether it is E.C. dollars or U.S. dollars, and they keep the change so they are dishonest. How could we decide to allow this Resolution to pass this Committee without being critical of it when a man has to go to Seawell Airport and show a document containing personal business, perhaps how you have made your will or how much money you have in the Bank? All these things I have to show the Airport Manager before I can get permission to pick somebody up from the Airport unless I am from Dear's Garage or of the Cooperative group. I believe this is badly worded. In addition they have to pay $3.00 and they have to keep to the Schedule price. If it is $10, $15 or $20 a mile, who is going to absorb the extra $3 which these men have to pay? What you are really and truly saying is that all taxi drivers should either amalgamate with Dear's Garage or the Cooperative Movement at Seawell Airport. This is impossible. There are several taxi drivers, and I know that Massey Green

is one. Do you mean he must pay $3.00 to go into the Airport when he gets an $8.00 job? How do you arrive at this when Dear's Garage, Johnson's Stables and Ronnie Smith charge US dollars? They are big operators, but what we are concerned with is the man who has one taxi and goes and gets credit from a garage to bring out another. The Minister mentioned that it is a lucrative business, and as soon as a taxi owner gets three taxis, he has to pay off the Bank, he has to pay for maintenance, licence, and insurance, and when there is a drop for him from the Airport to any part of Barbados he must first produce a document which you can read from top to bottom before he can go in, for which he has to pay $3.00, and if he charges over the amount for the drop from Seawell to Bridgetown, you will hear that the owner of such a taxi is robbing people. Who is going to absorb that $3.00? They cannot join Dear's Garage, so they have to join the Gittens' Group.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Prime Minister has been misled. He should have a talk with a cross section of the small taxi owners and really try to understand what is going on through their spokesman. I often hear them saying that they stand in the line for a whole day at Seawell Airport and do not get a call. Another would say he had one call to go to Sunset Crest, but Dear's Garage and Johnson's Stables can charge US15 all wrapped up in a package deal while they pay a man $US4 or $US5 to bring somebody from Seawell to Bridgetown. The Prime Minister said I have an inn. They come in there, so I must know what is going on. I often hear one man saying his battery has gone and he has to work for $60 to buy one, but he also has to look for the $40 to pay to the Association but that this is a lean season. All they are paying this for is secretarial services. This is a bad set-up, and I wonder if the Minister who is in charge of the Resolution would not have it reworded and take out the $3.00 charge, because I do not see why they should have to pay at all. I personally believe that they should catch as catch can, but you must have order.

5.50 p.m.

This is my view, catch as catch can but have order. If you are looking for a job you will get there early, but I see people park their cars at the Harbour and sleep in the cars, or some of them go home but catch the early bus next morning in order to get down there and get one of the first jobs, but now you are asking them to do this and pay this charge too. There are organised tours around the Island and these big garages charge U.S $10 and $15 a head, so when you have five in one car you will know that that is U.S. $75 for that one car, and this is agreed to in the United States or wherever they come from before they reach Barbados. These big concessionaires like Dear's Garage, Johnson's Stables, Smith's Garage and Sunset Crest Limited are all wrapped up in this scheme, and sometimes they are short of drivers and they would ask a small man to use his car and pay him $20 for the trip around the Island. How can you ask a man to pay $3.00 as a charge when Dear's and these other people are charging by the head?

I heard the members of the Government say that they are trying to protect the small man, but any Government in power has to protect somebody along the road. Do not think that we are critical, we are not critical (of protecting the small man, we are critical about the fact that you are trying to deprive the small man from making money just like the big concessionaires. Look at it another way, let us assume that you have a man living at Pilgrim Place which is no more than a mile away at the Airport, you are asking this taxi driver to drive to the Airport, pay $3.00 to pick up a man from the Airport and bring him to Pilgrim Road and charge $4.00. From the Airport to Pilgrim Road is no more than a $2.00 drop, so he has to pay $3.00 for submitting a letter so that the Airport Manager can be satisfied that he is bringing a man from Seawell Airport to Penny Hole, let us say, which is no more than a $1.00 drop, but he has to pay $3.00 before the can take somebody from the Airport to Penny Hole.

This is utter nonsense, and I hope that the Government will see the wisdom in discussing this again with the Cooperative Taxi Association and do something about it. This Resolution is badly worded, you cannot call on them to pay this $3.00 but you can charge a nominal fee of 50 cents. If a taxi owner has to go to Seawell to pick up his daughter he has to pay $3.00 to bring her from the Airport and that is not fair. We are making out a case for them; I am not supporting Hertz to come into the Island and run a service that will prevent the small taxi man from earning a living, but we do not feel that the tax of $3.00 imposed is good enough and then he has to submit himself to the scrutiny of the Airport Manager by showing some form of valid proof that he has a right to be there.

I am going to vote against this, I feel that Government should make the charge 50 cents or $1.00 but not $3.00; $3.00 is a lot for some of these taxi drivers, some of them do not get as much as $2.00 sometimes in any one day. I know many of them went into this $40.00 agreement because they could do no better and many of them wish now that they had never agreed to it. It is true that you cannot please everybody but I think this tax of $3.00 is too high, and I will call on the Government to make it 50 cents or $1.00.

6.00 p.m.

I would say leave out the valid proof, or let them find some other form of doing this; but do not subject a taxi driver to bring a letter as the Prime Minister says, from the person coming to Barbados or from some other source before he can pick up the Passenger at the Airport. I do not think this is a good feature in this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to formally move that this fee be reduced by $2.50, that is, from $3 to 50¢. *(Asides)* I beg to move that note 7, Head 20, be amended. It reads:

"The Airports (Amendment) Regulations, 1971 enable the Airport Manager to issue occasional per-

mits to taxi operators other than those authorised to operate under concession at Seawell Airport. These permits will allow the taxi operators to whom they are issued to collect arriving passengers on valid proof that they have been commisioned to meet them.

The fee for each occasional permit will be $3.00. Of this amount 50 cents is to be retained by Government to offset the administrative costs of operating the scheme. The remainder will be paid to the taxi concessionaires on the basis of the ratio in which they are authorised to supply vehicles under the existing franchise for the transport of passengers from the airport.

Supplementary provision is therefore necessary to meet payment to concessionaires in accordance with the above arrangements."

I beg to move that Note 7 to Head 20, para. 2, line 1, be amended to read: "The fee for each occasional permit will be 50¢".

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have followed a principle in this country in passing laws similar to Great Britain where certain usages and customs are followed in enacting legislation. I do not agree with the principle of charging $3 for an occasional permit. As I look at the Government Benches, I see the Minister in charge of this Resolution. *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, who is the Minister in charge of this Resolution? Is it the Leader of the House, or the Minister of Communications and Works? *(Asides)*. I understand that it is the Minister of Aviation and, perhaps, it is the Prime Minister. Maybe it has slipped the Prime Minister that people pay for taxis not only in Bridgetown but in Speightstown and so on.

Mr. Chairman, it may have slipped the Prime Minister that he gave us figures to the effect that there are 63,000 Barbadians living in England. It is the custom and practice when Barbadians go abroad for two or three years to write back and tell people in St. Lucy or St. John to tell their Cousin or Aunt that they will be coming in on B. O. A. C. flight 203. The woman cannot walk to town; she cannot get a bus to take her from her home to the Airport, so she is going to take a particular taxi from St. Lucy, St. Andrew or St. Peter. Do you know why? That taxi will be taking herself and her relative back to her district. Are you going to tell me that when she gets to the Airport that the taxi driver must pay $3? Is that fair? You are legislating just for the minority. I am going to second the Motion made by the hon. senior member for St. James.

As a matter of fact, it would be wise for the Government to postpone this matter, since the Prime Minister is not present. The Prime Minister represents St. John. Anybody from St. John, St. Lucy - and the Leader of the House should know this - would get a taxi from St. John or St. Lucy because the taxi would go back to the same district. Why should the taxi driver be asked to pay $3 to benefit people who are in an organisation?

Now, the Prime Minister should realise that every man who has a car licensed as a taxi for hire has to pay a trade tax whether he is paying $40 a month for working at the Airport or not. If he pays the trade tax, why should he pay an additional $3 to the people at the Airport for the benefit of a few people? Even $40 a month is too much for the people in the co-operative group to pay. I feel that, if you want to regularise things, the most you should charge should be $1. Are you only dealing with tourists? We are not dealing with tourists only; you can charge the tourists as much as you like; the tourists can pay anything; you can go on and run the tourist industry out of existence, if you want to. Why should this be? 6.10 p.m.

I would ask the Government to tell me how many hired cars there are in the Island. This is a question that should be answered on the floor of this House before I am asked to vote for this. Maybe the Minister of Trade can tell me how many there are in St. Peter, and maybe the Leader of the House can tell me how many there are in St. Lucy. This is election time and they should know because they would hire the taxis from the parish. Of course the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is not running, so it would not make any difference. This applies also to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Representation has been made to me.) Representation has been made to the hon. member to reduce this fee. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That is not what I said.) I am willing to give way for the hon. member to reply. Why should a taxi from St. Peter going to the Airport with an old lady to receive her daughter have to have some proof that this is he daughter? She ought to be asked to bring her birth certificate or marriage certificate. The hon. senior member for St. Philip is not listening to this because he lives near to the Airport. I know he would not tolerate this nonsense if somebody from St. Philip asked him to come to the Airport to meet him. Is it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Parliamentary Secretary had a fall at Seawell Airport and the Red Caps laughed at him and he had them chased out?

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the motion moved by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this debate, but the hon. senior member for Bridgetown tried his best to get me to talk because I did say in an aside that representation had been made to me on this matter. Long before this matter even became the concern of the Cabinet, a taxi owner of my constituency represented to me that he and other taxi drivers in the rural areas were at a decided advantage in plying their vehicles at the Airport, because he was well aware that there was a co-operative and Dear's Garage that were more or less running the Airport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can hardly hear the hon. member who is addressing the Chair for the noise at the back of the Chairman.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: It is well known to every hon. member of this Committee that presently the arrangement is that a cooperative of taxi owners and a taxi company almost entirely monopolise the trade at Seawell Airport. In order that any other taxi man can get into that business, arrangements have had to be made and these other taxis have to pay a fee. As far as I know this particular taxi man from St. Peter who I think represents the views of other taxi men feel that the fee of $3.00 was not considered too high by them. As a matter of fact, speaking from memory, the figure that he mentioned was more than $3.00. As I understand it, for a fee of $3.00 when a taxi owner shows proof that he has got a hire from somebody who wants to use his vehicle on arriving in Barbados, he is able to collect that passenger or those passengers and ply his trade.

Mr. CRAIG: I really do not want to interrupt the hon. member.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I hate to be interrupted and there is really no point of order. I never interrupted the hon. member. Let us carry on the debate orderly. We are in Committee, so the hon. member will be able to speak again.

Continuing, Sir, the ordinary practice is that although this man will be paying $3 for this permit, he may be driving around this party or these parties for a week or ten days or more; so you must not regard it as being $3 for a hire when he is only charging $5. That is an erroneous assumption. In cases that have been represented to me I have been told that when these people make a request for Tom Jones' taxi to drive them, they remain in the Island for a week or more days and that taxi-man drives them for the entire week. *(Asides)* I am saying what the taxi owners in the parish of St. Peter have told me. I was one of the Members of the Cabinet who drew to the Prime Minister's attention that taxi owners outside the Cooperative and the other big combine could not go into the Airport at all. *(INTERRUPTIONS.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While an hon. member is speaking, all other members shall be silent.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: If a taxi-man in St. Peter or St. Lucy is paying $3.00 that money as I understand it is going into a pool for the Cooperative and other combine, because it is, as it were, a closed shop at the moment.
6.20 p.m.

That is as I understand it, that this money is not just going into the coffers of Government, it is in a pool. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would hope that all hon. members who are not addressing the Chair would observe Rule 29(6).

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I do not think that all of it, but part of it by arrangement, is going into this pool. An hon. member asked if this was to subsidise Dear's Garage, but I understand that it is not only Dear's Garage that has a contract to ply for business at Seawell Airport; it used to be that way before, but today there is a cooperative that gets a greater portion, a cooperative of the ordinary taxi men, that is as I understand it. *(Asides)*. The thing about hon. members of the Opposition is this, if they understand a thing one way they are right, if we understand it and our understanding is different from theirs, we are devils, but in an Assembly like this it cannot work this way. I cannot discredit what you say because I cannot prove it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member refers to a cooperative, Dear's and so on, are there more members out side the cooperative than inside the cooperative?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that question will be answered, but it is not my particular portfolio so I am not in a position to answer it; I think my colleagues on this side will be able to answer it. I am saying this genuinely, the taxi man wanted this thing, they said they were left out completely and they did not mind paying a fee. After discussion and negotiation in the proper quarters, and with the Ministry of Labour, this agreement has come up. I see that hon. members on that side are not so much against the principle of this thing but they are talking about the quantum, because the hon. senior member for St. James spoke about reducing the fee, so as soon as a reduction is mentioned it is not that the principle is unfair but the quantum is considered unfair by hon. members on the other side who may not have all the facts.

Undoubtedly if there is presently existing what can be termed a closed shop arrangement, obviously you could not just let people outside of the contracting parties came into this business without in some way subsidising those who contribute and pay a sort of license. If you have an arrangement with one group of people and you have to extend certain services you could not ignore those with whom you have some kind of contract, therefore in order to widen the arrangement and allow others who are not in the Cooperative to come in, an arrangement has been made where they have to pay a fee.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, do I understand the Hon. Minister to say that he is satisfied that the $3.00 is too much or that it can be reduced? I do not know if the Minister is aware of the fact that when the small taxi owner pays $3.00 he is subsidising Dear's Garage and the Cooperative and then he cannot pass on that charge to the passenger.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The hon. member began by asking a question, by trying to find out from me if in my opinion I think this $3.00 should be reduced. I said that in the opinion of the hon. senior member for St. James it should be reduced; this is a

regulation that has been made for refunds and I think the hon. member should appreciate that in view of the fact that it is a motion which has been passed it must be done. Mr. Chairman, the result of this being here is that taxi owners outside of the Cooperative wanted it; this is nothing that Government off its own back sought to impose on taxi owners outside the Co-operative, I am perfectly sure that I am not the only member in Parliament on this side or on that side of the House who has had representations made to him, and it is as a result of that that this was done. 6.30 p.m.

The day will come when other hon. members will so be able to demean themselves in Parliament and outside of Parliament. I think I have said enough as let Parliament know this is not an imposition as might be pointed out by those who are, apparently, opposed to it. This is the result of a hardship that certain taxi owners outside of the Co-operative and outside of Dear's Garage have thought should be remedied. This is the form, the means and the manner of attempting to remedy it. That is the position.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious, having listened to the Minister, that the one thing he was afraid to say is that he agreed with the stand of the Opposition that the charge of $3 is too much.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that. I said that the hon. senior member for St. James seemed not to be arguing against the principle of making this fee, impost, charge or what else have you, but that the hon. senior member for St. James was speaking about the quantum.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is what I have said. I said that the one thing which the hon. member did not say is that he found the charge was too much. It is obvious from the statement he has made that he obviously agrees that the charge is too much. He said so in so many words. I think I should state clearly what is the stand of the Opposition. We are not against taxi drivers outside of the Co-operative and Dear's Garage going to the Airport. We feel they should have the right to go, but we are saying that the amount charged is too much. It is wrong to charge them $3, and then take a portion out of it to give the Co-operative and Dear's Garage as a subsidy.

Is it not iniquitous to suggest that a small taxi owner should be asked to pay any sort of subsidy to Dear's Garage? Would you call upon a small businessman to subsidise the largest taxi firm in this country? That is what you are doing by charging them $3. The Minister has said that the taxi drivers want this. Of course, the taxi drivers want the right to go to the Airport, but the Minister cannot suggest that the taxi drivers say that they want to pay the $3. No taxi driver in his right senses would ever agree to pay $3, when he can only charge $7.50 to take a passenger from the Airport to Bridgetown. We want to find out from the Minister responsible for this whether it is intended that the $3 should be passed on to the passenger; whether it is considered legal under the Regulations, or whether it is intended that the $3 should form part and parcel of the fee that is being charged. *(Asides)*

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that we do not have the facts and figures. What facts and figures do you want to support an argument that it is wrong to call on the small independent taxi driver to subsidise two big concerns? I refer to Dear's Garage and the Transport Co-operative. I understand that there are 80 taxis in the Co-operative, but you are still asking the small taxi driver to subsidise the Co-operative each time he goes to the Airport. That principle is obviously a wrong one. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a member is speaking all other hon. members shall be silent.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, some people will be uncouth and unmannerly even in Heaven. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "Just like your father.")

Mr. CRAIG: Order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All members are expected by the Chair to observe Rule 29(6).

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Even the hon. junior member for St. Thomas?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: The Minister said that the people who would go to the Airport and pay the $3 are the taxi drivers who would be taking the people around for a week and not for one day. This is really a stupid, puerile argument, and one would have expected better from a Minister of Government. He should not come up with this ridiculous argument which amounts to saying that every taxi driver who pays $3 to enter the Airport is not going on any one trip, but will be taking people around for a week. That is a stupid and ridiculous argument, Sir. I suppose the Minister is the Minister of Youth, and therefore he brings such youthful arguments.

Before this debate is completed, I would like to have an answer from the Minister on one very important point. Is this $3 intended to be part and parcel of the schedule fare that the taxi driver is allowed to charge for bringing a passenger from Seawell Airport to Bridgetown, or will he be allowed to charge the $7.50 as well as the $3 he has paid for the occasional permit to enter the Airport? This is illegal at the moment, when one looks at the way the Regulations are worded. I do not want any off-the-cuff opinion such as the one we had from the Prime Minister. Certainly the Minister should have some legal opinion on this. Surely this matter must have been discussed with a Legal Officer. He must have had a legal opinion as to whether this amount of money could be passed on. I should like to have an answer before we have completed the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is the senior member for St. Peter who has given us much food for thought on this Resolution. Now, he admits that Government knows that those taxi operators who are not presently allowed to take up passengers and bring them out of Seawell Airport genuinely feel that there is a hardship created on them by the manner in which Seawell Airport is operated at the moment as the result of the proposal to charge this $3 tax.

We are saying that what people, apparently, are not looking at is that whilst we are told by the Minister of Communications and Works that taxi business is lucrative, the principal mover in this Co-operative Movement at Seawell is saying that there is not enough work for the 100 taxis at Seawell.
6.40 p.m.

He is saying that there is only enough work for 86 cars, but the Minister says it is a lucrative business, and Dears garage and the Cooperative Taxi Owners are entitled to operate 100 cars. Mr. Chairman, the 100 taxis at Seawell can all take up passengers at Seawell and bring them out and they can also take pasengers into the Airport and they do not have to pay a fee. Now the other taxis can only take in passengers. You operate a closed shop for the 100 taxis at Seawell, but you also give them the right to take people from Seawell and go outside and enjoy some of the business that is left for the others, while for the man outside to go an enjoy some of the trade at Seawell he has to pay $3 to subsidise the Cooperative and Dear's Garage. Is it fair or reasonable?

Mr. Chairman, there are lots of things which we will have to consider before we could dream about voting for this measure. Now provision is being made here for a refund of about $600. We take it that this is an estimated amount for refund between the passing of this Resolution and the end of the financial year. This would have to be based on an estimated 225 permits. In deciding on this, we are convinced that Government is satisfied beyond a shadow of doubt that the hardship which the outsiders feel they are encountering is a similar hardship endured by those who can operate in Seawell; so whether or not you are an operator at Seawell, you are enduring a hardship, and the Government is now prepared to increase the hardship on the outsiders with a view to subsidising or relieving to some extent those that are enjoying the concession at Seawell Airport. You cannot do it that way, Mr. Chairman. It is not a proper method of approach to the problem at all. Remember, Sir, the President of the Cooperative at Seawell has himself given the lie directly to what the Minister of Communications and Works is saying, because if the President of the Seawell movement is saying that there is not enough work for 100 taxis, where is the lucrativeness of the business? All of this ought to be based on figures placed before the Minister which the Minister ought to be in a position to bring before this Committee. In the absence of those figures, there should be no further consideration of this Resolution.

The hon. senior member for St. James is not in truth and in fact accepting the principle of this $3 imposition. It is merely a case where he sees that the Government is bent on bringing into existence this $3 permit and sets about to see if he can relieve some of the hardship that the people who will be called upon to pay will have to bear. No member on this side is prepared to accept the principle of creating hardship on any member of the community, and this is what we would be doing in this Resolution. This measure is undoubtedly to create a hardship on the people who are outside of Seawell to relieve in some measure the hardships experienced by those who are with the Seawell Airport compound. We have got to look at this in an entirely different light from that in which it is presented to us.

Now we feel again, Sir, that the question of administration with the issuing of these permits is a matter of utmost importance from the point of view that the manager's office at Seawell Airport has a 4.00 p.m. or 4.30 p.m. closing time, but planes arrive at all sorts of hours during the night. Now are we to expect, unless there is going to be an arrangement whereby tickets will be issued throughout the night, somebody to journey from St. Lucy which is 19 or 20 miles from Bridgetown to rush to the Airport to get a permit before the manager's office is closed for a plane that is coming in three or four hours later? How can you expect a man to leave St. Peter or St. Lucy as the case may be and journey up there to get this permit? He cannot afford to wait at the airport; he has to journey back to St. Lucy and go back at 1 o'clock in the morning when the plane is arriving. So you will see that if we are imposing this $3 fee on these people some proper arrangements will have to be made, and we are more than wedded to the idea that you have got to abandon the whole operation as at present carried out at Seawell, and employ a toll system whereby each and every taxi is free to go to Seawell Airport on the payment of a toll and pass through the gate provided therefor.
6.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the question of valid proof. Do you know what we are really doing? We are asking people overseas in writing home to their families and friends asking them to meet them at the Airport to write two letters. We are asking those people to write a requisition that the taxi operator will have in his possession to present to the Manager. What kind of nonsense is this? What are we engaging in? I do not know if hon. members on that side have given any thought to that aspect of the matter, it would amount to the people writing a letter with all the family business and that letter will then have to be presented to the Airport Manager, or to avoid all of this you are asking that individual to write two letters, one for his friends or whoever it might be, and a separate requisition to be presented at the Airport.

I feel that enough has been put forward to the Government that if the Goverament is prepared to see reason in a matter of this sort this Resolution should be taken back and reconsidered in the light of the views of hon. memberson thisside of the House. I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister of Com-

munications and Works, he is not the Minister of Seawell Airport or for Civil Aviation, but I would like to hear which Minister in Government is in possession of the necessary facts that should accompany a Resolution like this. After all, all we may do, it is the question of the people's bread and butter with which we are dealing, and you cannot in one breath pretend you are doing all you possibly can for one section of the community, and in the other create hardships by taking away a portion of the bread you seek to provide and giving it to others whom you in a sort of way claim to be protecting. All this amounts to is that Government is overcharging these people at Seawell Airport, and to justify the overcharging is now seeking to impose a penalty on these other people.

We are asking in all seriousness that the Minister should not proceed with the passing of this Resolution in its present state. We are appealing to him in this respect, and as far as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, representations have been made to him by taxi owners that they would be prepared to pay a fee to get in to Seawell Airport. This in itself is only an admission as to how people really feel about closing Seawell Airport to them, not that they in truth and in fact want to pay but they do not want to kick against the pricks and rather than not being able to go into Seawell Airport with those who are being protected they decide to pay the fee. If the people at Seawell are now saying that there is not enough work for them, upon what is Government basing its proposal to allow those who are now kept out to go in on the payment of $3.00? Is it that the Cooperative Movement - and my understanding is that there is really and truly no Cooperative Movement but a mere handful of taxi owners conveniently coming together to grab a concession, it is not a question where there is a Cooperative which owns these taxis that are operating, it is a casual coming together of individuals. There is no Barbados Cooperative Taxi Association or else that owns 80 taxis that operate out of Seawell Airport, it is nothing like that at all, so can any Minister really support the argument that they are doing something to boost the Cooperative movement?

You will find further that even the taxi owners at Seawell are complaining that they are not receiving the cooperation that Government led them to believe that they would receive from the airlines, the tour operators and the hotels, so Seawell operators are in themselves crying out, and if that is so, how much the more the taxi operator on the outside? My view is this, Government does not have before it any information concerning the actual turnover of the taxi owners at Seawell, it is mere guess work, a mere assumption that those on the outside are doing more than they are really doing, because my view is this, that if Seawell Airport as it stands at present cannot provide enough employment for the 100 taxis there, what assurances have you got that those on the outside are getting enough to keep them alive as to bear this $3.00 imposition?

7.00 p.m.

On what are you basing it? We are satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has not carried out the kind of survey that the operations of taxis require for it to be able to determine how many taxis should be or should not be operating at Seawell Airport. We would urge upon the Government to do something in this matter at this stage. It is not too late, and we are quite prepared to give consideration to any Resolution of the sort. We are still wedded to the view that all taxis, hire cars, goods vehicles and all vehicles other than private vehicles entering Seawell Airport should be called upon to pay a toll. You can provide a gate for that, and that would be the best way, in our view, to solve this problem. You can then throw the gates open at Seawell Airport.

You must remember that when the President of the Seawell Co-operative complains of not getting enough work for.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that this is a substantial number of times that he has been repeating himself. If within the next few minutes he cannot produce something new, I will have to ask him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I crave your guidance on the matter, that you advise me on what I have been repeating myself. I would not like to go and repeat myself not knowing I am committing a breach. I would like to be advised exactly on what point I have been repeating myself, so that I would not do it in the future. If I say that the President of the Taxi Owners says that there is only enough work for 86 taxis, that is a point any hon. member, in addressing the Chair, would state 75 times. If I go on to say that if the President says so and so and so and so, then so and so and so and so must follow; if I go back and say that if the President says so and so and so and so, it must mean that so and so and so and so will ensue or something of the sort, that is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of a member repeating himself.

Now, the Rule specifically states that you are doing so tediously. If, for the sake of emphasis, I refer to a valid point regularly; if my argument is based on the fact that the President of the organisation says one thing and the Minister says something to the contrary then we must know who is right and who is wrong. If the President says so and so, then let us know exactly where we stand on a matter of this sort. A question of repetition what! Mr. Chairman, I do not want to repeat that every time I look in a certain direction I see a fool. I do not want to do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with the Resolution which we are discussing now, and, if the hon. member persists in irrelevance, I will ask him to sit down.

Mr. HINDS: I will try, Mr. Chairman, to be very relevant. The time has come when the Government should arm itself with certain basic and relevant points of information when presenting measures such as this now before this Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This, again, the hon. member has said about five times in his debate. If you have nothing more to add to the debate, I will ask you to sit down.

Mr. HINDS: I have something more to add, Sir. This is the time when the Government should not be presenting its case merely on hearsay. This is the time that the Government must weigh the possibilities of the man on the outside to see the extent of the hardship he is undergoing and to see whether or not he can bear the burden without crying out against the imposition that the Government now seeks to place upon him. His offer, if that is true, to pay something to get into the Airport is, perhaps, based on the same assumption on which the Government is basing its case that the business is flourishing and is providing bread for so many persons. We are told that this is not so.

You must remember, Sir, that we see and know that something will have to be done as time rolls on to refund, out of common decency, whenever a survey is carried out as a survey must be carried out - the Government will have to come back here and seek to refund the money or give some sort of rebate to those taxi operators who have been paying the $3 from time to time. If the taxi business is now considered to be laying a golden egg, from the point of view of the Minister, we are saying that the Government is taking steps, either wittingly or unwittingly, to kill the goose that is laying that egg.
7.10 p.m.

We are urging Government to act now and not to proceed with the passing of this measure as it stands at present.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members opposite have really made it almost too difficult to answer the points which they have raised because they have scrambled and scrambled this issue until both sides are in danger of not knowing what it is we are debating. I remember many years ago when I got my first introduction to the science of logic the person who was teaching me said that the first thing you have to understand is the similarity between an elephant and a cabbage. This puzzled me for many weeks and I asked him why is an elephant like a cabbage and he said to me, it was because neither can climb a tree, and the arguments we have heard from some hon. members opposite have been of that variety. In the first part of his speech, the hon. member who has just sat down said he would like a more open airport where instead of a franchise as it now is, you have a toll system so that more people can enjoy the business. In the part of his speech basing his argument on an allegation that the number of taxis that now operate there, according to somebody who is concerned with it, is too many, he is now telling us that if you accept that too many are operating, some thing still has to be done to bring more in. I do not understand that kind of argument at all.

Let us come back to the plain facts of the issue. In running a taxi service in an airport, you can do one of two things. You can have a system or you can try to run it without one. If you try to run it without a system and everybody plies his trade there, you would not go very far before you discover that nobody is properly served, neither the people who are supplying the service nor the people for whom the service is supplied. So that most people will agree that you have to find some system for taxis to operate at an airport or at any place where large numbers of people want the service. You cannot arbitrarily say that X, Y and Z can and A, B and C cannot. So you create franchises, and in our particular system, for a variety of reasons, two concessionaires have these franchises, and these two concessionaires are required to pay for the opportunity to operate at the airport. Now if you give concessions to people and you charge them a certain amount whether what you charge is reasonable or not.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, since the Minister has mentioned something about the two concessionaires, I wonder if he is in a position to say in the course of his reply whether other tenders for the airport concession apart from Parravicino and the Cooperative were received. The reason why I ask this is primarily because I would like to know if Smith's Garage or Johnson's Stables wanted to have a concession whether they would have to join the Co-operative because you have more than one large taxi fleet operating in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will deal with that point in its proper sequence, Mr. Chairman. I have to marshal my arguments with a little more precision.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you have two concessionaires to whom you have given a franchise and the agreement between the granting authority and the franchise owners is that they should pay so much per month for the opportunity which you have given them, it is obvious that both they and you must protect so far as this is possible or secure their right to earn their living; but at the same time there may be people outside of the concession who undoubtedly may justly claim a right to ply at the airport from time to time. Now if you did nothing to this, if you neither recognise their right to do so or if you ignore their attempts to do it, a situation would very soon come about that the people who hold the concession and the people who want to break in occasionally would come to serious differences of opinion. You may have clashes and you may have disorder. At one time as far as I can recall a serious situation was really developing even before the position was regularised at the airport. So what do you do? The Government should not in a matter like this arbitrarily decide the conditions and terms upon which people outside the franchise should operate. You have to come to some agreement, have some sort of discussion with the people who are already there and come to some practicable arrangement.

Now I think it was in August last year in Regulations made under the Airport Act that the franchises

were settled, and I am sure that the Government will have another look when this year's period is over to see what can be done in respect of those people who hold the franchise and who may now think, as someone is saying, that the $40 a month has proved too high for them. I would like to say in parenthesis that we did not impose that on them. There was a long period of argument and negotiations and at one time we understood they were willing to pay as much as $45 a month, then they went below that and $40 was the mean that was struck. When you come to review the matter, those people who have the franchise in the light of the experience of this past year may wish to have it reviewed, and I am sure that Government will give consideration to that. But while it is in operation, you have to protect them because they have to earn their living and make money and make their operation viable as well as anybody else, and having entered into contractual obligations with them you could not just allow other people to come in and to ply at the airport without let or hindrance. Some system would have to be devised to safeguard on the one hand the rights of people with whom you have a contractual relation, and the rights on the other hand of the people who wish to ply at the airport occasionally.

Now let me pause here to say that what we are discussing now in this Resolution is not whether or not a charge for an occasional permit ought to be made. I understand that there is some feeling at least by one hon. member on the other side that a charge might be feasible, but that the scale is too high.
7.20 p.m.

Another hon. member was suggesting that you should not do it that way at all but that you should have a toll system. Just let me say this, that as early as February this year the concessionaires themselves informed Government that they had been approached by the other people outside to discover the terms and conditions under which any number of people would be able to come in, and they wanted to know the people who had a franchise for this, and the proposal which came out of this was that these outsiders, if I may call them this, should apply to the authorities for occasional permits and that a fee in respect of these permits should be charged; that some part of this fee should be retained for administrative expenses and that the rest of it should go to the concessionaires.

A lot has been made by the other side of the fact that you are subsidising these two people but this can only be a matter of definition; it seems to me that if A and B have a legal right to operate a concession and C and D want to come in from time to time to take part in it and A and B have to pay for their concession, some consideration should be paid by C and D to A and B. Further, if there is argument as to what the charge should be, I think we ought to agree that something ought to be paid by the irregulars for taking away some of the work of the regulars. There is always the extreme case and occasionally some single operator may be asked to come for somebody and he may even be doing it as a favour and it may be hard for him to have to pay $3.00, when perhaps he might not be getting anything at all. This is a hard case and it ought to be examined to see whether something might not be done to deal with that type of case, but I think that we must remember this, that an extreme case is by no means the norm, for you have a situation in this island by which some taxis enjoy franchise at the airport, others at the sea port, others again at various places like the Lower Green or around Nelson and so on, so that just as how those at the airport make their living on their pick, if you can call it that, the others make their living on their respective bits, so the little man who would have have to pay.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I understand the Minister to say that the little man makes his living on his pick while the man at the airport makes his living on his pick; what about the man from the airport coming out at night and making his living on the other man's pick while the other man cannot go into the airport and make a living on that man's pick?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is a line to be drawn. You have a group of taxis at the airport, some at the sea port, and some who enjoy franchise at various hotels, restaurants and places, you have other groups around the bus stand, Nelson or the Lower Green, and then you have individuals who from time to time ply for hire anywhere.

Mr. CRAIG: The airport taxi can go into the bus stand and park and make his living in the taxi stand without paying any fee, but if the taxi man in the Nelson taxi stand goes to the airport he has to pay money to make his living at the airport. I do not follow your line of argument.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The man who plies his trade at the airport has to help with the upkeep and running of the airport, the man in the Nelson taxi stand is not called upon to pay for the upkeep of Nelson.

Mr. CRAIG: If the man who is coming to the airport has to pay that $3.00 to go into the airport why is he not then allowed to charge the extra $3.00 over and above what the man at the airport charges? The small man paying $3.00 to go into the airport to bring someone from Seawell to Bridgetown charges the passenger $10.00, but if he charges $13.00 which would then be above the schedule price, you can only conclude that he is pricing himself out of the market or committing an offence. Where is this $3.00 being absorbed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Does not the hon. member see that the concessionaire at Seawell does not charge anything over and above what the tariff is? I think hon. members believe that only the occasional man with the odd drop is the person who would be affected in this; what about the taxi owner who is a regular driver for well known individuals, well known to him, who have been driving with him over a long period of time and who when they come stay with him for three or four weeks at whatever arranged price that is made between them?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, that is exactly what we have been trying to get out of the Minister; how many such people do you have in the course of a year? On what are you basing your argument?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is not the point, the point is that you have entered into contractual relations with two franchised Corporations and you have given them under the terms of that contract fairly wide opportunities to do the trade at the airport outward, but anybody can do it inward. After all, the point arises when the incomers are coming to take people who land from planes and who are going out of the airport, but the opportunity for that kind of business should rest equally with people who have agreements if they want to give up any portion of that business, whether it is 2%, 3% or whatever it is, they face a drop in revenue, and it is only fair that they should be compensated for that drop in revenue which they face because of sharing this outgoing trade with people who have a right to call for particular people. 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Can the Minister tell us if there is enough work at Seawell Airport for the 100 taxis plying for hire there?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, whether there is or is not enough work at Seawell Airport for the 100 taxis would depend on the season of the year. The people who may complain now that there is not enough work may not feel the same way in December, January and March. There is a slack season in this type of thing as the hon. member knows as in all types of business, and even those who now may say that $40 a month is a bit steep for them at this point, all they are, in effect, asking for is to be able to spread whatever the charge is over a full period, taking into account the season and the off season. That is all they are asking. There must be a time in the year when things will be slack, but because things will be slack for them is no reason why we should forever exclude people from coming in if they want to do so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this Head. I will ask the Deputy Clerk to read it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed further, I had asked for certain information.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not have it.

Mr. HINDS: You say you do not have it and you want us to pass the Resolution just like this! Is the information beyond the Minister to get?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister does not have the information otherwise he would give it, but he should be able to get it. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Communications and Works could give us the figures. There are more taxis in St. Michael than anywhere else, and it should be easy to get the figures. A man cannot use a taxi until he pays a trade tax. The owner of a taxi must have a special license and he must pay a trade tax.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Hon. Minister would be able to get the approximate number from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Communications and Works. I can appreciate the fact that the Leader of the House would not be in a position to give the figures. I realise that the Minister of Communications and Works might not be able to give the figures since he has only been in this Ministry for a period of a few months. However, there is a Parliamentary Secretary and he should be able to give us an approximate figure. What is the use of having him here? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "You want to attack the hon. member.")

Mr. Chairman, this is not an attack on anybody. We are asking Government to let ss know how many taxis are in operation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am awaiting the amendment from the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the Resolution. This is of paramount importance, because you are imposing a tax on the outside operators when they go to the Airport for a job. You do not have the information to satisfy this side of the Committee and you have a Minister of Communications and Works who is in his place. Let us accept the fact that the Minister of Communications and Works cannot give this information because of the fact that he has recently taken over that office, but you have a Parliamentary Secretary who has been here for approximately 10 years and he should be in a position to give us the information we require.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to find out from the Mover of the Amendment if what I have here is the entire amendment he made. I will read it.

Mr. CRAIG: Are you referring to Note 7?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CRAIG: I dealt with Note 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It reads as follows:

> "That Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 1, Note 7, para. 2, line 1, be amended to read "50¢" and the figure "3.00" be deleted."

Is that the Amendment?

Mr. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. The figure "$3.00" will be deleted and "50¢" will be inserted.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I feel that before the Government can ask us to vote on a matter such as this, the Government ought to be armed not only with the number of taxis operating, but with information as to the number of outside taxis carrying passengers into Seawell Airport. The Government should be able to tell us how many drops they make to the Airport over a period of three months and how many passengers they take in. That is the type of informa-

tion that is pertinent to this Resolution. The Cooperative has not yet been operating for a year in order to be able to produce a balance sheet or a report; nevertheless, the Government should have had machinery in operation to be able to determine how many passengers the Cooperative and Dear's Garage have been taking out of the Airport or how many drops they have made. If we had that type of information we would then be in a position to know whether Government's claim to levy this $3 is justified.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Regulations have already been made; it is the money for the refund we are discussing.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I learn from the Minister that the Regulations have already been made and this is the money for the refund we are discussing. 7.40 p.m.

What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that all this must be based on something. After all it is a movement and you start off on a point. Mr. Chairman, let them pass it as they like.

The question that the figure proposed to be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. HOPPIN; and Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON - 8.

NOES: Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 4.

The question that Head 20 – Civil Aviation – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. HOPPIN and Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON - 8.

NOES: Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 4.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

On resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. Thereto its reversion is automatic.

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

Head 23 – DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES – was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 23 - Department of Archives - stand part.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to draw to your attention the absence of a quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am grateful to the hon. member. Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung but no quorum was obtained.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not observe nine hon. members including myself to be in this Chamber, therefore there is no quorum. But I do not need automatically to adjourn this House because it is already adjourned until Tuesday of next week, 20th July, 1971 at 12 o'clock noon, and that stands.
8.50 p.m.