
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

Friday, 23rd July, 1971.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 4.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S.,
(*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA,
(*Minister of Health and Social Welfare*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR,
C.M.G., M.A., (*Leader of the House*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN,
J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications
and Works*); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE,
J.P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P.; (*Chairman of Committees*);
Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Friday, 9th July, 1971, have, I understand, been duly circulated. In absence of any objections.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have observed that there are a few places in these Minutes where, to anyone who is familiar with the use of English, it would appear as if the word (Esquire) forms the surname to most hon. members referred to in these Minutes. I suggest that we defer confirmation of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will defer consideration of the Minutes, and I suggest that the hon. member should discuss the matter with the Clerk.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to amend the note to Item 13 of Head 19 - Barbados Regiment.

Also on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Hire-Purchase Act, 1959.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Hire-Purchase Act, 1959, be now read a first time.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is yet time for Private Members' Business which will continue up to 4.30 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 17 be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE ERECTION OF A SOCIAL CENTRE AND PAVILION FOR RESI- DENTS OF NEW ORLEANS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 17 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and it is

to move the passing of a Resolution requesting the Government to take immediate steps to erect a social centre and pavilion so that the residents of New Orleans may have all the accepted and available recreational facilities for their use.

When this matter was last discussed on the 22nd June, 1971, the hon. senior member for St. James concluded his speech.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business has expired.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Order No. 21 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, Order No. 21 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Public Order Act, 1970 (1970-15).

PUBLIC ORDER (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend Section 29(1) of the Public Order Act, 1970. It is a very short Bill. It seeks to delete the word "eleven" where it appears in Section 29 and to insert the word "twelve". That Section provides that no loudspeaker equipment may be used after the hour of eleven o'clock for the purpose of a public meeting. It is felt that the hour of eleven o'clock is too early and, therefore, we have been prompted to bring this amendment so that the time may be extended to twelve o'clock. It does not in any way interfere with the principles of the Bill, which was recently passed by the Government. I do not think the Government will object to this amendment, since it does not in any way alter the principles of the Bill.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that. The reasons for bringing this Bill have been well set out by the mover, and I think that anyone who has had experience with public meetings in this country will appreciate the difficulties under which people have to operate now with the restriction of the use of loudspeaker equipment to eleven o'clock. All that this Bill seeks to do, is to allow a reasonable extension of time, and I trust that this will commend itself to the other side.

4.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we on this side are really very sorry we cannot accommodate hon. members opposite. The amendment itself is in order, but we feel that the Public Order Act has only been on the Statute Book for a little more than a year and so far as we know it is working satisfactorily. And in any case the law as passed by this House, indeed by Parliament, applies to everybody, and much as we would sometimes like to be able to use loudspeaker after eleven o'clock, we have to obey the law and we are happy to do so. For these reasons we do not think we would be justified in accepting this amendment and we shall have to divide the House on it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the introducer wants us to believe that 11 o'clock is too early to stop using loudspeaking equipment. Sir, meetings are generally scheduled to start at 8 o'clock, but sometimes when 9 o'clock they have not started. Now there is nothing to prevent anyone who intends to hold a public meeting especially in the country from starting at 7 o'clock and ending at 11 o'clock. It would be the same as if you started at 8 o'clock and ended at 12 o'clock, but 12 o'clock in my opinion is really too late if you are going to give consideration to the people who have to work next day and need a rest, because the loudspeaking equipment would keep them awake until 12 o'clock. If you go to the country now and ask the people whether they would prefer to start a meeting at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock, I am sure that you will get the majority voting for 7 o'clock. Some of the people who attend meetings walk some distance and they have to leave and go back home, but they may want to listen to hear everything that is being said and done. I notice that meetings are now advertised to start at 7.30 p.m. which formerly started at 8 p.m.; so there is nothing to prevent anyone from starting at 7 o'clock.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, if it is desirable to do this matter for another few minutes, I believe it would be appropriate now to move an extension.

I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now extended for ten minutes

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that sometimes when 11 o'clock the speaker is only speaking to about three or four people, but the loudspeaking equipment is still blasting. These few people have a reason for waiting; but I cannot agree to extend the time to 12 o'clock. Four hours is sufficient time for any meeting if you are going to talk sense, but if you are going to talk rubbish and all sorts of foolishness, by all means you need the whole night, because you can find time to talk all foolishness especially when you are resorting to lies and you can do your own thing the whole night, but if you are going to speak the truth and tell

the people something they would really like to know, I believe one speaker can do it in half an hour. As soon as you are going to get tearing, ranting and cursing and where this person was born and what he does, you will take up the time and prevent the other speakers who would be in a position to speak in such language that the people would know what to do and whom to vote for from coming on. I am not in favour of the extension to 12 o'clock. The meeting can be held from 7 o'clock until 11 o'clock.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN - 4.

NOES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. SMITH - 8.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND INCOME TAX ACT, 1968

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 19 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

(Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We have to take a vote on that.)

Mr. St. JOHN: This is Private Members' Time and the Leader of the House cannot dictate what item of Private Members' Business is to be dealt with. Do you want to be able to control Government Business and Private Members' Business? Do you want to be able to dictate what we should say and should not say? What kind of democracy do you believe in? I submit that if you as Speaker understand, and I know you understand, the rights of an Opposition, you should not allow the Government to ram it down the throats of this House to dictate the pace and the way Private Members' Business is being dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to face the fact that if a motion is made and seconded, that motion has to be put.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am not finished speaking yet. It is positively clear that from the time this Resolution was brought to this House the Leader of the House decided in his mind that he was going to use every obstructive tactic imaginable to prevent the debating of this Resolution, and the object of this Resolution is to let the Government know and understand that what we have been saying for a long period of time is that the time has come when this discriminatory attitude in relation to taxation between husband and wife should come to an end. You will remember that when this Resolution was brought to the House, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House tried to obstruct it and asked for a ruling from you and you have said it was proper and in order. Now

we are doing Private Members' Business, the Leader of the House wants to dictate to this side what item should be dealt with, but common courtesy demands if you believe in the Parliamentary system that for that short period of time which is allocated to Private Members' Business in the course of a day's proceedings, it is completely within the discretion of Private Members and no other Private Member in here can ask for any other business to be done.

4.35 p.m.

Of course the Leader of the House decides in his mind that he does not want this done. I want the public to understand the obstructive tactics of the Leader of the House, and this is all part and parcel of the Government's programme. Day after day we have come in here and the Government deliberately did not come back to form a quorum so that we could deal with these matters; this happened some five or six times and they got into the habit so much that it happened even with Government Business. Whether they use their majority or not the basic point is this, that we are going to insist that today it will be known that it is the Leader of the House who obstructed the voice of the House on this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not really raise his indignation on so minor a matter at all; all I am saying is that if an hon. member moves a motion and it is seconded by another hon. member, the motion has to be put to the vote, that is all.

The question that order No. 21 be the next order of the Day was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES: Hon'bles. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA and G. G. FERGUSSON; Messrs. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J. W. CORBIN, R. StC. WEEKES and W. R. LOWE - 8

AYES: Messrs. C. L. BOLDEN, W. C. B. HINDS, ELLIOTT MOTTLEY, H. B. St. JOHN and L. E. SMITH - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member intimate that which he now seeks to deal with?

Mr. St. JOHN: I will leave that to you and the Hon. Leader of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the extended time for Private Members' Business has expired; accordingly Government Business is the instant Order of the Day.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve under section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960 the expenditure of \$10,854 to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1971-72 Part I - Current of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - 2 PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval under section 10 of the Harbours Act to supplement Item 57 and Item 59 of Head 102. The reasons are clearly set out in the Addendum why this money is required. The Addendum reads as follows:

Item 57

A re-vote of \$6,000 is required to pay for a spare conical buoy for the Port Department. Provision for this was included in the last year's Estimates but the buoy was not completed in time for payment to be made during that financial year.

Item 59

The sum of \$4,854 is required to provide toilet facilities to a Mechanical Workshop at the Port Department and to make final payment in respect of the cost of construction of a Salt-Meat Shed. The amount (\$1,333.45) was retained against possible defects of workmanship on the construction of the building.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister would undoubtedly be in a position to tell us if the buoy was being constructed locally or if it was being imported.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member giving way?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir, I am giving way to the Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The buoy was built locally but it was not satisfactorily completed in time for payment to be made during the financial year. Mr. Speaker, they are using fibre glass as a protection on the metal buoys from corrosion and they are also using steel hulls to prevent the salt water from corroding it, because it has been found to be more resistant and a lot of the former buoys that were imported are being coated with fibre glass as a resistant against the salt water because fibre glass stands up much better. We have also started to make our own buoys because a lot of money has been spent in importing buoys, so that if anything is needed urgently and we have the materials here we then can meet local requirements for them. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister has answered my question. Is the buoy made locally, or is it imported?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: It is a locally made buoy, but I am giving you the reason for what has

taken place. We have been using fibre glass on some of the old buoys imported to stop electrolysis and the wear on the iron.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the Acting Leader of the House to intimate that which he proposes next to deal with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether hon. members have been circulated with Item 3 on the Order Paper. It deals with the proposed lease of a parcel of land at School Gap, Westbury Road, to Mr. Marville. I do not think that hon. members have received their copies. Notice of this Resolution was given on the 20th July, 1971. (Mr. HINDS: "I have my copy.") If hon. members do not have their copies, I would not attempt to proceed with the matter. It is a slight matter. It is a small parcel of land which was acquired at the building of President Kennedy's Drive abutting this gentleman's place which cannot be beneficially used by the Government and which can be of use to him. It is proposed to rent it to him at a reasonable rental. Everything is set out clearly. It will be beneficially used by a good citizen of this Island.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, he must move what is the Instant Order of the Day. It cannot be done like that; he has to move the Resolution properly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am quite aware of that.

RESOLUTION RE PROPOSED LEASE OF LAND TO MR. MARVILLE

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES, Mr. LOWE, and Mr. SMITH - 8.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the "Ayes" have it. Now, Item No. 3 is the Instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Health, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of a parcel of land at School Gap, Westbury Road, to Mr. Fred Marville.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this Resolution relates to the lease of a parcel of land as set out in the Schedule. All that certain piece or parcel of land situate at School Gap, Westbury Road, in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island containing by admeasurement 3,195 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on the public Road School Gap, formerly Seafield Gap: on other lands of the Barbados Government, and on lands of James Smith or however else the same may abut and bound. This proposed lease is for a period of twenty-one years at the rate of twenty-four dollars per annum.

This is a parcel of land which was acquired in the building of the - (*Asides*) It is at the School Gap and it is part of the old Westbury Girls' School. I have plans here, and if hon. members would like to see them I would be quite willing to pass them around. (Mr. St. JOHN: "Pass them around.") It is a piece of land which the Government does not have any need for, and it can be more beneficially used by this person.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this area of land 3,195 square feet, is to be leased for twenty-one years at a fixed rate of twenty-four dollars per annum for the entire period. I would like to know what influenced the Government in deciding to lease it for twenty-one years at a fixed rate of twenty-four dollars per annum for the entire period. There is no suggestion here that the rental would be reviewed every five or ten years as the case might be.

Now, I remember not so long ago that the Hon. Mover of this Resolution tried to make out to this House that the price of land, in his view, was arrived at bearing in mind the relation to the use for which it would be put. I do not share that view. 4.55 p.m.

Sir, the Addendum here states that the plot of land is to be leased to Mr. Fred Marville as a house spot. Now, Sir, can the Minister tell us if this spot of land is to house a supermarket or some sort of business? The Addendum says that this land was formerly under the control of the Ministry of Education. I wonder under whose control it is now. Is it part of the lands on which the Westbury Girls' School stands? I do suppose you will agree I cannot make very great progress at this point in the absence of a plan, and it is somewhat shocking to find that three very senior Ministers of Government cannot up to this moment find a plan. I am to wonder if the interest of the public would not best be served if I were to move at this point that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed, and I do so formally move.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. Peter

because to me it appears shocking that three Ministers of Government cannot find one little plan, and it has taken the House half an hour to find a plan. It just shows the general incompetence of the other side.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed, was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY and Mr. St. JOHN - 4.

NOES: Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. CORBIN; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. SMITH - 10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter therefore remains under consideration.

Mr. HINDS: There can be nothing more shocking and disgraceful than the attitude adopted by the Government in circulating to hon. members on this side a fraudulent plan.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member cannot get in here and accuse the Government of fraud, and I am asking him to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see two hon. members on their feet. I do not deem the expression "a fraudulent plan" to contravene the Standing Orders.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the plan that has been circulated to this side of the House bears no relation whatever to the Resolution before the House at this moment, and we are still awaiting Government to be able to carry on with the debate on this matter. After all, if you have three Government Ministers devoting all their time, skills and energies to finding a copy of a plan of an area of 8,374 square feet from which an amount of 3,195 square feet are to be leased..... the plan that has been circulated is a plan of properties likely to be affected by construction of an access road into the northern end of the Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I am sure that I sat here and heard the hon. member speak on this already. He sat and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown started to speak. How can the hon. member speak again? We are not in Committee. I am asking for a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shouting at me has no effect whatsoever.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is the only way you can understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate that the hon. member can understand.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this parcel of land to which the Resolution relates.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on a point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have asked for a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. junior member for Christ Church say he had risen on a point of order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to await the ruling of Your Honour.

Mr. HINDS: Await what ruling? Must the Speaker rule on your incompetence?
5.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Await what ruling, a ruling of incompetence? Must the Speaker rule on your incompetence? Mr. Speaker, we do not want the hon. member who moved this Resolution rising on a point of order to read the Schedule to us, we want the plan for the land which we are supposed to debate in this Resolution. This plan which has been circulated to us bears such names as C. Preddie, Timothy Emtage, Douglas Reece.

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

Mr. HINDS: Elsie Beckles, G. Mason, Bertha Flemming.

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

Mr. HINDS: Brewster's Tenantry, G. Mason, Joseph Forde, Fitzgerald Morris and Janet Griffith. A 14 foot wide road is also shown on the plan.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet; will both hon. members sit? I will give my ruling on this point. The motion was that further consideration be postponed; had that motion been successful on another occasion when further consideration was resumed the hon. member would be entitled to resume. In view of the lack of success of that motion, the fact that that motion has been negatived, it is my ruling that the hon. member may not now speak again on the Resolution. I want this to be made perfectly clear, that the ruling is not actuated by any noise from either side.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, for some time we have been in this House insisting that when Resolutions come before the House dealing with disposal of Government property that the other side is under an obligation to bring a plan to the House. Common decency necessitates that this be done because if it is their habit on the other side to sit down and approve of matters which they do not understand the implications of, it is not the habit of this side. A plan should have been circulated; while the hon. member was introducing it a document was circulated and there is nothing on this plan which shows any relationship to the subject matter of the Resolution which is before us. It is for that reason that the hon. member moved that further consideration be postponed be-

cause he was being unfairly asked to deal with a Resolution when all the documents had not been properly circulated and I just want to make this positively clear.

A habit has crept up in here that the Government, aided and abetted by the Officer responsible, is bringing down matters and giving people too little time to look at them, and you, Mr. Speaker, should stop it, you have it in your power to see that the documents are circulated within a reasonable time. Mr. Speaker, you can always adjourn the House and bring us back in here every day, but some sort of regularity has got to be introduced in here. How is it they can circulate a plan which is the plan used when they were acquiring land as long ago as 1950 or 1961 when the Deep Water Harbour was being built? Look at this plan, a dirty piece of paper, who but a pig would want to use this? That is an insult to Parliamentarians to send a nasty looking plan in here; what kind of department do you have up there who would send a plan that you cannot read anything on it? You accept that kind of third class work and expect to bring it in here for us to accept as well?

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness and having regard to what is circulated which nobody with any kind of sense could accept, and agree to, when not even the terms of the lease are included or what other aspects of Government land will be affected, how can we be expected to vote for this? There is absolutely nothing in the Addendum to indicate anything about the rent; what are the covenants? Who is the next door person? What business does he wish to carry on if he wishes to carry on a business? The other side just decides that because they have the majority we must accept everything they bring; they can use the majority and have this Resolution passed but it is going to pass over protest in here because all those unfair things that are done in this House have got to come to an end.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, we have asked for a copy of the plan which relates to the Resolution which is now before the House. Unfortunately I had to spend some time doing surveying, and I have been searching this plan from the time it was handed over here, and from what I know of surveying I know that every plan should have some sort of definition where one can pinpoint the various areas from a master plan. I do not know if this was intended to be a master plan of the area but there is nothing on it which shows the old Westbury School, School Gap or the lands of James Smith, and it is impossible for any member of the other side to indicate to this House where the Old Westbury School is, where James Smith's land is or where the Government's land is. It is true that this is not the plan, so when the hon. junior member for St. Peter says it is fraudulent I agree with him in that sense, and I would ask the Minister to withdraw it at this stage until members of this side have had an opportunity to look at the correct plan, because if one should read the Addendum carefully, it says:

The land described in the Schedule forms part of the area of 8,374 square feet formerly under the control of the Ministry of Education when used as the old Westbury Girls' School it is unsuitable for educational purposes.

The Addendum itself does not make sense, what is unsuitable for educational purposes? Is it the old Westbury Girls' School or the piece of land which is 8,374 square feet?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, it is part of that area. There are two areas, one of 3,195 and then there is another of 1,600 square feet. (Asides) I am just explaining it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, it makes it even more stupid, complicated and difficult, because now you hear of two pieces which are supposed to have been taken out of the 8,374 square feet, so we are now deep down in a maze, even the Minister cannot find his way out.

5.15 p.m.

I wonder if he knows how he got into it. What are the plans of the Government for the school, or the area on which the school stands? If you are going to lease out this portion of land for twenty-one years, what are the plans in relation to this portion? What will happen if Government needs to develop the area and finds itself hamstrung with a twenty-one-year-old lease? Where is the plan to show how it is located in respect of other Government property? Where is the area indicated on the plan which has been handed to us? These are things, Mr. Speaker, which we must know before we can agree to the Resolution.

Now, the Addendum itself makes no sense. It states that it is unsuitable for educational purposes. Is it the school? Is it the land? Which is it?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the file. If the hon. member knows what is in the file that is a matter for him. The total area of the land at School Gap, which had been formerly under the control of the Ministry of Education, was 8,374 square feet and comprised two spots of 3,195 square feet each and one spot of 1,984 square feet. That is the land we are talking about.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us what is going to happen to the other area of 3,195 square feet? What is going to happen to the 1,982 square feet? What is going to happen to the 1600 square feet to which he referred a minute ago? Where are your plans to show how these things relate? If the Minister would be so good as to tell me where I can find the proposed areas on this plan, I would be in a better position to make my contribution to the Resolution. If the Minister can show me the four lots of land on this plan, I should be very pleased. If the Minister can tell me where I would find School Gap on this plan, I may be able to work out things for myself.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, there are four plans here. These are obviously the plans for the changing over of the road after the Deep Water Harbour was put in, which includes properties owned by W. K. Fergusson, Allan Bourne, Holborn, the Hill's property, passing through Westbury Road and Husband's Gap and going right out to Eagle Hall. These are plans showing the properties that were likely to be affected and this area is included. There is no direct plan of the particular area, but there is a plan of the overall area which included that very area in Westbury Road that was likely to be affected.

Mr. Speaker, this spot has been vacant for very many years. It is a spot where the old Westbury Girls' School used to be and it was disposed of for several years. There were School Gap, Pounder's Gap, Branch Gap which reached part of Holborn's property of which a large part was used up by the building of the road. There is no direct plan of the specific area of the School Gap. There are four sheets of the plans of the area leading from Fontabelle and the Deep Water Harbour up to Eagle Hall along Barbarees Hill where the road was cut.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear that the members on that side do not know what is going on. Nobody can sit down and say from a master plan of this area, which has no chain marks or anything on it, what area is involved in this particular lease. If, as the Minister has said, there are four maps which indicate the total area, it cannot then designate the area which we are supposed to deal with in this Resolution today. I submit that it is fraud upon this Assembly to pass around a map, and ask us to vote for something which is not on the map. There are no plans available.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is on the map. You can see part of Smith's property where the land is bounded.

Mr. BOLDEN: Then show it to us. There is no trace on this map.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The hon. member is a lawyer, and he can read as well as I can.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no trace on this map. It shows a 14ft road; it shows a road to the Deep Water Harbour, and the Minister knows as well as I do that School Gap is no where within that area. Westbury Girls' School is not in that area.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not the present Westbury Girls' School. It is the old Westbury Girls' School that was known as Miss Allamby's School that has been destroyed. It has not been in use for over 25 years.

Mr. St. JOHN: Let us have a proper plan.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, that makes things worse. I would like to know how they arrived at the

figure of 3,195 square feet. I would also like to know how they arrived at the four sets of figures. If there are no plans in existence, then it is obvious that the figures are guess-work. One cannot be expected to vote for a Resolution of this nature when there is nothing accurate here. We asked for a plan. If the Minister had said that no plans were available something else could have been worked out. We have been given a plan which has no relation to what we are dealing with; the Addendum to the Resolution is ambiguous because it says "it is unsuitable for educational purposes". What is unsuitable for educational purposes? Is the land unsuitable? Is the school unsuitable? What does Government propose to do with the remainder of the land? How did they work out the \$24 a year for a house spot? What are the agreements? These are things that we have to know before we can agree to a Resolution of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. If the Government intends by virtue of its majority to ram legislation through this House, then the people outside will be the judge. It would mean that you only have to draw up close under the members of the Government and anything can be done. You cannot satisfy all of the people in the electorate, and that is one thing you must remember. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "You can satisfy the majority. You never yet had a Government by minority.")
5.25 p.m.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. HOPPIN; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. SMITH - 10.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. St. JOHN and Mr. ADAMS - 5.

RESOLUTION RE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERUSSON; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. HOPPIN; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. SMITH - 10.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. St. JOHN and Mr. ADAMS - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting of three parcels of land at Wildey, St. Michael, in the Industrial Development Corporation.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am now being circulated with a document which is the subject matter of this Resolution. What kind of standards are we going to allow in this House? How can we be expected to deal with something that is now being circulated to us?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no indication of what is being circulated.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am objecting to this being done now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is probably sheer inadvertence on the part of the Clerks-at-the-Table that Your Honour was not first served with a copy of the document, but let me put the House's mind at rest on this matter. First of all I moved the motion that the Item be the next Order. Hon. members opposite in accordance with a promise earlier in the day divided the House on that. I could not circulate the document until the House had disposed of the motion. The house having disposed of the motion, I circulated the document and the hon. member has objected to it. My understanding is, because I was not present when this matter was first engaging the attention of the House, that the Resolution was moved in the House but was postponed because the Schedule was not amended, and I believe that the hon. member who dealt with it gave an undertaking that he would have the Schedule amended. I thought it would be more courteous to the House to provide the House with new clean copies of the Resolution and Schedule, and that is what they have. If the hon. member looks at the Schedule,.....

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, surely if an undertaking was given to this House that it would be circulated, why couldn't they circulate the amendment to the Schedule before we came in here? It is this sort of thing that we must object to. The Minister of Finance said the other day that he had increased the establishment by 5,000 more Civil Servants in the last ten years, and do you mean that despite that increase you cannot get these things done so that hon. members can get them before they come to the House. Are we going to sit down and accept this all the time?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I was saying, I thought I was doing a good thing, Mr. Speaker, by preparing clean copies for distribution to hon. members. It is possible that this could have been distributed earlier, but the hon. member must not think they have not been distributed because I have been holding them back. The whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that hon. members are already seised of the Resolution and I have circulated to hon. members two copies of the plan.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea that this Resolution had already been introduced, moved and seconded.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It has not been, but my understanding is that the mover on that occasion saw there was something wrong and undertook to have it corrected, but he explained it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the chief thing that is wrong with this Resolution is something that the mover and members on the other side are unwilling to put right. The chief thing that is wrong with this Resolution must surely be the administration of the Industrial Development Corporation as presently headed and constituted.

Now, Sir, I have listened with interest to two political meetings held, one of them being one of the largest public gatherings I have ever seen in this Island. You could hardly see the speaker for the Permanent Secretaries and other important officials of Government; Independence Square was covered with more cars, the Market square was packed with humanity, some of it saying what a high quality meeting, and the subject of this meeting was the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation and its Chairman.

5.35 p.m.

I suggest to hon. members that the reason why there was so enormous a crowd out to hear the Assistant Manager of the Industrial Development Corporation expose to public view the infelicities, to use a somewhat neutral expression, committed by the Chairman, the Manager and one Mr. Tudor and others.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not going to sit here and allow this to go on all the time, the Resolution is for vesting of land in the Corporation, we are not here to hear what Mr. Bailey or anybody else said. Let the hon. member stick to the Resolution. This is what you should do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I really do need any advice from either side, but I will caution the hon. member to proceed to deal with the Resolution to vest a parcel of land and not the speeches at a meeting.

Mr. ADAMS: If you please, Sir, I fear I am not in any way contesting what you say, this is the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and I have respect for the Chair. I try to behave like a gentleman in here where the Chair is concerned, and I try not to tell you how to carry out your functions, but I must to some extent refer to these speeches because until the content of those speeches is answered by Hon. Ministers I cannot vote for any Bill to put anything under Sam Ashby, that is what it is. Sir, it was stated that on premises similarly handed over and vested in the Industrial Development Corporation, it was stated by the former Assistant Manager that he was aware that the Chairman made an application in another capacity for permission to use one of the IDC's factories at Newton, Christ Church,

for the activities of a firm called one Rose & Laflamme which is listed in the telephone book under Standard Agency which is listed at the Registry as a private firm owned by Samuel Victor Ashby. It was stated at that meeting that at this factory, notwithstanding an undertaking given that a certain number of persons would be employed in this Rose & Laflamme at Newton, premises also vested in the IDC by a Resolution such as this, that notwithstanding an undertaking given as to how many people would be employed, only three people were working there and were occupying 5,000 square feet of floor space to employ three people. It was stated on that occasion by the former Assistant Manager that another factory which would have employed 120 people wanted to use the floor space occupied by Samuel Victor Ashby's business, Rose & Laflamme, and he would not give it up. Sir, there are not any circumstances under which I can vote for a Resolution to put any land in the hands of such a Corporation, not constituted as it is at present.

We do not know whether this 12 acre lot may not be turned over entirely to be occupied by further acolytes of the Chairman of the IDC. I remember hearing a Permanent Secretary at the meeting after he heard the emoluments of the Manager of the IDC described, together with his perks approaching those of a Minister, saying that he might do better in the Corporations. That represents the bad management of this Corporation which would prevent me from voting for vesting any land in it, and I believe there are other hon. members on the other side who have the interest of the workers of Barbados at heart, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Labour has seen fit to leave the House as soon as the interests of the workers are being discussed, there are yet hon. members on that side who have the interest of workers at heart and who will be shocked to know that 120 people could be working at Newton...

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I rise to correct the hon. member on a point which he made in respect of the perquisites of the Manager of the IDC. The IDC is a different nomenclature from the Development Board as it was; the Development Board when it was established was headed by a non-Barbadian, a man called Babb, whose salary was far in excess of that of a Permanent Secretary and the perquisites with it were far in excess of the perquisites of the present incumbent of the post today and that was done by the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. ADAMS: It is quite untrue that Mr. Ken Babb ever had a salary of \$1,000 a month.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I am saying with great authority that the Manager of the Development Board in the time when the Barbados Labour Party ran the Government of this country received emoluments far in excess of those of the Permanent Secretaries at the time, and the hon. member would also remember that Permanent Secretaries were even seconded to hold posts in the Development Board because of the standards which was established by the Barbados Labour Party then

in Government. We can remember Mr. C. B. Williams being appointed Manager of the same Development Board, and he got more emoluments at the time than the Permanent Secretaries were getting, so I do not see the logic in his arguments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, the hon. member has made his point.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member used a phrase for which I thank him. He said you could see the standards which were established by the former Government's Management that Permanent Secretaries were seconded to its work. Nonetheless, the hon. member is firing his guns at a target that does not exist; I said that I heard a Permanent Secretary criticising the salary paid to the Manager, I did not say whether I thought the Manager should get a greater or a lesser salary. The hon. member who has just spoken is - and I am using the phrase not in any derogatory sense - but he is extraordinary ignorant of what goes on in politics outside Barbados. I really am not saying it to insult him, but I have heard the hon. member repeatedly come in here and say that this goes on outside and so on. Anybody who is familiar with politics outside this Island is familiar with the fact that there are certain technical positions to which politicians sometimes are forced to appoint technicians, for want of a better word, and pay them many times what the politicians get.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the impression the hon. member sought to give when he first spoke on this matter is that the Manager of the Development Board ought not to receive those perquisites; he was attempting adverse criticisms of the Government, but now that it has been made clear to the hon. member that it started under the Barbados Labour Party - Babb never came to work but he still received the perquisites and the large salary - now that this has been pointed out, he begins to dance the twist.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister must not put words or judgements into my mouth. Admittedly, Sir, I believe that I can think quickly and think on my feet, but I do not think so deviously as to sit down for 10 seconds and then get up and change my direction in full flow, so to speak, I think that belongs to 1984, those who speak with two tongues at once and indeed try to speak with a third tongue out of the back of their heads sometimes. I try to talk consistently if nothing else. I have not said I have anything against Mr. King getting the money, indeed I will say this, and hon. members must believe it is sincere, that as far as criticisms of Mr. King which I heard are concerned I think they carry far less weight than the criticisms of Mr. Ashby. 5.45 p.m.

I have listened with some care, and I was familiar with the problem. I will not hide that from hon. members. I have listened with some care to the strictures, and I thought that the strictures against Mr. King carried very much less conviction. I am not against paying a man a proper salary to do a technical job for which he can command a much higher salary

outside. In this country it is believed that only politicians must get big salaries. I have heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that his view is that the Prime Minister should get a bigger salary than anybody else. I have lived in a country where a Prime Minister getting £10,000 a year, appointed a Director of ICI to a job running British Railways - running them down in fact - at £24,000 a year. I can recall a Conservative Government taking Mr. Robins from off the Labour benches and giving him a £20,000 a year job - twice as much as the Prime Minister again for running the Coal Board. It is understood that if you want a man to carry out certain administrative functions, you have to pay the rate for the job. You cannot have any dog-in-the-manager attitudes that I have seen exhibited in here that a Permanent Secretary will not respect a Minister unless the Minister gets more money than he, or you cannot have this man working in the IDC because he gets more money than a Permanent Secretary. I call those dog-in-the-manager attitudes.

I have hopes of becoming a Minister some day, Sir, but it is not the salary that is going to attract me. (*Asides*) It may be to my financial advantage if it is delayed. When I go into office, it will not worry me in the slightest that there are people in Barbados a great deal better paid than me. I have no wish to become a millionaire, Sir. I have every confidence in my ability to support myself in or out of office. I hope I will never depend on any man's favour. If I am a Minister and I get fired, I will not have to run behind anybody to beg for a job again. Sometimes you have to say these things, but I am not saying them to insult anybody. I would not wish any hon. member in this House to project his own views into any views which I care to express. If you have to pay the Manager of IDC a big salary, then do so, no matter what the Permanent Secretary says and do not jump to conclusions when you hear an argument about it. Sir, that is what I quite freely admit is an irrelevance.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so worried about the management of the IDC, but I have heard some accusations made against a member of the Board, Mr. Clement Tudor, who apparently wanted to block concessions being given to certain industrial products because he was interested..... (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "He is not related to me.") I have never heard that he was related to any member of this House, although I think that the Leader of the House would do well to make it clear to the public.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Why?

Mr. ADAMS: Well, the Leader of the House finds it necessary to say in an aside that Mr. Clement Tudor is no relative of his. If he is making it clear to hon. members, perhaps, he should make it clear to the public as well. The same reason that applies to his making it clear to us should also apply to his making it clear to members of the public.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I got the impression that the only conceivable reason for the hon. member calling Mr. Tudor's name was because there happens to be somebody with that name who is still a member of this House.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, there are criminals in Barbados called "Adams". There is none in prison, but there is at least one in the Democratic Labour Party. I have never found it necessary to get on a platform to say this. Indeed, Sir, I see from the Voters List that there are three persons named "Grantley Adams."

Mr. SPEAKER: And there are three parcels of land at Widley which is the subject of this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: None of them owned by the three Grantley Adams, Sir.

Hon. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did these three criminals call Adams commit crimes in the United Kingdom?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order!

Mr. ADAMS: The only Adams I can ever remember committing a crime in the United Kingdom - *(Asides)* His crime concerned ladies; he killed a number of old ladies. I am glad to say that a member of my profession earned 20,000 guineas for successfully defending him on that charge. *(Asides)* Sir, hon. members who are familiar with the allegations made by Mr. Bayley must have some disquiet. They have not been answered. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation which can ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church about his electoral prospects upon his return from a trip abroad could yet not find it possible to ask Mr. Ashby, the Chairman of the IDC., one word about his industrial prospects upon his return from a trip abroad. It seems that there is a conspiracy of silence not to answer Mr. Bayley. These are very serious charges, Sir.

If I were a member of a Government against one of whose servants these charges had been made, I would be extremely worried, Mr. Speaker. I would want them answered; I would have to hear about them; I would have to know if it were true that a firm wished Rose La Flamme's floor space to employ a large number of people and was refused it. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Andrew defend Barbados' local offshoot of The Mafia the West Indies Hospital Sweepstakes Trust, on the grounds that it employs Barbadians. So much more so, should we attack Rose La Flamme on the grounds that it blocks the employment of Barbadians.

I am glad to see the Minister of Labour here in his seat, because it is my belief that whatever may be said about the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, if he hears that the possibility for employment for people in an industrial estate is being blocked by the selfishness of a member of the IDC, I believe he would take it up. *(Asides)* I do not know if he has taken it up. If it has been drawn to his attention, I would believe that he has already pursued it. This is why I think that, as a mark of disapproval of the failure of the IDC to answer the serious charges brought against it, as a mark of our disapproval of the administration of the IDC as at present constituted, all of us in here ought to vote against this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the Minister could let us know the views of the Town Planner in some detail on the industrial development of Widley. Now, Widley, theoretically, is an area which would, at first blush, appear to be suitable for this type of development. There is already the Banks Beer Factory; there is a good deal of unoccupied land; the Pine Housing Area is just on the other side of Regent Hill and Widley Heights and provide a reservoir of labour. You will no doubt be inconveniencing all those who have bought homes in Widley Heights upon the basis that it had a nice view and it is a quiet neighbourhood, but you have to break eggs to make an omlet. The fact yet may be that large scale industrial development for this part of Barbados is unsuitable at the present time when you look at considerations such as transport facilities. The Widley Road is now a good one, but it is a much choked road when you reach Collymore Rock and when you try to go through the Pine. I have not heard anything about a proper road system being built to connect it with Worthing, but even when that is done, all you will do is overload Highway 7.

I would like to know if it is intended that the factories which will be zoned here will be factories producing a product relating to Air Transport rather than anything else.

5.55 p.m.

There could be no other justification for putting a large industrial area in the middle of this part of St. Michael unless adequate facilities for the transport of the ultimate product and indeed the transport to and from work of the workers are being provided. I have thought, Sir, that Widley looks very nice. Banks Beer factory is a pleasant factory and a garden. It is a nice place to drive along with a distance view of the St. Thomas hills so much appreciated by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and myself even when his reception in one of the uppermost of the St. Thomas hills has not been what he hoped.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is beginning to stray.

Mr. ADAMS: I was talking about the booing at Clifton Hill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that doesn't arise at all here.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry I am straying a little bit, Sir. I will not refer to Clifton Hill Church again. But I do in fact believe that you can get a view of Clifton Hill almost from Widley. Certainly you get a pleasant view right across the southern highlands of St. Michael to the southern highlands of St. Thomas. If the view has to be obscured by factories, I would hope that whoever is going to reply on behalf of the Government will give us every assurance that these considerations have been taken into account and will continue to be taken into account when the detailed layout, should this Resolution pass, comes to be considered. I will not be assisting it to pass today.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, because what is important here is that even though the Resolution speaks purely in terms of vesting three parcels of land in the I.D.C., if one is going to consider the Resolution, one must look at the conduct and the operations of the I.D.C. because I do not believe that we can be called upon merely to vote "Aye" or "No" as to whether we are going to vest land without considering the activities of the I.D.C. and to see whether it is a fit and proper body in which lands should be vested.

Now, Sir, one of the first things that comes to mind in discussing the Industrial Development Corporation is the fact that there is a conflict of interests so far as the members of the I.D.C. are concerned. You find in the case arising with the Rose & La Flamme where the Chairman of the I.D.C. signs an application for pioneer status for Rose & La Flamme and then sits on the Board and grants approval to the firm. What is a more glaring and blatant example of conflict of interests, and even the Manager..... (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Is the Resolution about a Manager?)

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution is not on a Manager, but the hon. member if I understand him correctly, is giving his reasons for not being prepared to approve of the vesting of land in this Corporation, whether one agrees with them or not.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that we cannot just sit and vote "Aye" or "No" as to whether we agree that land should be vested in the I.D.C. without at the same time examining the activities of the I.D.C. to see if that Corporation is a fit and proper Corporation in which land should be vested, and that is why I prefaced my remarks by saying that, because I feel that as presently constituted, the I.D.C. is not a fit and proper body in which to vest land, and I am giving my reasons for saying so; and the first reason is that the Manager signs an application for pioneer status as Managing Director of a company, the application goes to the I.D.C., and the Manager in his capacity as manager of the I.D.C. grants approval to his company to employ four people. What is required in Barbados is not merely industries for the sake of industries, and I note that according to the Economic Survey you had the Rose & La Flamme with a capital investment of \$49,000 employing only four people. Certainly what is needed is not only capital intensive industries, but labour intensive industries, industries that will employ a great number of people, not employing four persons as in the case of Rose & La Flamme. What could be more unjustifiable than to find that this has been brought to the attention of the Government and nothing has been done about it. One can only come to the conclusion that the Government is condoning the Manager's activities and conduct in making an application and granting permission to himself.

I think I should make it clear that the Rose & La Flamme was granted 5,000 square feet of office

space, and a company above Rose & La Flamme that employs 120 people wanted to expand its operation and applied to the I.D.C. for the use of the 5,000 square feet of office space below for the purposes of extending the company and had told the I.D.C. that in addition to the 120 people now employed it intended to employ 80 people more. What we find is that this was a case where the company was then applying to the Manager of the I.D.C. who at the same time was Managing Director of the Company whose space he wanted to use. It is rather obvious that in these circumstances he could never have been granted space to expand because Sam Ashby in those circumstances had a conflict of interests, interests as Manager of the I.D.C. and interests as Managing Director of the Rose & La Flamme, and it is scandalous that the Government should allow such a situation to exist in this country.

Mr. Speaker, when people ask from time to time what is the evidence of corruption, it is all of this where the Government is aware of the situation existing and yet they do absolutely nothing about it. That is not the only blatant example of people in the I.D.C. having a conflict of interests with their jobs.
6.05 p.m.

This is not the only position, you have the other case of Mr. Clement Tudor, but before I leave the Manager there is an allegation which was made, that the Manager is only interested in businesses that operate within the CARIFTA area. Is it right to have a man as Manager of a Development Corporation, giving industrial incentives or pioneer status to companies coming into Barbados and at the same time in return for the grant of pioneer status that same man is receiving 5% commission when the company is established?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, one has to exercise extraordinary forbearance in this House sometimes; surely, it is possible for hon. members to say what they wish to say in this debate without trying to impugn the integrity and honour of an employee of a Statutory Board, the House of Assembly is not the place to say this kind of thing, if you know something about somebody, go out and say it outside where if they wish to, they can take you before the Courts.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, it is a definite fact that the Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation exerts all influence to get businesses on the foot of his firm, Standard Agency, can be given commission for distribution within the CARIFTA area; that is a fact, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS: It is a fact, nevertheless.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I beg to move that that remark be expunged from the record.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact, and I will tell you further now, the firm of C. F. Harrison & Co. Ltd. went out and got business, and for those firms to carry on their business they had to agree that all the business they do outside of Barbados that Sam Ashby be given copies of all the invoices.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I beg to second the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House, and we expect you to give a decision before the House resumes debate on this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member rose on this present occasion he started with the words "on a point of order", therefore when an hon. member rises on a point of order he may not second a motion.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I grant you that, but at the same time I rise to bring the rules of the House to your attention, I am not saying that you do not know them, but I cannot see if an hon. member makes a motion just like a former motion I made here and you allowed the hon. member to rant and rave before you gave a decision. I beg to second the motion that was moved by the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed by-the-Clerks-at-the-table that the Hon. Leader of the House rose on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I now rise to move that the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter be expunged from the record.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: One may not rise except on some order of interruption, whether a point of elucidation, whether a point of order or otherwise. I will ask the hon. member to keep himself within the limits of the subject matter of this debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the senior member for St. Thomas stated that we on this side could not agree to this Resolution to vest land in the Industrial Development Corporation as it is presently constituted because we do not agree and we will not condone any sort of fraud or manipulations by anybody; let us make that absolutely clear. I made no attack upon any employee of any Statutory Board, I said, and I will repeat it for the benefit of the Leader of the House, that it is wrong for anybody to sit on the Board of the Industrial Development Corporation and to use his post there to enrich

himself, to get 5% commission on all items sold within the CARIFTA area. If you do not like my saying that, I am very sorry.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member before he said that, whether he meant to say Manager or employee or member actually said employee.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not mean any employee, Sir, I mean Sam Ashby.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us try and remain calm.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am very calm, Sir, but it is interesting to note that the Leader of the House, when he thought I said employee - and if I said employee I would have withdrawn the remark - but now I say Sam Ashby it is interesting to note that he does not get up and object; inferences will be drawn from that. Mr. Speaker, as I said inferences will be drawn, and if the Leader of the House thought I meant an employee I did not, I am talking about the Chairman, Sam Ashby, and I am prepared to sit down if the hon. member wants to get up and object to that remark in relation to Sam Ashby. The hon. member for St. Peter directed his remarks to the Chairman of the Board, not to Mr. Kurleigh King. Let me make it absolutely clear that my remarks are not directed to Mr. Kurleigh King.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you turn to page 24, Rules of debate, Standing Order 26(9): "The conduct of Her Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General of the West Indies, the Governor, Members of either House of the Legislature, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by other persons shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion." 6.15 p.m.

The hon. member has referred to Sam Ashby as Chairman of the IDC. Sam Ashby, Chairman of the IDC., is a Senator. (*Asides*) I am not speaking to you. Why do you not behave yourself? I know it is difficult for you to do so, but you should try. I am now speaking to the Chair, and I am asking that the hon. member desist from calling the names of hon. members in the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER: My interpretation of Standing Order 26(9) with reference to Members of either House of the Legislature, Judges...., is that in the absence of stating that X is a member, M.P., or that Y is a Senator, he has not referred to the conduct of a member of either House as such, because the person has not been identified. I am not entitled to take judicial notice or notice from the Chair of the fact that anyone may or may not be a member of a Legislature. If that is not so stated, I am not entitled to take notice.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Law is something that can be interpreted only by fools. You are not bound to be right at all times. Judges give decisions, you appeal to a Court of Ap-

peal and get another decision up there. Law can be interpreted even by fools. *(Asides)* Mr. Speaker, I did not write what is mentioned here. It states here:

"(9) The conduct of Her Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General of the West Indies, the Governor, Members of either House of the Legislature....."

The hon. member specifically mentioned Sam Ashby who is the Chairman of I.D.C., and you are going to tell me that you are taking no notice of that!

Mr. SPEAKER: No mention has been made of any Senator. No mention has been made of Senator this or Senator that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you mean "Senator" a racehorse?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is my ruling.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I accept your ruling, but it does not mean that you are right.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this comes about when, as I have said, you have people placed in positions where you have a conflict of interests. This is why the hon. member can get up and make this objection. I am talking about a man who is a card-bearing member of the Democratic Labour Party, and who is using his position on a Government Corporation to enrich himself at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and it is scandalous for the Government not to do anything about it. *(Asides)* I do not have to be careful about anything. Then you turn around and ask people what sort of corruption!

As far as I am concerned, I was not criticising the Manager. My remarks were made entirely with reference to the Chairman, a political appointee of the Government and a card-bearing member of the Democratic Labour Party. As I have said, what is required by the Board of the Industrial Development Corporation is to attract labour-intensive industries to Barbados. It is quite some time since we have not had any current Report on the financial operations of the Industrial Development Corporation, yet we are being asked to give more land to the IDC.

I think the senior member for St. Thomas has made it absolutely clear that our stand is that we, as a mark of protest, cannot agree to this Resolution vesting this land in the IDC as it is presently constituted. If we did that we would be tolerating and condoning the very acts and conduct that we are now complaining about.

Now, we have heard from time to time of the number of industries that came to Barbados, and we can only hope that it is one of the aims and objects of the IDC to ensure that the wages paid to people in this country are proper wages. Despite any statement attributed to the Prime Minister or anybody else that it is better to work for cheap wages than no

wages at all, we still hope that there will be people on the IDC who have the interests of the workers at heart and will ensure that they work for proper wages.

It is strange, after all of these years, to hear the General Secretary of the Trade Unions refer to some of the factories in which the workers of this country are working as "sweat shops". This is really interesting. After 10 years of Government by the Democratic Labour Party; after a number of years under the present Chairman, we find that the boss of our leading trade union is complaining that the factories in which the workers are working are nothing but "sweat shops". This is a serious reflection on the Government's attitude to workers, and it is a serious reflection on the activities of the IDC.

Now, what makes things worse is to find that of all the people in this country the Prime Minister tolerates and condones such a situation! What could be worse than the Prime Minister saying that it is better to work for cheap wages than not at work at all. Cheap labour is better than no labour at all. How can any industrialist coming into this country and going to the IDC be told that he has to pay proper wages in this country? If that person does any sort of research in Barbados, he will find out that the Prime Minister of this country is on record as telling the workers of this country - not the civil servants - that it is better for them to work for cheap wages than not to work at all.

6.25 p.m.

It is really scandalous that in this day and age you have people working in the garment factories, to whom you have granted pioneer status, for \$14 and \$15 a week. A year ago a lady came to my office and said she was working at the time with one of the factories opened at the Deep Water Harbour and she had started off at \$19 a week. Two weeks ago the lady came to my home at 6.30 one Saturday morning wanting to put her husband in court for maintenance. I asked her how many children she had and she told me nine. She said she was working at Cavalier Limited and that she was earning \$14.95 per week, and despite all the fancy figures one sees displayed in the Economic Survey, despite the number of jobs coming into this country, I think the I.D.C. is failing in its duty by not ensuring that workers are paid proper salaries when the employers come to this country. It is the duty of the I.D.C. to ensure this. One of the most amazing things was when the Prime Minister made the obviously unfortunate remark because I do not think he was really thinking when he made it. I should hate to think of the Prime Minister in such a way that could consciously say or be mentally alert in saying that cheap labour is better than no labour at all. One of the amazing things is that this was said at the opening of a factory and members of the I.D.C. were present, and they did not come out and say that they did not agree with the statement. One would have expected the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union who is a Board member to come out and say something about

it, but he does not say anything because so far as he is concerned, he is serving two masters, one called the Democratic Labour Party and the other is the Barbados Workers' Union, and he does not want to offend either one.

As far as we on this side are concerned, we cannot support, as a mark of protest, the Resolution unless Government gives us some sort of undertaking about changing the present Board membership of the Industrial Development Corporation.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on this side in not supporting this Resolution but on different grounds. Quite recently, Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of applications to the I. D. C. from persons who would like to develop certain industries and trades in this country. I believe as a Barbadian that we have reached the stage in our development where we have to look around carefully and see what developments are still to come and whether or not nationals are placed in such a position that they should not be deprived of the opportunities which are still left with us. It is clear that because of the interest shown in Barbados the price of land rose considerably during the last ten years, and it makes it rather difficult for the average Barbadian to be able to accumulate money to start a business and to buy land or vice versa. I was shocked quite recently when a man reported to me that he had made an application to the I. D. C. for assistance in establishing a business in Barbados, and he gave the number of persons whom he hoped to employ, and it was considerably more than is employed by the Rose La Flamme which is in operation now and has got pioneer status. He was told by a junior member in the I.D.C. office that there were two foreign companies who had made indications that they intended to set up in Barbados and as such, his application would not be considered. He was written a letter, and I know the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can vouch for this as well, by the Acting Manager of the Board confirming the statement that two foreign companies had applied to carry on the same business, and the Board's policy was to encourage foreign companies who did not want assistance from the I. D. C. or any privileges. This is where I would have to vote against this Resolution, because if the Resolution is to provide land to bring foreign companies to operate to the detriment of Barbadian nationals, I would have to be against it 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a rumour going around this country for a long time that if you come to this country and occupy one of the buildings owned by I. D. C., you can only do so on the grounds that your insurance is placed with one particular company, and that company, is operated by the Chairman of the I. D. C. These are the reasons why I would have to oppose this Resolution today, because until you change that Board, until you have members who are impartial, until you have members who look at the interests of Barbadian nationals first and others afterwards I must oppose any Resolution of this na-

ture, because the time is fast coming, Mr. Speaker, when this country will find itself in the same category as places like Bermuda and the Bahamas where Barbadians will be walking the streets and the land and businesses will be owned by expatriates, I have often said that whether you are white, black, pink or yellow and your grandfather was from this soil, you are a Barbadian, and the British Government has supported me in this contention because under the new Immigration Bill, the original Bill contained a paragraph which allowed patrials to enter Britain, but in the Committee stage that was removed, which means that all those who had their ancestors in Britain and could go back there are now prevented. They are Barbadians like myself whether white, black, pink or yellow and therefore I have to do my best to preserve the land and the industries that still remain in this country for Barbadians like myself; but if the I. D. C. is going to foster a policy of telling Barbadians that they would rather grant pioneer status to companies coming from outside or that they will withhold pioneer status from Barbadians because expatriates have indicated that they are going to put down factories in this country along the same lines and would not be asking for incentives, it means that the Legislature has now got to protect the Barbadian national and the Board has got to know quite clearly that it is Barbados' money, it is Barbados land and therefore Barbadians should come first. This is why I have to oppose this on different grounds from other hon. members. I have to preserve a little bit of the birth right of my brothers and sisters, and if you have got a Board whose policy is to foster expatriates in preference to the Barbadian national, it is time that that Board should be changed, it is time that Government should reiterate its policy in respect of development in this country, because I know that there are expatriates who come into this country and look around for prosperous businesses which are being operated by Barbadians to move the Barbadians out of them. There is a story of the Fibre Glass Company which was being operated at Newton, and that man never had a visit from anybody from the I. D. C.; he filled out a form asking for pioneer status and after 18 months they told him he had filled out the wrong form and the only difference on the form was the heading. When he asked them to change the heading they refused and he had to fill out a new form and they started him from that date, but he had a visit from the IDC and he was told by a member of the IDC that they had a Canadian who was interested in his business and who would like to look it over with a view to taking it over. These are the things that are happening in this country, Mr. Speaker, and until the Legislature gets up, has a look, and investigates the operations of IDC, when the time comes we will all be sitting down saying, it is too late, and this is what we have got to look at, that Barbadians must be encouraged and they must be protected, and if the IDC, the Board with the power to assist and encourage Barbadians, does not want to do it and it will encourage non-nationals, it is time that this Legislature has a second look at what is going on in this country.

6.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric in this debate, and really the temptation would be strong to follow all aspects of the debate and pursue them and ignore the real purpose of the Resolution before us. We are asked to give approval, which Government is seeking, to vest three parcels of land situate at Wildey in the Industrial Development Corporation. These parcels of land are required for factory space in their various capacities, and it is because of the urgency of the matter that this has been brought before the House.

One of the significant points made by one of the speakers - I believe it was the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas - was in respect of the overall plan of the Wildey area, and I believe, although he did not say so, that he was wondering whether the Town Planning Authorities felt happy about this, and how this would fit in with any eventual overall plan for the whole development. I can assure the hon. member that a master plan of the total Wildey Development is being prepared, but in the interim, the Town Planning Authorities have accorded their permission to this development; they have felt that this in no way prevents or inhibits the overall development, and they have given the go ahead to this.

The hon. and learned member for St. Joseph said that he was differing from other hon. members on his side in the reasons for which he was opposing the Resolution, and his anxiety was whether and to what extent Barbadian interests were incorporated in the policy of IDC. I think that both sides of the House are *ad idem* on this point and while it may be true that the Corporation, perhaps in my view, has not sufficiently emphasised this policy, it certainly is the Government's policy that Barbadians should have priority in all things and in discussions in this House on both sides of the House agreement has been forthcoming from all of us on this point that incentives and opportunities ought to be made available for Barbadians first, and I think I can safely say that the Corporation as a Statutory authority is not ignorant of this and would certainly not be unmindful of it.

I am really sorry that the debate has taken the turn it has, I do not know, as I have said several times in this House, why hon. members opposite always find it necessary to introduce this note of asperity and bitterness in the debates, I am now, thank God, at the end of my Parliamentary career and I have not once found it necessary in this House in the course of any debate, except in an argument with the Chair and not even when Your Honour was occupying it, to be this way. I have no particular brief for any individual members of Statutory Corporations, but I support one and all in Parliament because from where I sit in Government they perform their functions satisfactorily and even if there are some cases where Boards or individual members of Boards may not be interpreting Government policy as accurately as they should, all of them by and large try to do so, and the results of their work are reflected in the success of the various Statutory Boards. I think myself, I cannot speak for Mr. Sam

Ashby in this respect, that if he finds that he is under attack from within this House and particularly outside this House, he should know what recourse he has to justify himself, it is not for me to advise him. I have myself listened to Mr. Bailey's effusions, and so far as matters which came within my personal knowledge, matters that he touched on, I would have no difficulty in vindicating the Government and indeed rejecting certain of the allegations in so far as they were aimed at the Government, and I would imagine that the members of the Board ought to be in a position to do this. It is a pity of course that when Mr. Bailey was importuning members of the Board when he wanted the job, and some members of the Government, the public was not brought into the argument with the same effervescence and assiduity as when he was leaving it, but that is entirely a matter for him.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I do not think it is fair to say that he was importuning the members of the Board when he wanted the job, his letter to the Cabinet must have caused them to realise that he had some sort of ability.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I merely said that it is a pity that when he was importuning the members of the Board - (*Asides*) - it seems to me Mr. Speaker, that members opposite say anything they wish and are not to be interrupted and I cannot say what I wish to say. I say for the third time that when he was looking for the job, this is nothing to do with his qualifications, and was importuning members of the Board and some Ministers, the public was not brought into it, but now that he and the Corporation have gone wrong, the public is inundated with complaints from him. I have my own view about that whole matter and I have said in another place when the issue was first brought before me at my level that if people had taken my advice they would not have had this particular issue; if he had complained about having to leave the Board he would be complaining without in any way having to admit that the Board had been more than generous to him.
6.45 p.m.

My feeling is that if a man is going to be at emnity with you and you have to dispense with his services you do not have to perform works of a super human to show how humane you are, if the end result is going to be the same. This is all I will say on this, but I think it should be said that Mr. Bayley...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister is talking about you do not have to perform acts of being super-humane, is the Minister aware that when every other employee of that Board was given paid study leave abroad, on the day that Mr. Bayley was going abroad on his study leave he was told that they would not pay for it? Are you calling that humanity?

Mr. SPEAKER: That could be no point of order.

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: That is his version of it, but it is not exactly like that. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Only the hon. member addressing the Chair may I hear, please!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would just like to warn the hon. members opposite that in this particular period it may be quite convenient to espouse Mr. Bayley's cause, because we are approaching an election and all of these things are grist for some political mill. I do not like making prophecies, but I think that all hon. members who are, attempting to espouse Mr. Bayley's cause may well find that his enmity is more of a blessing than his friendship. I say no more.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. HOPPIN; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. LOWE - 9.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. HINDS; Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; Mr. ADAMS and Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the Ayes have it, and the Resolution passed.

RESOLUTION RE GUARANTEE OF REPAYMENT OF LOAN FROM INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No 2 stands in the name of the Rt. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance of the repayment by the Barbados Development Bank of a loan equivalent to \$1 M (U.S.) from the Inter-American Development Bank and the interest thereon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Item in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we have another Resolution on the Barbados Development Bank which deals with a slightly different subject. It is the one about the ratio of equity. This one, however, deals specifically with a guarantee which we are seeking in respect of a loan which has been negotiated for the

Development Bank from the Inter-American Development Bank. The purpose for which our Development Bank requires this money is to open what they call a "soft-loan window" in respect of small business. The details, I believe, are set out in the Resolution, and if there are any hon. members who want to ask any questions, I will try to answer them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO DETERMINE THE AGGREGATE OF THE LIABILITIES OF THE BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BANK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 9 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: This Item stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Item in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Item No. 9 in the absence of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister. If there is no objection leave will be granted. There being no objection leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed to move the passing of a Resolution to determine the aggregate of the liabilities of the Barbados Development Bank.

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will trouble the House much further. It is not really the month of August yet, but I know that hon. members opposite want to get away to their grass moors. I must, however, thank them for their co-operation. (Asides) Well, this is the irony of the situation: hon. members obstructed me and assisted me to get on.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 4 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I formally adjourn the House, I am going to discharge the members of those Select Committees in respect of the Condominium Bill and the Severance Payments Bill. I congratulate

them on the expeditious manner in which they performed their duties.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 4 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.55p.m.