THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 20th July, 1971

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker);* Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs);* Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Health and Social Welfare);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications and Works)* Mr. R. St.C WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, *(Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing);* Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P. *(Chairman of Committees);* Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS *(Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology);* Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG and Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 29th June, 1971, I understand, have been circulated and unless there is any objection they will be confirmed. Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes for that Meeting to be duly confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of 6th July, 1971 have been duly circulated, and unless there is any objection they will be confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, both sets of Minutes to which you refer were only circulated during today's date and I do not believe that any hon. member could have availed himself of the opportunity to give them the attention they really deserve. I personally have not had such an opportunity, I received them only this morning.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member on perusal discovers any error or omission, I will take the necessary steps to have them rectified if he will bring them to the attention of the Clerk of Parliament. In respect of those for the 6th July, that is merely a record of a meeting when there was no quorum. Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of 6th July duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay the following:

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1971.

Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th June, 1971.

Barbados Economic Survey 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbour Act, 1960, the expenditure of $10,854 to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1971-72 of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution.

Copies of this will be circulated, and I would like to ask that this be dealt with in all its stages.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of the repayment by the Barbados Development Bank of a loan equivalent to $1m. U.S. from the Inter-American Development Bank and the interest thereon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease of a parcel of land at School Gap, Westbury Road, to Mr. Fred Marville.

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready.

No. 145 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, No. 157 asked by the hon. junior member for the City, No. 185 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James and No. 192 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the Sanitary facilities at the Christ Church District Hospital formerly Christ Church Infirmary, are in a bad working condition?

Will the Minister have the said facilities investigated and take immediate steps to rectify same?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the fact that there is grave dissatisfaction amongst Staff and patients with the standard of diet at the Christ Church District Hospital?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister take appropriate steps to have the above-mentioned matter investigated and remedied immediately?

STATEMENT

Rt. Hon. M. E. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Finance, I wish to give the House notice that I intend to present my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday next for the year 1971-72.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, I claim the customary privileges the Government extends with regard to political broadcasts.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member will have to negotiate that with the Leader of the House, I am not giving any such undertaking.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will hon. members keep quiet, please. The Leaders of the House and of the Opposition will, I have no doubt, get together and then they will inform Mr. Speaker of their unanimous decision, if they can come to such, and he will act accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting, subject to the right of the Opposition to deal with any specific item under Private Members' Business which they may consider fit.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 on the Order Paper be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1971.

RESOLUTION *re* APPROVAL OF THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 2 of 1971 made under the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, provides for adjustments to the establishment structure of some of the Ministries and Departments at a total cost of $504,390. The Departments and Ministries which have been affected are the offices of the Services Commissions. I notice in the Addendum it is stated "Service Commissions' Department", but they are really the offices of the Services Commissions because there are several Services such as the Police Service, the Judicial And Legal Service, and the Public Service to be considered. In that particular building they are all catered for in one building, but there are several offices of Services Commissions.

It is proposed to provide on a temporary basis for the offices of the Services Commissions -

1 Senior Personnel Officer
1 Personnel Officer
1 Assistant Personnel Officer
2 Clerical Officers
2 Stenographer/Typists.

That is a total increase of 7.

The Public Service in Barbados has increased during the past 4 years from some 10,800 personnel to over 15,000 people working directly for the Central Government of Barbados. There are 3,000 people mainly in the Works Department and the casual staff; there are about 5,600 Administrative Officers, and with the taking over of the work of the Local Government there has been a considerable increase in the volume of work which has to be done by those Departments. Whereas before we had a Local Government Services Commissions, most of this work is now being done by the Officers of the Services Commissions.

We need three more officers in the Auditor General's Department; we need 5 officers (1 Senior Clerk and 4 Clerical Officers) in the Rates and Taxes Division of my Ministry. In the Customs and Excise Department we need 50 additional officers. There has been a rapid expansion of trade in this Island during the past four years and the office of the Comptroller of Customs has not been able to cope adequately with the large increase in the volume

of work. We have had several complaints from the Barbados Chamber of Commerce about the delays in the Customs. The Airport has also been expanded considerably, and we anticipate a further expansion in the volume of the traffic going through the Airport which will then call for more staff. The total increase is 50, but there is a net increase of 44, because it is also proposed to abolish under this Order 6 posts of Senior Assistant Supervisor with a salary range of $5,040 - $6,480.

Now, under the Ministry of Home Affairs you have the Town and Country Planning Department. I do not know if hon. members are aware that only half of this Island is subject to the Town Planning Development Control Orders because of inadequacy of staff, and only the heavily built up areas along the South and the West Coasts really come under the Town Planning Department. It is now proposed by the Ministry of Home Affairs to have a more positive approach to development, planning and research and, therefore, it calls for a re-organisation of the Town and Country Planning Office and the creation of 12 new posts -

1 Deputy Chief Town Planner
1 Senior Town Planner
2 Town Planners/Assistant Town Planners
2 Planning Assistants
2 Junior Planning Assistants
1 Senior Draughtsman
2 Clerical Officers
1 Telephone Operator/Receptionist.

The total increase there is 12.

Now, in the Post Office, it is proposed to redesignate the existing post of Assistant Postmaster General as Deputy Postmaster General. Now, 73 new posts will be created, but there will be a reduction in the number of Supervisors, as we had in the Customs, from 10 to 8, consequent on the provision of the accounting staff shown above. This increase is not really for postmen, it is for the administration of the Postmaster General's Office. You will see that they are Postal Officers, but I believe they are already there. They are really going to be embodied as it were into the new structure. There will be 26 Clerical Officers and 31 Postal Officers in the 71 net additional staff which it is now proposed to establish.

In the Waterworks Department there is the correction of an error regarding the number of posts of Station Foremen. I think the establishment was for 4 Station Foremen, but there are 5 Station Foremen who were there all the time. The problem is that when an additional post of Senior Station Foreman was created some months ago, the number of Station Foremen was reduced, so that technically speaking we should only be paying 4 Station Foremen but we have 5 Station Foremen through an error. We have money to pay them, because a Senior Station Foreman has not been appointed.

12.35 p.m.

There is a station foreman at the new automatic station at Hampton, one at the Bell, one at Warleigh or Haymans, one at Bowmanston and one at Golden Ridge. You have a situation where due to a clerical mistake there are 5 station foremen. There was provision for the appointment of a senior station foreman and one of the posts of station foreman was deleted, but we have had to pay five station foremen. A senior station foreman has not been appointed. When the Public Service Commission makes an appointment of senior station foreman, we will then examine whether we really need five station foremen and possibly we will delete again the five station foremen and reduce them to four. I do not know if hon. members understand the position.

I made a Civil Establishment Order which the House approved establishing the post of senior station foreman. There are already five station foremen in that Order. The number of posts was reduced from five to four station foremen on the assumption that one of the existing five, which I have no doubt is true, will be appointed senior station foreman. If that were done immediately it would have been alright because then we would have to pay four station foremen and one senior station foreman, but for one reason or another until I got this sorted out..... as a matter of fact I am partly at fault because I wanted clarification on it. No appointment has yet been made of a senior station foreman, but you have five station foremen but only an establishment for four. So we are re-establishing five station foremen, then an appointment will be made and then we will delete one of the posts I believe if that is the recommendation of the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks for a senior station foreman. So the establishment would be what appears now - one senior station foreman and four station foremen. It is as simple as that. If there are five people in the job and four salaries are provided, then we would have to say we do not know which four of you to pay the four salaries that are available, so you will all have to wait. Obviously this would not be in the best interest of the public service or the personnel involved. We are going to re-establish the five posts and then an appointment will be made of a senior station foreman by the Public Service Commission and I will then have a recommendation from the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks about the deletion of the five posts and the reinstating of four in the Civil Establishment. It would appear to be a bit confusing to hon. members if I did not give that explanation.

In the Ministry of Education there are a few posts - 19 - including eleven tutors one senior tutor, two library assistants, one executive officer, two clerical officers and one stenographer-typist. Then there are certain changes being made in the Ministry of Health which members can read for themselves, changes really in the designation of the posts rather than a quantitative change; and then in the Ministry of Trade we are strengthening the Ministry because quite a lot of the work which should be undertaken by the Ministry of Trade now has to be done perforce by members of my staff in the Economic Planning Unit. We think that the Ministry of Trade ought to have a strong staff of its own of the right calibre to go to conferences and strengthen the general image

of the Ministry of Trade itself, and for this purpose we are going to appoint an economist, an administrative assistant, two clerical officers and one messenger. In the meantime I have seconded a senior officer from the Economic Planning Unit to assist the Ministry of Trade with all these numerous conferences and agreements which they have to negotiate.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side appreciate and understand that the level of efficiency in the various departments spoken of is not what one would expect, and we hope that the provision of adtional staff would to some extent cure the dissatisfaction which the public gets, although in some respects we are doubtful whether this will be so. We feel that a look at the structure of Government as a whole in this country would have to be taken almost immediately if the efficiency is to improve.

In so far as the Service Commissions Department is concerned, there is still a tremendous amount of complaint about the period of time it takes for people to be appointed. Not so long ago the Prime Minister raised the hopes of many young people in this country when he said that he would remove the barriers of qualificatinn for certain types of jobs, but to this day there is still a tremendous amount of frustration in existence when these young people go and apply and they still are not able to get the jobs, and there are vacancies in the service, but still the Public Service Commission cannot match the vacancies with the applicants within a sufficient period of time. I keep maintaining that until the Chairman of that Public Service Commission is regarded as an executive officer with full time functions - he has to go there as a full time job to see what is happening in all departments - that situation will not be improved.

I also drew the attention of this House to a case in which a man has been suspended from the Ministry of Health I think now for three and a half years, and he is still drawing three-quarters pay or whatever the suspension pay is. As a matter of fact he has now set up a new shop and is working. *(Asides)* This is very unsatisfactory and the Public Service Commission is not above criticism in any place. It is a very serious position and we must do something about it. It is no longer, with the expansion of the service, an agency which can be looked at as any part-time job for any retiree. This needs a vigorous person who is aware of all the ramifications of the job.

Now, Sir, we come to the Auditor General's Department. I am very glad to see that consideration has been given to the expansion of this Department. Hon. members on both sides have been sitting on the Public Accounts Committee and we are in a position to report on the public service as a whole, and the report should soon be in; but it is a sad state of affairs that the attitude of the Government Departments to the Auditor General's Office in this country is something which is very shocking. It is clear that the Auditor General will be called upon in the future to perform much of the work for the accountants in the departments and the Ministries whose understanding of accounting for some reason or other seems to be non-existent. I hope that the Auditor General will go further and regard his job not only as to review and to check whether the expenditure that has been authorised by law has been spent for that purpose, but also to expand it and to see whether criticism cannot be made as to some of the purchasing and spending policies in the departments; so that an expansion of the staff of the Auditor General is absolutely necessary. I would have hoped that parallel with this new attitude in the Ministry of Finance would have been adopted whereby in each Ministry an officer of a sufficient grade who is responsible for financial control would have been instituted, because believe it or not, Mr. Speaker.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I am going to wait until the end to reply to the other points, but if the hon. member reads the Administration and Audit Act and the Rules made in 1964, there is an accounting officer in every single Ministry and department, and it is not the duty of the Auditor General to institute accounting procedures. That is done on the advice of the Accountant General. The Auditor General cannot get mixed up with procedures when he has to investigate the procedures himself and report on the correctness of them. When the hon. member said that we should appoint an officer, it is provided for and they are given instructions and rules, but if they do not stick to the rules, I cannot really act like a detective as the hon. member would know and go and break their hands or anything like that; but we have laid down the rules and we have appointed accounting officers.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: This is precisely the point I have been making, they have what one calls legal accounting officers, but the same legal accounting officers say openly they know nothing about it, they do not even read the Financial Rules or the Auditor General's report on their accounts, and they say repeatedly that they have been pressing Establishments to give them technical expertise and when you look at them point blank and ask them if they want to be relieved of the function of this they hedge because they feel it would mean a diminution of pay or status, but not one of them who have come before the Public Accounts Committee has ever said that they have any interest in the accounting functions under the Financial Administration and Audit Act which are placed squarely on them. There is only one exception and that is the Ministry of Health; for some reason or other there has been no comment on that, and if you ask why is it that they say that the Ministry of Health is lucky because they have the best Senior Accountant in the whole Service.

This is exactly the position, so that the Auditor General has got to do things which he should not normally have to do, because he writes queries to the Departments, and very often he has to bring people

from his Department, send them into Departments to help the Accountants straighten out their functions, and that is a very serious problem. Of course when the report comes down the Hon. House will see, but it is a very serious problem that you cannot get in a country the returns from the Departments sent in to the Accountant General so that they can be sent in to audit unless there is a lapse of two or three years, and when the people responsible are summoned they tell you that this is a function that they are legally in charge of but they really do not know anything about it, they are begging the Ministry of Finance for help and they cannot get any help in this direction. It is a very serious state of affairs.

Town Planning. The lag in this Department is something fantastic. The lag between the submission of applications and decisions is fantastic, and I say further that there is evidence of administrative indifference, of what I would say trickery in order to cover up their own administrative incompetence, because by law they have a certain period of time to make up their minds as to whether they will make a decision or not, but they have a habit of not making a decision, not notifying you of your right of appeal, telling you it is under consideration, telling you to come in and see them, and when you go in and see them after about two years they make a decision, but before they make the decision they ask you to sign to a consent that they extend the time, and when you sign the consent they then give you their letter. On one hand you sign the consent and on the other hand you get the letter of rejection. There have been cases where people have appealed and they have sent up to the Ministry wrong information as to the date of rejection, then the appellants have to send in the final letter and then they say they made a mistake. There will never be any improvement in town planning in Barbados until the Government sets up a Planning Authority and make the Town Planning Department the advisers to the Authority.

The Town Planning legislation which we have in Barbados was based largely on the English planning legislation which operates against the background of a Planning Authority which is the Local Council or the City or whatever the Local Government structure is. With the abolition of Local Government in Barbadoes and the centralisation of planning I say the Planner can make a decision and the Minister does not know when the decision is made, whether it is in Government's interest or not because it is only when he refuses and you appeal that he hears about it and there is no system of proper advertisement in Barbados in relation to it. This increase in staff, I know you will have to increase the staff there because it is the fastest Department for losing files anybody can find. You go up there, you have dates and times to meet them and then they will tell you they are sorry they have lost the file.

They do not seem to understand that they are playing an important function in employment in Barbados, because the more they hold up people's applications up there, it means the less amount of construction work that can go on. Some people have actually paid finance charges for negotiating loans opened for commitment fees and they take so long up there to give a decision that the thing lapses; they have absolutely no understanding of the importance of the function they perform.

Another thing is this, I think there has got to be closer liaison, and I am not sure whether the administrative structure is correct, because the Planning Department is not staffed with people who are confident enough to see that the planning regulations in respect of the subdivision standards are carried out, so they have to depend upon the Chief Technical Director and his staff at Highways and Transport. This is a very important thing because a developer can carry out his plans but the conveyances now demand a compliance certificate because they have a new form of giving permission which says that no lot can be transferred until the Town and Country Planning permission certificate has been granted stating that you have complied with the services. This was to catch a couple of developers they had around here who used to get planning permission, sell the lots and then did not put in the services, but they do not have their own machinery for ensuring that the standards have been maintained, so when you are finished and you go and apply to them for a compliance certificate they charge you for it, and people do not mind paying for it, but what people object to is that weeks pass and when they go back they say they have to rely on the Department of Highways and Transport, and that Department is very heavily overworked, so you have big engineers who ought to be doing important work doing compliance work for the Town Planning Department. Surely the Town Planing Department should have people who can see whether the standards laid down after consultation with the Department of Highways and Transport are being carried out; surely they have Inspectors, but the trouble with the Inspectors is that they spend too much time drawing plans for people who come in with applications telling them that their plans want changing a little bit, and they charge $100 to change them a little bit. They tell you that as long as they make the change, they can guarantee it; this happens right through the Planning Department, Mr. Speaker, that is positively true. They are past masters at just that little change so that it will comply with the requirements.

I know the grandiose ideas that they have, but surely after 12 years of planning in Barbados we ought to have had sufficient background work done that we would know all the relevant matters necessary for them to provide for zoning in Barbados, a lot of what we have to apply for in Town Planning should be shifted on to a schedule with proper permitted development which would help reduce the applications, and one would have the position of people being able to comply and apply for their compliance certificates.

Post Office. I am not saying anything on the Post Office, except to say that I am going to take up the Hon. Minister for Communications on his agreement that in certain areas people can apply for permission

to sell postage stamps. In the Oistin area in particular I know the Greenidges used to sell but they have gone out of business and they were the only people who used to sell stamps other than the Post Office, but the Post Office has certain hours. There is definitely a need for one in the Oistin's area.

We come now to the Ministry of Trade. I am glad to see that the Government is staffing this Ministry with Economists, but this is also the Ministry of Tourism and just as it is necessary for the Ministry to have at its command people who are aware of the implications of international trade agreements, I maintain it is necessary for the Ministry to have at its command expert advice on matters of all aspects of the tourist industry in Barbados.

12.55 p.m.

Now, if you look at your Agricultural Department, you will find that you are staffed with specialists. As far as accounting data and information is concerned, the agricultural industry in Barbados is well documented. We were very fortunate in that we had to keep these statistics and to prove the cost of production of things in that respect for the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, and a couple of Auditors' firms in this country have built up a good review of the industry.

Tell us now about tourism. I defy the Ministry to tell this House that they have comparable information in respect of tourist operations in Barbados. There is no machinery at all to look after such matters, and I do not believe that the private accountants in Barbados have this information, because of the fact that many of these industries operate under the write off principle. Some of them do not always like to have their books audited, and even when they are audited some of them do not like to agree with the report of the Auditor. The Government is operating at a disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what percentage of the gross revenue in hotels is attributable to pay-roll costs. Let us see what is the percentage of the food costs. All of these things the Ministry should know. Somebody should have this information, because these people walk around here and they talk. I am shocked to see how the Hilton Hotel could sell mauby at $1.50, and the Manager writes and justifies that! This is a terrible thing. What we have to get out of our heads in Barbados is that the tourist industry is an industry that we can continue to charge people what we like and that they will continue to come back! The idea has to come through that this is an industry which has to compete with competitors in other parts of the world and the price rate and price structure in Barbados must be competitive. Because we may be fortunate in the winter time to be able to attract people who would like to pay anything unlimited, we must not think that we must allow this psychology to get through. I hear at Rockley Beach you have to pay $1.10 for a coconut that can be bought for 8¢! You have to pay $2.60 for a Whisky and Soda at the Hilton Hotel; you have to pay 75¢ for a coke. *(Asides)* I never go there unless somebody is paying the bill! If this is permitted, this is one of the effects that tourism has upon you, because it causes pressures in other sections of your economy. Some people will say that the Hilton Hotel can get $1.50 for mauby; that is a first-class place; we are a second-class place, and we can charge 90¢ or $1, too. That will bring us right down. We have reached the stage where some measure of responsibility must be injected into the people who run these institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry must be aware of what are the charges. Why is it necessary for them to have a mark up of that amount? What are the costs? Is it pay-roll cost? Is it depreciation? This is a very serious thing, and we must have this information. I do not think you can rely on the Tourist Board. The Tourist Board is a pure promotional agency. Its structure is such that it does not have at its command the people with the requisite qualifications to do this kind of detailed work. Under the Act it has a lot of powers, but it has never been able to use those powers. This is something that the Government must do as part of its functions in the Ministry of Tourism. The Government must staff it properly, and let the industry understand that the Government is interested in finding out what is going on right through the industry. Let us plan the industry for Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot rely upon the Hotel Association, because they have to protect their own interests. All we have to rely on is periodic surveys by people from abroad who come in. They spend so short a period in Barbados that they only get such information as is given to them, and in the period of time that they spend here, they can only work on averages and compare the ratios. These are my comments on the implications of this Resolution, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is well known that on this side of the House we are glad, indeed, to see that provision is being made for an increase in the Public Service by way of staffing, but at the same time it is to be hoped that the increase in staffing will make for efficiency in the various Departments. We have it particularly in the case of the Ministry of Health with the change over from the Local Government to the Central Government, there is every attempt on the part of the Accounting Officers and Administrative Officers as such to give of their best. Particularly with respect to the Child Care Board, every attempt is being made there to undermine the smooth functioning of the Board and to hinder its operations in many respects. Persons employed by the Child Care Board are being subjected to unnecessary transfers at the whims and fancies of certain people without the knowledge of the Minister, the Chairman or people connected with the Board.

It means, therefore, that the Accounting Officers may go ahead to carry out the preparation of pay sheets merely to find that they are making preparation to pay someone at a particular Department when the person has been transferred weeks or days in advance without the appropriate officer being notified of the transfer. Many of these transfers are causing a considerable amount of inconvenience to the people who are transferred. We would like to know that, with the appointment of the Personnel Officers in

this Department, something will be done to keep things running as smoothly as the Government or any one of us on this side would like to see them.

Only today, Sir, I heard the Leader of the Opposition table questions here with respect to an institution which falls under the portfolio of the Ministry of Health. The same thing, that the questions are tabled in respect of, is obtaining particularly in the Child Care Board.
1.05 p.m.

We must look at it as a very terrible situation where a member of staff sets about to cause overexpenditure of certain votes and then the officers who have been trying their best to comply with the law can get no assistance whatsoever when these situations occur. We would like to see and to know that the strengthening of the staff in this department is going to remedy the situation which I have complained about.

In the case of the Post Office I think it was only yesterday that the question of building a new Post Office came in for discussion. We see here, Sir, that approximately 73 new members of staff will be recruited. We appreciate the fact that they are not all being posted at headquarters, but even now with the limited physical accommodation, officers are definitely concerned about where they are going to place these other officers. They are just tumbling one over the other now to such an extent that already this year a packet of some size arrived at the Post Office containing the Cambridge Examination results, and it was just left there for weeks being trampled over whilst the schools and pupils from the various institutions had been awaiting the results. There is not the type of accommodation that is necessary, and the placing of these officers now to work under these conditions is not making for the efficiency of the staff. We appreciate the fact that we must have an increased staff to cope with conditions, but we would like to know that the physical accommodation provided for staff is adequate so that they can give of their best.

In the same way the apportioning of the work in the Customs Department so that we will have an officer in charge of each department is in itself a good thing, but there is need for some physical accommodation as well in the Customs hall at the wharf, and we would like to see the Government give active consideration to these matters.

Now the Leader of the Opposition was at pains to bring to the attention of the House the matter of the Town and Country Planning Department. I want to say here and now that there is something radically wrong in that Department. Nobody can really and truly respect the Department by the way it is functioning. I have very good reasons to feel that there are definite signs of corruption amongst certain of the personnel employed in that Department. People are submitting plans and those plans however right they might be are being rejected because certain people did not draw them. You can submit plans there, have them rejected and you can be told there where you should go to have these plans drawn, and people know and understand what it all means. You will also find, and I have a case in point, where for seven years the Town and Country Planning Department had been refusing permission to carry out certain development because to allow that development as had been requested by applicants would have changed the physical appearance of certain areas. Just about two months ago we must say that the department has changed its policy in this particular respect, not that circumstances have varied in any way, but when an investigation is carried out, one is told that it happened while a particular officer happened to be on leave. Now are we going to have the Town and Country Planning Department changing its policy every time a particular officer goes on leave or is absent? Under these conditions people cannot have any confidence whatsoever in the Town and Country Planning Department, and we are hoping, Sir, that in the provision of staff such as proposed here, we will see a change of attitude in some of the people employed in this Department. This Department has now got to lay its foundation in this country.

Now, Sir, we come to the Ministry of Education. We support the decision to provide additional officers and I am very sorry that as mention is made about education, the Prime Minister has seen it fit to leave his seat, because we have had the sad state of affairs just about three Sunday nights ago - the very things that we in the Opposition have been pressed upon time and again to desist from doing - where the Prime Minister himself was at pains to say all sorts of things against an accounting officer in the Ministry of Education from a public platform. We feel, Sir, that if the Prime Minister or any other Minister had any evidence whatsoever against a public servant there is an avenue through which that public servant can be brought to discipline and to answer for any of his errors, but not for the Prime Minister to get up in public and to name a civil servant and to lay charges against him which I am saying he has absolutely no evidence to support, because knowing the Prime Minister as I do, if he had any evidence the officer would have been put to the nearest point to the gallows. It is because he had no such evidence that he took advantage of the situation, because the public servant cannot now go and set up a public platform and reply to any of the charges that have been laid against him. We would be glad to see the Prime Minister of all persons desist from taking the kind of mean advantage that he took of a public servant in public as well as of others. It is a disgrace.
1.15 p.m.

There is no point staffing the Ministry of Education with personnel who are going to find themselves the day the Prime Minister or any other Minister finds he has cause, quite justifiably or unjustifiably, to say something, to get up in public and malign a Civil Servant when the Civil Servant cannot reply at the time or is not going to find a lawyer who will stand up in Court for him against the Prime Minister in an action.

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

Mr. HINDS: I have made my point, and having made my point I merely want to say that all we are trying to do here to increase the staff in the various Departments you can then find the Prime Minister doing a disservice to the whole Public Service of this country by making such wild statements as he has done. I think I have made my observations and that all that is left for us now is to look forward to greater productivity in these various Departments and to see that the public is better served than we have seen during the past.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see that attempts are being made to increase and bring in line certain Departments of the Service. If I may start with the Waterworks Department, in my opinion, while I have no criticisms of the present staff, it is very difficult for the people in that Department to work in such close confinement, and the Government must have heard of the difficulty where they are sending out bills which people have already paid. If you cannot trace your cheque or receipts you will find yourself in difficulty, and I am sure the Government will find itself in difficulty there. I do not suspect anything is really going wrong because as soon as you draw to the attention of the clerical officers who are responsible for accounts these things they very politely and quickly settle the matter for you and let you see that it is a genuine error, and I believe it is genuine myself. I think the Government should do something about this Department; they are stumbling over one another and it is impossible to work there, something should be done. I understood that the Government was going to use Passage Road for a Department for this place but I see nothing is being done; people cannot work in this Department and something is radically wrong, either the Government will lose money or the people will have to pay money which they have already paid.

Relative to the Town Planning Office, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that in this Department some people take a lot upon themselves. I understand, for instance, that if a man in this country decides to apply to the Town and Country Planning Department for permission to develop certain land, he receives a letter before the application is made telling him that they are not going to pass that application. This is not a Minister, this is somebody in the Department doing this, and I think people should know this. Instead of paying all this money for drawing plans and so on, they can get a plan done at some of the private places around here for $25; I speak in respect of people who have to build a small bungalow or so. It is rather difficult for a person having to extend his house who is called upon and then kept back for nearly two years, because he is only putting in a bath and toilet, but he is turned around and around. I am glad that you are bringing this Department up to date but please let these people know that these things are not right.

I will deal now with the hotels under the Ministry of Trade, and there is one thing I would like the Government to take seriously. It is pathetic to go around at all these hotels and see the conditions which are offered to tourists and then to hear that during the off season the hotels in this country owned by locals and by foreigners prefer to close down rather than offer the conditions to local people. You are having an up and coming new middle class in this country, you only have to go into these banks in Broad Street to see; do you know that any of these girls who want to go on holiday during the summer season could decide instead of going to Grenada or St. Vincent to stay at a third class hotel to spend 14 days or so at some of our hotels? Why could the hotels not remain open and make an offer of these 14 days at $150 or so? When local people go outside of Barbados people can tell them how beautiful it is at Sandy Lane and some of the other hotels, and it is my considered opinion that the hotel industry is making a tremendous profit and they should be able to make these offers during the off season instead of closing the hotels altogether. They have not got to give them all this fancy food and so, but give them an opportunity to enjoy the facilities there, and I believe that the Government or the Tourist Board should take steps to encourage this, it would be a good idea.

I hope what I have said will not fall on deaf ears, and I hope it will be reported to the Tourist Board and that they will be able to do something about it.
1.25 p.m.

A lot of these people borrow money from this Government, and they use it to develop hotels. Everyone of these people wants to make back the money he has spent on a hotel in 5 years. I had to look into some particulars in respect of a hotel which had to be closed down recently on the St. James Coast, and I was shocked at the figures when I saw them. This was a hotel with rooms at the rate of $192, $200 and $240 a day. This is all nonsense! We should not encourage a hotel to do that sort of thing in this country. Imagine somebody buying land, and his share in the hotel which is put up on the land is $1,200 a month. That will build up his shares and he will be able to pay for the hotel in 5 years. Could I make all of that money if I invested in real estate in 5 years? They prefer to close down the hotels rather than give some of these up and coming middle-class people, who would like to spend their vacation in Barbados, a chance to spend a holiday in them at a reasonable price. They could charge $5 a day and let these middle-class people enjoy the rights and privileges of their own sea bathing. Very few people in Barbados are able to see and enjoy any of the comforts which these luxurious hotels offer. If I had anything to do with them, they would either have to do what I want or get out.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the other Heads under this Establishment Order are concerned, I am very happy to see that the Government has agreed to increase the number of people in the Public Service. There is one Department I should like the Minister concerned to look into very, very carefully. I refer to the Waterworks Department. I do not believe that anything is going wrong there from the point of view

of carrying away money, but the officers do not have the space in which to work. In a small space you can see 15 or 16 people working, and I am sure the Minister of Communications and Works will look into this matter. When they send out bills for two or three years you have to look back in your cheque book or check your receipts to see that you have already paid the money. They will apologise to you when you can show them that you have already paid, but something is certainly wrong there.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I look with interest upon this Civil Establishment Order for an increase in the number of civil servants - those whom the Prime Minister so often calls the army of occupation. I see that he is adding to their numbers in no small measure, Sir. I see here 50 more in the Customs; 12 more in the Ministry of Home Affairs, and 73 more in the Post Office.

Sir, I am particularly looking at the Services Commissions, because recently I have been very worried by the attitude of the Government to Civil Servants, and their discipline and their position. I would like to suggest that, if you are increasing the Services Commissions Department, you provide someone in the Services Commissions who can investigate complaints made by a Government Minister and by members of the public against Civil Servants. I could hardly believe my ears when I heard of a certain tape recording relating to this matter. I know that no responsible politician, who holds Ministerial Office, would make a statement which, if untrue, was grossly slanderous of a Civil Servant and grossly actionable in the courts. In am sure the Prime Minister could not have said, if he did not know them to be true, these words:

"I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to deny that a Civil Servant, Mr. Burgess, did not give Mr. Tudor wrong information and gave the Opposition (Mr. Hinds and Mr. St. John) correct information. I am calling names now. He should have been reported to the Services Commission."

Now, if the Prime Minister has that kind of evidence about a Civil Servant, it is his duty to investigate it or else to withdraw such a vile accusation against a member of the Public Service of this Island. I do not know if that is why he is increasing the Services Commissions, I hope Mr. Burgess will sue the Prime Minister for slander, or ask the Services Commission to investigate the matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I made a responsible statement, and the matter is being investigated as to what disciplinary action should be taken. He is now doing the public officer a great disservice. I did not make that statement under any shelter of privilege; I made that statement in public to show the banality of some of the people we have inherited from the last Government. If the hon. member is pressing me - I did not want to press the particular officer, because the Leader of the House does not want him dismissed - I will make sure that the officers of the Services Commission deal with expedition in the disciplinary action against this officer.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it the quintessence of - I do not want to say insubordination..... *(Asides)* I do not see how an officer who is here to advise Government Ministers could be having any sort of dialogue with the Opposition. *(Asides)* Any information they want, they can get from a Government Minister. When you have a dialogue with the Opposition and give them one set of information, then it must be assumed that you deliberately gave the Minister wrong information. *(Asides)* If you want to make an issue of that, I am saying that that officer is not really doing justice to himself and setting the high standard that we expect. This Resolution has nothing to do with that.

I make absolutely no apology, because I want the ambulance-chasing lawyers on the other side, who go in hospital trying to induce sick people to bring actions against people for political reasons, to know that I was not privileged when I made that remark, and I would welcome Mr. Burgess or any other Civil Servant.....

Mr. HINDS: You have been to Mr. Burgess' shop to get false witnesses against me.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never had a case against you. You would not be here if I had a case against you. I would do you as I did.....

Mr. HINDS: You would do anything; you have injured me already; you have injured your own father.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would tell the Prime Minister this. The Leader of the House made a statement in here that members of the Opposition are entitled to go into any premises controlled by the Government of Barbados and engage Civil Servants in conversation about their official duties as long as it does not interfere with their work. Now, how many voices is the Government speaking with? You are talking about Civil Servants, but Sir Grantley Adams has evidence that a certain person who rose to a Permanent Secretary gave the Prime Minister confidential information at the Press Club. I did not worry with you or him. That is the difference between the vindictive nature of the Prime Minister and Sir Grantley Adams.

Mr. HINDS: The Prime Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member sit; do not let this debate degenerate.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: I had formed the impression that Civil Servants were allowed to come to the House and sit in a privileged place in order to assist all members of the House in matters which they wish to pursue for debate, and I held this impression until today. I challenge anybody on either side of the House to say that they had ever heard before that a Civil Servant is doing wrong when he attends the Gallery of the House and we engage him in conversation. I have engaged Civil Servants in conversation in the Minister's presence, I have engaged them out of the Ministers' presence, I have spoken to Civil Servants

I think in the Prime Minister's presence in here in the little ante-Chamber.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member knows that what he is saying is absolutely incorrect. As a member of Government before I became a Minister, I was trying to get some information from a particular Ministry and I was told by the then Permanent Secretary that the Minister would have to give him permission first. I have a book on Cabinet Government and I will bring it for the hon. member to read if he has not read Jennings on Cabinet Government. A Minister is not even supposed to see the files of another Minister unless he wants him to see them; so don't come in here with this nonsense playing to the Gallery and think you can fool people. The only person who has permission to see the files of another Minister is the Prime Minister; so don't try to come here and fool the public.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member has made a very valid point in so far as no member of the Opposition can expect to see a matter which is in its nature confidential, but if the Minister for National Insurance had listened very carefully to what I had said, he would have heard me say on many occasions that I have spoken to Civil Servants who have visited the House and obtained information from them in the presence and out of the presence of Ministers. I am talking about Civil Servants who come here to the House to assist hon. members with material to pursue a debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to make a categorical statement here and now. I have never had any discussions with any Permanent Secretary at the Press Club because the Press Club only turned out alcoholics and three or four of them have died as a result, and I do not intend to die at an early age. There is a whole procession of people who have died through alcoholism who frequented the Press Club.

The second point I want to make is that public officers who come to the House of Assembly come here to assist the Ministers when they are asked questions on the floor of the House by the members of the Opposition. The public officers are there to assist Ministers and indirectly the House. If a Minister is on his feet and he gives a particular member authority to speak to a public officer about some information or to give him specific information, I have no objection to that, but I will never do it. I want to make it abundantly clear that we ought to get our procedures absolutely straightforward. Therefore a public officer should never be put in the position where he supplies one set of information to the Opposition and another set to the Minister. A member on the floor can say "check with your officer and see if that information is correct, I believe it is wrong", but it is quite wrong for any public officer to give two different sets of information on the same subject to two sides of the House, and I make no apology for it whatsoever.

I want to say further that I was so careful, and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas knows that this is true, that when I crossed the floor of the House in 1955, no public officer of any rank or Permanent Secretary of any rank spoke to me until we wond the election six years later in 1961. I was never invited to their houses and I never invited them to mine, and the first time that I went into the Ministerial Buildings or knew what they looked like, was the day that I took office in 1961, except for one occasion when money was diverted to build a bath for the then Premier and I went during construction and wrote my name in the cement on the bathroom to certify that I had been there. Now I can see members of the Opposition floating through the Ministerial Building all day long talking to public officers. As long as they do not come into my office except on official business and by invitation or appointment, I do not not mind, but the security of this realm is very important to me.

Mr. ADAMS: I have heard the Prime Minister say, and I want the public to take note, that between 1955 and 1961 he never went into the house of a public officer or had anything to say to a member of the Civil Service; he did not speak to any.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was never invited and as a result I never invited them. I would not embarrass them because to be seen talking to a public officer in those days was the biggest crime that the public officer could commit even although he did not open his mouth. So I would not embarrass any of my friends. All of the Permanent Secretaries were in the same form as I was in at school, and I stopped going to their houses for six years.

Mr. ADAMS: Is the Prime Minister now trying to limit it to Permanent Secretaries, or is he telling us that unlike the other 239,999 people in Barbados, he for six years never spoke to a public officer? What kind of nonsense is that? Did you never speak to Fred Cozier or went to his house, or Louis Redman? You get up and say things without the slightest consideration for what is coming out of your mouth. You are looking at the House and saying that for six years with 20,000 Civil Servants or how many there are in Barbados you never had any social contact with any public officer!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just want to make this clear. There may be public officers who had divorce cases and a few of them may have had criminal cases who came to my office, but my routine was straight from my office not to the Press Club like the other lawyers, but down to Land's End, got in a row boat, go out to Pelican Island, scrub off the bottom of my boat, go for a sail, go back home, have a drink, do my reading and go to sleep. The Minister of Communications on my left can verify that that was my routine. I am not a social person. I do not believe in discussing Government business even in my own home far less in anybody's else home, and I would not embarrass a public officer. I do not hold anything against them, but they can tell you. I can go further, but it will be embarrassing people in high places. I have never been near to any Ministerial Buildings nor asked any public officer any confidential information

at all. My friends were George Fergusson, Cameron Tudor and T. T. Lewis.

Mr. ADAMS: Anyhow I congratulate the Prime Minister for being for six years in a position not to have had any social conversation with any member of the public service of this Island, not at cricket, not having a drink anywhere, not even perhaps speaking to them when they came to the House of Assembly.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to know if the last fifteen minutes' discussion was on the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: My answer is that each of the hon. members has gone off the beaten track.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am trying to talk about public servants. It is disgraceful that public servants should be pilloried on political platforms like that, and we are dealing here with the Services Commissions and all this chit chat and nonsense about not speaking to members of the public service and not going into Ministerial Building, is what is irrelevant apart from being mistaken. We should not in my suggestion pick up Civil Servants' names and talk about giving the Opposition correct information and giving the hon. junior member for St. Lucy wrong information. Talking about that, I may say I am glad perhaps that the damages have been compounded a little bit by the intemperance shown by the Prime Minister on this occasion. I do not know Mr. Burgess. I do not know if he is old, young, red, white, or blue. This member of the Opposition, Mr. Burgess is a total stranger too. I have heard for the first time that he comes from the Baltic, St. Peter; so all that I know of Mr. Burgess is that he was defamed on a public platform.
1.45 p.m.

My introduction to Mr. Burgess is defamation on a public platform. If I were really the type of lawyer who, as the Prime Minister suggests, runs to the hospital to look for people to bring cases perhaps I would run to Mr. Burgess to get Mr. Burgess to bring a case. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: For the second time?) I wish the hon. junior member for St. Thomas would say that on a political platform, because all those who slander me are going to see a Writ; I am not Mr. Henry Forde or Mr. Burgess or others who will listen to the most untrue things said about them and not bring law suits, nor am I like the Prime Minister who has brought three separate law suits against people saying things about him and lost each time. No judge will ever say that he cannot accept my evidence, no Judge has ever said that of me, not ever.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are much too far from this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I have never brought a law suit yet and lost it and had been ordered to pay $16,000 costs on appeal. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no dialogue between any hon. members, not even the two hon. members for St. Thomas.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not a funeral chaser, people come in my office, and it may interest the Prime Minister to know that in the case to which he referred - and I will tell him this in particular - that a number of approaches had to be made to me before I took that case. I sent back that man twice, and I say it quite categorically that I never went to the hospital to him. *(Asides)* The Prime Minister has such a capacity for putting forward things that may not be true that he actually has me doubting myself, he has me believing that I went to the hospital to see some patient, and I am going to have to enquire now if I went. I would have stated categorically a minute ago that I never went to the hospital to see this man whose leg the Prime Minister broke, and the Prime Minister has said it three times now and he has me doubting myself. The man approached me through a friend of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Mr. Wiles, on more than one occasion and I refused to do the case because I said that the Prime Minister would say that it was being pursued politically.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have gone far enough.

Mr. ADAMS: I will not be long, but subsequent to that I wrote a personal letter to the Prime Minister asking him to let the Insurance Company deal with this matter and I have had no reply. I asked the Insurance Company to avoid having to put the Prime Minister in Court, and Mr. Turney came and told me that they are not paying a cent, he broke his leg and he will have to take it, and so the poor man who was knocked down by the Prime Minister and broke his leg lost his work. The Prime Minister came into Court and used his prestige apparently which exists in the Courts of Barbados.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This does not arise nor must there be any indirect aspersion cast on any of Her Majesty's Judges.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, it is not the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who cast aspersions on Her Majesty's Judges, I have never accused anybody of running to the Judges to prejudice their minds and discuss cases that are before the Courts, I have never accused anybody of buying a house opposite a Judge or running with him on mornings.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not refer to things which he has not done, I believe that there are so many things which he has not done we will have to remain here until long after midnight.

Mr. ADAMS: I have never bought a bottle of whisky and given to "Slims" to change his evidence in a manslaughter case. I am calling on the Prime Minister if he has evidence against Mr. Burgess to carry it to the Public Service Commission, he may do that. My information is that Mr. Burgess is perhaps overwrought by the circumstances of where

he finds himself; I do not know the man, but that is what I understand. If the Prime Minister is in a better position with this new staff at Services Commissions, let him charge Mr. Burgess before the Services Commissions so the people of Barbados will see whether the Judge in Trinidad that said he could not believe the Prime Minister is accurate.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, whenever there is an Order of this nature before Parliament to increase the Civil Service I am one who cannot do anything more but support this Order, but I would like to be in a position to see these people who are now going to be appointed on a temporary basis in the Civil Service try to get into private enterprise, for this reason. They have not got an idea of what they are going in to as long as that Government, headed by that senior member for St. John, remains at the head. There is no living man on the face of the earth that has ever treated the Civil Servants in this country as badly as the senior member for St. John; there is nobody who has ever treated the Civil Servants of this country worse than the Prime Minister - if you want to call him a Prime Minister, I will call him that to satisfy you - but he refers to the school teachers of this country as gully bores, he refers to the Civil Servants as an army of occupation, he calls them lazy rats.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg your pardon.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not giving way unless the Speaker rules you are on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said "a point of order".

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I make no apologies for any statement I have made; I will continue to call the Barbados Public Service an army of occupation. I was in an army of occupation and I know what I mean and they should know what I mean too because they expect the exact tribute from the rank and file in this island without giving anything in return, but I have never called anybody a rat, not even anybody from the "Flash 'N" so the hon. member must not misquote me, I make no apologies for the statements I made, because I made them advisedly. I have never described any Civil Servant, male or female, as any kind of rat or mouse or anything like that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I believe if a rat saw this Prime Minister coming down the road it would run. The big difference between himself and a rat is that the rat would be ashamed to be in his company. It is this Prime Minister, the senior member for St. John, who is responsible for the inefficiency in Government; he has driven fear into the hearts of the Civil Servants, the empty lousy threats by the hon. member on the other side.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the Civil Servants in this country now enjoy better rights, better privileges, higher salaries and all the facilities are better than they have ever had before. History knows that and everybody knows that, so when the hon. member says that, it is not in keeping with things that are normal and expected of him.

Mr. CRAIG: It is regrettable that so many of them in this day and this age are charged before the Law Courts for stealing money from the Treasury under your administration.

1.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If Civil Servants commit wrongs and crimes, they can expect to be charged by the Director of Public Prosecutions. The hon. member is implying that they never would have been charged if his Government were in, when he says that they were charged under my administration. The administration does not charge Civil Servants. Evidence is brought to the attention of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and I am satisfied that he tries to do his best. That is all I have to say on that. To suggest that we are charging Civil Servants because they commit crimes, I say they ought to be charged and a lot more should be charged when they commit crimes. Very often the evidence is not forthcoming Everybody who commits a crime in this Island ought to be charged for it - even members of the House of Assembly on both sides - I do not believe that they should be immune from anything.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, we can say that within a few months time the Prime Minister and some of his Ministers will be charged. There will be no private plane to take them out of Barbados; they will not be able to get out. The Prime Minister had the audacity to stand up here and say that he has never had a chat or ever invited certain people to his home. I wonder if the Prime Minister can remember Louis Redman who lived opposite to him for several years. He was a Civil Servant at the time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Redman was not an officer in the Public Service of this Island; he was a neighbour of mine; I believe my present Permanent Secretary, Mr. Blackman, lives near me; I am surrounded by Civil Servants.

Mr. CRAIG: You are talking a lot of nonsense. You say that you do not go to cocktail parties and you do not encourage no social thing. There was nobody I have ever seen in a newspaper looking so pleased with himself than the Prime Minister when he was dancing with Princess Margaret with his eyes closed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: It arises in reply to what the Prime Minister said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not bring in the names of members of the Royal Household, but let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am saying nothing derogatory about a member of the Royal Household.

I said that there was a picture in the Press with the Prime Minister of Barbados dancing with Princess Margaret with his eyes closed. He said not too long ago.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But that does not arise in this Resolution!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As far as I am aware, Princess Margaret is not a member of the Civil Service of Barbados, and as such that is a totally irrelevant statement. Whether or not the hon. member feels that he should have been in the place of the Prime Minister with his eyes closed that is a different matter. Probably he might have fitted in better than the Prime Minister did on that occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. Let us stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the whole position is that you find today a greater number of people leaving the Civil Service and going into private enterprise not only because it is more lucrative, but primarily because of the fear under which they live in the present Civil Service under this Government's administration. I have met several young Civil Servants in St. James; they push their hands out and say: "Craigie, you know how it is boy." But you will see a Mr. Moe - his brother is a Civil Servant - walking around in St. James canvassing. They will tell you that they cannot afford to do that but Mr. Moe is in a high authority. This shows you entirely the fear under which some Civil Servants are working.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since this administration or Government has come into office, there are certain privileges which have been granted to the Civil Service Association. The Civil Service Association today is a union as such and duly constituted. Members of the Civil Service, whether they be teachers or in any of the branches of the Service, are given the right and privilege of standing for election and being granted leave if they have a contribution to make. Mr. Moe conforms with the normal practice, and he has resigned. If he happens to be the opponent of the hon. senior member for St. James that is a different matter altogether.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow the Acting Leader of the House to get away with that. I said his brother, who is a senior Civil Servant and an Education Officer. You have junior Civil Servants who are afraid because of the fear the Government has driven in them. You merely have to be a member of the Dems and a Civil Servant, and you can do no wrong. The hon. member should know that Civil Servants are there to serve the Government of the day. Do not tell me that some Civil Servants can get away with certain things and others have to be subjected to illtreatment. That is not fair. This is the fear which the Government has driven in them. I say that the Civil Servants must always work at a level of efficiency, and the public should complain about the work of Civil Servants.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since the election was in the air the standard of the Civil Service has disintegrated completely. There is no co-operation existing now, because the election is around the corner. Even in my Ministry I am experiencing great difficulty, and a lot of sabotaging has been going on from top to bottom. I tell you that.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order!

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think I can sit down after hearing the Acting Leader of the House. He has now established my case. He says that because there is an election around the corner there is complete deterioration in the Civil Service in this country. My view is that, regardless of whether there is an election or not, there should be maximum efficiency in the Civil Service. As the Acting Leader of the House says, because there is an election around the corner there is a complete disorganisation of the Civil Service.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Civil Servants today think that the election will be next week or next month, and they are showing their hands clearly now. They can easily be detected and identified. I know many of them, and in my Ministry I have more than 50 per cent.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the whole organisation of the Civil Service, according to the Acting Leader of the House, has fallen down. The taxpayers' money is going down the drain, because there is no efficiency in the Civil Service. Fear has been driven into the hearts of the Civil Servants. In some quarters you will find them showing their hands. We must have efficiency in the Civil Service despite the fact that the election is around the corner. After they have finished walking around canvassing at night, they are too tired to work the next day.
2.05 p.m.

They walk around in the pubs buying liquor and saying who should be in and who should not be in, not realising that with any change of Government they have to serve the country and serve it well. This is the whole structure of the Democratic Labour Party from the time they came into power. You must bear the passport to the seat of viciousness in a vindictive, wicked Government. You have turned the Civil Service into a political organisation. The civil Servants of yesteryear were people who worked for the Government no matter which Government came into power, but today you have them opening their hands and telling you who is who and what is what. When we gain power, what confidence will we have in them if you have created this sort of attitude in the Civil Service over the past ten years? You are pushing one young Civil Servant over the other, and this fellow who is not in your corner or has no passport is victimised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Civil Service, and I am saying that the Government is a wicked vicious Government by introducing politics into the Civil Service of this country, and when there is an Order of this nature which comes to increase the establishment, I am saying that no Civil Servant comes into the Service to make it a career; he comes with a degree of fear not knowing what the future holds for him. It is no wonder that everyday at Highways and Transport you find the technical officers leaving, and in the Police Force you have resignations every minute. Young people are afraid to enter the Civil Service; they enter just to get a couple of dollars for the time being sandwiching themselves between the high cost of living and the talk that cheap labour is better than no labour at all. I regret that this state of affairs has taken place in this country under this Government's administration, and the Prime Minister has the audacity to come in here and say to them today that he has never sat in their house with them as if he is Saint Peter. You are the most dishonest creature I have ever met.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, no! That must be withdrawn immediately.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I withdraw the remark. You do not have to sweat yourself up. I withdraw the remark that the Prime Minister is the most dishonest person I have ever met.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member then must not repeat what he is purporting to have withdrawn.

Mr. CRAIG: It is still the opinion of many people too. I have to support this Order because it is an Order which is going to create jobs for young people, and I know the conditions under which they are living, and one must expect them after leaving school and growing into adult life to look with a ray of hope to the future, and if this is their choice under the administration of the present Government, they have my greatest and deepest sympathy. It is no wonder that when we had the Hilton Hotel built by the Public Works Department that there was such mismanagement of that department.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow a discussion on that cannot arise under this Resolution. I regard it as irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: What is irrelevant? I am only asking for your guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: My guidance is that a discussion on the accounting of the Hilton Hotel does not properly come within the purview of this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not dealing with the accounting; I am dealing with the building of the Hilton Hotel by the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: But that cannot arise under this Resolution. That is my view and I regard it as irrelevant.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, may I draw this to your attention? You have ruled me out of order and said that it is irrelevant to draw to the attention of the Government that the Public Works built the Hilton Hotel, and the Public Works is a Government organisation. You have told me, Sir, that I cannot speak of Civil Servants from the Public Works with respect to the Hilton Hotel. If you so rule, I shall bow to Your Honour's Ruling, but therefore I should be able to speak then on the Civil Servants who built the Hospital or the Financial building if I have Your Honour's ruling. If I cannot speak about the building of the Hilton Hotel by Civil Servants from the Public Works, therefore I cannot speak on the Financial Building that was built by the same Civil Servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not specify or deal with the building of any whether it is the Hilton Hotel, the Financial Building or any such thing under this Resolution. It is irrelevant to this Resolution whether we should increase the number of public servants employed in the Public Service of this Island.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is coming pretty close to lunch time and I am going to lunch with you, Mr. Speaker, but I shall take this up outside with you on your ruling, or as you always warn hon. members, in your Chambers, remembering clearly that you ruled that I could not under this Order speak about the Civil Servants and the administration of Government in the building of Seawell Airport, the Hilton Hotel, the Financial Building or the Port. I will bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I shall take this matter up with you in Chambers. I am not going to allow you to ask me to leave this Chamber. I shall take this matter up with you at lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let all hon. members understand that I am not to be interrupted during my luncheon period.

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

THE LAW OF PROPERTY (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is a very short legal matter here about mortgages and the principle of tacking, and I wonder if we can dispose of this because I have made a certain promise to the House about next Tuesday and I want to be able to fulfil that engagement. I would like to deal with this Bill which gives the Banks authority to tack on a subsequent mortgage. If you borrowed $10,000 and somebody has a second mortgage of $5,000 and you wanted another $3,000, you can tack on the $3,000 to the $10,000. *(Asides)* No, they cannot do it now. They can do it in England under the 1925 legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member moving that this be the next Order of the Day?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 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: Order No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the law in force in Barbados relating to notice in respect of transfer or creation of legal estates and changes by way of legal or equitable mortgage and to the priority of mortgages.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members would look at Clause 4 of the Bill which is very simple, mortgagors have been experiencing a great deal of difficulty. Let us say they were buying a building or bought one, they would get, using simple figures, a mortgage of $10,000 from a commercial bank or from the finance corporation. Then at the time when they did this or subsequently they get a second mortgage, then they may find they need additional money to carry out extensions and the only person who is prepared to lend them money would be the bank who is the first mortgagee. Well this gives the first mortgagee the right to tack on the second mortgage, and in section 4 to secure priority over the second mortgagee who has probably declined or is not in a position to make further advances.
2.15 p.m.

You probably have heard of cases like this where the banks would say they are willing to give you another $5,000 but they have a greater sum in the building than the second mortgagee and if they can tack on the amount - they call it tacking in the law. It was dealt with in the 1925 legislation of the United Kingdom, and what we are doing is bringing our law up to date, but in the United Kingdom you can tack on - let us say, the third mortgage to the first mortgage, and the third mortgage together with the first would take priority over the second mortgage, and the second mortgagee is deemed to have notice of this. The hon. member said it is to restrict the right; you have to do certain matters so that they would be deemed to have notice, but right now in Barbados the man who lends the money first and has a first mortgage on the property, if he wants to make a further advance to you after you have got a second mortgage, whether the second mortgagee is in a position to give him more money or not, the point is that he has said he cannot give you any more money because that has to go on the second mortgage, you go to the bank which had the first mortgage and they say that if they have the right to tack on they will then give you the money. This is all dealt with in the 1925 English Act.

If the hon. member says it is restricting in the sense that section 3 provides - section 3 states:

Recording in the Registration Office to be notice.

3.(1) The recording in the Registration Office of any instrument transferring, agreeing to transfer or creating a legal estate or a charge by way of legal or equitable mortgage shall be deemed to constitute actual notice of the transfer of, agreement to transfer or creation of the legal estate or the charge to all persons and for all purposes whatsoever, as from the date when the instrument is recorded.

What we are saying is that if you go into the Registry and register the second mortgage - a mortgage is really a transfer of legal estate, because the legal estate goes to the mortgagee and the mortgagor who is the man borrowing the money has the equity of redemption. As long as you file it in the Registry then that is deemed to be notice to the second mortgagee but nobody else, that there is to be a further advance. Frequently you find that there is an agreement made between the bank and the man who is building the house that when necessary, on the bank's examination of everything, of course, your books and so on, they will advance you a subsequent loan and the present position is that although there is such an agreement, unless you specifically give notice to the second mortgagee, the second mortgagee would take a priority to that agreement although that agreement anteceded the advancement of the money by the second mortgagee.

This really makes it easier for the borrowers to get more money when they need it. This is now in line with the 1925 legislation in England which we should have had a long time ago and we have investigated and we are satisfied that it would actually assist house owners and house builders in securing further advances. *(Asides)* It is a question of notice, that although you may do it, the banks have discovered that the second mortgagee will still have priority over them, because you have an agreement with a person when you need more money he will advance it to you, then you get a second mortgage probably paying a higher percentage, then you can tack it on to the first mortgagee because you want to build an extension, and the second mortgagee says that because he is the second mortgagee he is not going to risk any more money on any extension, but he is in the position now that any money advanced by anybody else for the extension, say, to the building, that he, the second mortgagee, although he did not lend you the money, has priority over the man who helped you to extend the building, but you may have had an agreement with the first mortgagee for further advances.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Why should the second mortgagee have the priority when at the time of the loan the place only had a certain value?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The first person that you approach - if you want to build a house for $20,000 - is invariably a bank because they will give you money before the building is completed, but they are not going to lend you to the limit. I can give you a practical illustration of what it will cost to build a

house plus the little money you may save. They are only going to give you a certain amount on the understanding that when the house is completed and you have no overruns in your construction costs they will consider a further loan. Now you have gone, say, to Plantations Limited and the house has taken six months to build; Plantations Limited have given you stuff and they may have got judgment, not in the sense that they will sue you, but a judgment or bill of sale or something like that; that is registered. When the house is completed, Plantations Limited is not a money lender, they say they will give you a year or 18 months to pay off for the materials they have supplied, but they have no security or they might have a legal or equitable deed on the property. The bank now says that you need another $10,000, you already have and you want some more money, they agreed to lend you a certain amount and they only lent you a part of it, but now somebody else has come in between, so what this Bill provides for is that as long as that second advance has a lien or an equitable mortgage or legal second mortgage, but it could only be equitable because the whole of the legal estate is already on the first mortgagee, so he has an equitable mortgage which ranks after the first mortgage then, the first mortgagee is willing to advance $10,000 now the house is completed to pay for the contractors and so on, but although they had an agreement with you and although it has been registered there is not clear in the law that their $30,000 ranks in front all the money that you got from Plantations Limited, and the banks are now doing mortgages, whereas in Barbados eight or ten years ago they did not go in for mortgages, but they are the people now who are in a position to advance further money and are willing to advance it, and we call this tacking.

I think the hon. member appreciates the point because several representations have been made to us even by practitioners on the other side that this should be put on the same footing as the English legislation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the passing of this second reading, this is simply bringing in line the local conveyancing practice with what has obtained in England since 1925. The doctrine of tacking should be very well known to Solicitors and some Barristers who do conveyancing and real property and equity, but most unfortunately many of them are not fully conversant with real property or conveyancing as such, some of the hardest branches of the law.
2.25 p.m.

The doctrine of tacking is a well-established doctrine which protects the first mortgagee provided certain things are complied with and set out in the document itself when it is drawn up in the first instance. Provided you have notice and provided there is a clause for further advances, in such cases the first mortgagee is protected and allowed to grant further advances and be protected. He has a right to be protected. Everything depends on how the document is drawn up. Even if he makes two or three advances the money will be protected in totality. This is nothing controversial; it is a simple matter being brought into line with English practice that obtained in England since 1925, and we are now bringing it here in 1971. It is a long established practice in England which Barbados, after all of these years, is only bringing now.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: If there is a slump, what happens?

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I agree with this Bill. The position is very simple. If you have a legal mortgage of property, the mortgagee has the title deed so a second mortgagee can only be an equitable mortgagee because he will have no title deeds. It is registered; he cannot have his title deeds, because he already has a legal mortgage on it. He would then have to enquire why you do not have your title deeds. When you do not have title deeds, he tells you to get a mortgage; he looks at the mortgage and sees that the first mortgagee is under an obligation to give a further advance. That is the point, and this is exactly what we get in Barbados. This helps to facilitate a landowner who wants to go in for what is called "a sharing arrangement" with somebody who wants to build a hotel on his land. He wants to see the man start putting up the hotel; he has the first mortgage, and he has agreed for a Bank to come in and take over.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the objects and reasons you will see that the second mortgagee can only be at a disadvantage if the first mortgagee has made an arrangement, and it is a binding obligation to do so, or if he has no notice. The question of notice. could never arise in Barbados, because he is bound to have notice. The last point is whether or not he has such notice, where the mortgagee imposes an obligation on him to make such advances. The object of this is to make it clear that where you have a first mortgage and the man agrees to lend you more money - nobody can predict the true cost of a building in Barbados no matter who he is - he wants priority because he was the person who started the ball rolling.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing I have against this Bill is that if you are going to introduce these sections of the Law of Property Bill then the other sections about abolition of joint tenancy, tenants in common and so on will have to be brought in. You will also have to stop this nonsense about transferring the legal estate, and let us have a simple document. I saw one in New York the other day. Let us have a simple document to show that a man owns property; he executes a simple charge and is entitled to a first mortgage. The English Law of Property Act also says that, too. You can have a mortgage by way of charge. All of these covenants that they write in mortgages should be in the Act. They should tell you if the land is sold what your remedies are. Today all of this is costing us money, because we are photostating all of these documents. The paper that we waste in photostating additional covenants, which has no right in there and which ought to be in the

laws of Barbados, would be saved. It is costing people money, because a 9-page document has no right to be photostated with a mortgage. Mr. Speaker, you could have all of that in an Act. You can say so long as you use the word mortgagee you would have certain powers, and so long as you use the word mortgagor you have certain obligations. Let us do a thorough job, and do not let us do things piecemeal.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse everything the learned Leader of the Opposition has said, if I may give him his title in view of the speech which has just been made. To some extent I am satisfied that this Bill will prevent the possibility of these elaborate frauds with a second mortgagee that you could carry out by getting somebody to take out an alleged third mortgage and then to buy out the first mortgagee, and then the existing doctrine of tacking would allow you to exclude the second mortgagee from ever getting his money. You can give a third mortgage to a friend; you only have enough money to pay the first mortgage; your friend then buys the first mortgage and he then becomes the first mortgagee not only for the amount of the first mortgage, but for the amount of the second mortgage as well, leaving the second mortgagee to get no money at all. That is the law of Barbados as it is at present. I have no doubt that there are some people who would be so advised if they found themselves in a situation so wide that they could take this step of fraud on the second mortagee. I am quite satisfied that that particular right is going to be abolished by this Bill.

I would like to add to what the Leader of the Opposition has said about bringing some more of the Law of Property Act, 1925, into force. He may not have mentioned it, but I know that it will be very restrictive on lawyers' fees. It is time that the outmoded doctrines of law like joint tenancy and tenants-in-common were modernised. The Leader of the Opposition recently, I believe, had an enormous case in St. Vincent dealing with a portion of the Island of Bequia, which turned upon the difference between a general tenancy and a tenancy-in-common. I do not wish to deprive those who may come to succeed him in practising at the Bar in another few months of the possibility of making some money, but nonethe-less progress cannot be hindered. The Prime Minister, the Attorney General and others will have to satisfy themselves to make money out of some avenue other than the antiquity of the land law of Barbados. He has mentioned those, Sir. There are a lot of simple things in the Law of Property Act which long ago should have been made part of the law of Barbados. Why should people have to depend on a 200-year-old statute of fraud for the rules that a contract for the sale of land must be in writing? That should have been in our Law of Property Act, and I deplore this piecemeal approach to law reform in so important a part of the law as the law of property.

I am inclined to think, Sir, that what has happened is that the banks, the persons who have a great voice in this Island in these days, are finding difficulty in getting adequate advice or, indeed, not wanting to pay for proper advice in respect of mortgages. I feel, although I am not commenting on any matter that is sub judice, that the banks have been making mistakes in interpreting the Rate of Interest Act and in interpreting the law of mortgages in Barbados. I think that they do not always get the best legal advice, and they tend to advise themselves on the basis of what the law is in Great Britain or Canada without paying strict attention to what the law is in Barbados. I have no doubt that it is pressure from the banks that have got this little piece of the Law of Property Act to be made a part of the Law of Barbados. I would like to offer this word of warning to the Prime Minister. Before now I have said that he takes too easily the advice of those who tell him that the banks say this and the banks say that.

2.35 p.m.

As you would know, I have just represented the Parliament of Barbados being one of the delegates at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. I have always been interested in how the Bermudans have managed to maintain so thriving and flourishing a commercial economy without any foreign banks. There are no foreign banks in Bermuda. All banks that have been set up in Bermuda must have 60 per cent of the capital owned in Bermuda, and 60 per cent of the directors must be Bermudans, and beneficially owned, not owned like Cayman Islands companies. The Prime Minister would know what I mean by that. There are other banks which have come into Bermuda besides the traditional Bermudan banks and the Bank of Butterfield. There are in fact three others, and it is said that there is foreign money behind them; but on the face of it, they are Bermudan banks with 60 per cent of the capital owned right there in Bermuda.

Now the maximum rate of interest in Bermuda, rich place though it is, is 7 per cent and deposit accounts attract only 4 per cent in the Bermuda banks. So when I hear that, I have to a large extent to reject the argument, that we hear down here, about how money will run away from Barbados if we do not turn the rate of interest free. The Bermudan owned native banks are happy to conduct their business on the basis of 7 per cent and Bermuda is a completely mortgaged economy. There are no wooden houses in Bermuda. Everybody has to build a stone house, if he wants to live in it if he can find somewhere, and 100 per cent mortgages I am informed on house properties are by no means unusual in Bermuda at 6 1/2 per cent. I would like the Prime Minister therefore when banks put pressure on him the next time for something like this or something like the Rate of Interest Act to sit back if he is still in office and have a look and see whether the pressure is justified. *(Asides)* I am using "if" now according to the heckler because the banks may try to put pressure on the Prime Minister between now the election. They know they cannot put any pressure on us; so they may try to put on what pressure they can between now and the next couple of weeks, months or days as the case may be.

There is one last point I will make very briefly. I do not know if members of the Government are

aware that the definition of "property" has been adopted in full and that this Bill will now make it possible to mortgage personal property as well. In other words, as I understand it, Bills of Sale over motor cars and so on are likely to take effect as mortgages. "Mortgage" includes any charge or lien on any property for securing money or money's worth"; and "property" includes anything in action and any interest in real or personal property". As I understand it now, all those who borrow money from the banks on chattel houses and so on are going to have to look to registering these mortgages under this Act. There may be some nice legal points as to the interplay between the Housing Act, the Bills of Sale Act, the Chattel Buildings Mortgage Act and so on and this particular Act here, and I do not think the draftsmen have altogether considered it. No doubt some lawyers will have to consider it when the time comes, but the House may also have to consider it at some future stage, but subject to that the Opposition is happy to see the law advanced in this way.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, 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 Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time, passed, its title read and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO VEST LAND IN THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 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.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is a very short Resolution to vest in the Industrial Development Corporation three parcels of land situate at Wildey in the parish of St. Michael.

As hon. members well know, we are rapidly running out of land on which to build factories. We have water restriction zones in this Island which prevent us from going into areas where land appears to be suitable, but because of the restrictions which have been imposed as a result of the Tulstrom Report that we are unable to build. There are very few areas within a reasonable distance of the heavily populated districts, the catchment area from which we draw our labour force.

2.45 p.m.

We had the foresight some few years ago when the House approved of a Resolution to purchase Wildey Plantation, and there is a comprehensive plan being drawn up now for Wildey Plantation, and part of the area has been allocated for industrial development, and as Your Honour is aware, part has been allocated for housing and part for agriculture. There are already two corporations, one a private one, the Barbados Dairy Industries, and the other a public corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, sited close to this land which is the subject of this Resolution. I should just like to make a slight correction, that that land originally was land which was vested in the Housing Authority itself.

There is just one slight change, and I am looking for the amendment. In this Resolution there is an area of land which has been reserved for the Caribbean Development Bank, and this is at the back of one of these parcels which have been delineated in the Schedule. We would like to take out from the Resolution the parcel of land immediately to the west of the parcel which has been reserved for the Caribbean Development Bank, some three or four acres have been reserved, and that parcel is parcel (c):

(c) ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land situate at Wildey in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island, containing by admeasurement 25 Acre 1 Rood 37 Perches or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on other lands of the Government of Barbados now leased to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, on other lands of the Government of Barbados on lands of General Traders Limited and Ward *et al*, on a private road 16 feet wide and on the public road or however else the same may abut and bound.

Part of this parcel has already been built on; I have the amendment here. I am sorry, Sir, it has occurred to me that the amendment has not been sent and it is in relation to the last parcel of land, parcel (c) in which there is already a very large textile factory on part of this land but it has not been vested in the I.D.C. so they will now in turn have to arrange the leases with the new textile plant, but the whole of this land is not at the moment being vested. I regretfully have to move, until members have the amendment, that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 4.00 p.m. on Friday, 23rd July, 1971.

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

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

2.52 p.m.