

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)



FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th October, 1972.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. Elliott D. MOTTLEY; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, (Temporary Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A.; Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. A. MORRISON; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of this Honourable House for Tuesday 3rd October, 1972 are before you for confirmation. If there are no objections, the Minutes will be confirmed. There being no objection the Minutes are hereby duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance I am commanded to lay the following documents:

- (1) The Marine Fuel (Exportation Fees) Regulations, 1972.

- (2) The Customs Duties (Amateur Radio Society of Barbados) Order, 1972 and

- (3) The Preliminary Bulletin on Housing in Barbados in respect of the Commonwealth Caribbean Population Census, 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Retreat Tenantry Road, St. Lucy, for the purpose of providing a site for the construction of a Communal Bath and Latrine.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following resolutions:

- (1) A Resolution to approve the expenditure of \$53,243 required to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1972-73, Part I - Current of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

- (2) A Resolution to approve the expenditure of \$69,775 required to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1972-73, Part II - Capital of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$118,508 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1972-73 No. 14 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance I beg to give notice of the following Resolution and Bills:

- (1) A Resolution to grant the sum of \$561,160 out of the Consolidated Fund and to

place it at the disposal of Government to Supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1972-73 No. 15 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(2) A Bill to authorise the Government of Barbados to borrow money externally by the issue of securities for such purposes and in such sums as are approved by resolution of Parliament.

(3) A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year 1972-73.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what rule says that if I give notice of a Resolution under the Standing Orders and in accordance with the rule, why it is that my Resolution is not permitted for me to give notice of it today. I have given notice in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member kindly refer to Standing Order 20 (5) which states: "Any such notice shall be submitted to the Speaker who shall direct -

(a) that it be printed in the terms in which it was handed in; or

(b) that it be printed with such alterations as he may direct; or

(c) that it be returned to the Member who signed it, as being in his opinion out of order."

I must say that I received this Resolution only yesterday afternoon but I returned to the Island on Sunday evening. The Clerk of Parliament has done a certain amount of research work to find out the propriety of the Resolution, and further work is being done in-as-much as it involves a Ministerial Statement. I promise the hon. member quite faithfully that at the next sitting of this Hon. House I shall give a ruling on the propriety of the Resolution.

Resolution Re Plight of Pedestrians and Motorists using Highway No. 1

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution.

WHEREAS the plight of pedestrians and motorists using Highway No. 1 at its junction

with Archer's Lane at Queen Street, St. Peter and the frightening and sickening experience of residents of the said area following each downpour of rain have been brought before this Honourable House, but to no avail;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House takes cognizance of a grievous situation affecting the lives of many people, and also property owners immediately adjoining, and urge upon Government the necessity to take immediate action to remedy the situation and so remove threat to life and property as herein stated.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to authorise the Government of Barbados to borrow money externally by the issue of securities for such purposes and in such sums as are approved by Resolution of Parliament be now read a first time.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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 a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year 1972-73 be now read a first time.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

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

Is Government aware that guarantees given World Health Organisation in respect of one-year scholarships tenable at the University of the West Indies at Mona, and leading to the Certificate in Nursing Education or Nursing Administration, are not honoured by the appropriate authority in respect of the posting of the graduates upon returning home?

2. What is the structure of the staff of the Tercentenary School of Nursing at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Barbados?

3. What is the nursing experience in terms of years, and the teaching experience in terms of years of each of the Tutors or acting Tutors or other personnel on the teaching staff of the said school of nursing?

4. Is it a fact that the Certificate referred to at No. 1 above and obtained from the UWI is not recognizable by the General Nursing Council of Barbados and therefore has no promotion value in the eyes of the Public Service Commission?

5. Will Government take steps to have the appropriate bodies carry out a re-assessment of the course offered by the UWI and the Certificate obtained in the light of the value attached thereto in the United Kingdom?
2.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:—

Is it a fact that at several work sites, teams of workers are kept idle because of the absence from the site of essential materials for the execution of the work?

2. Is it a fact that on some projects more than eight workers have been idle at one and the same time for two full days because of conditions as at No. 1 above?

3. How many man-hours have been so lost on projects in each of the districts — North, South, South-East, South Central, North East, North-west and City during the present financial year to date?

4. What is the total cost of such man-hours, in terms of wages, salaries or other emoluments?

5. What steps Government propose taking to reduce wastage and to keep work sites supplied with such materials as are available locally?

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Is Government aware that a number of residents at "Little Pattaleys" (North) off Road View, St. Peter, experience serious difficulties in getting to and from their homes daily?

2. Would Government make an effort to bring some measure of relief, even on a temporary basis, so that these poor people would not suffer to the extent they do especially after heavy rainfall in the area?

STATEMENT BY HON. MRS. G. L. EASTMOND,
TEMPORARY MINISTER OF HEALTH AND WEL-
FARE RELATING TO THE REPORT ON THE
INVESTIGATION INTO THE AMBULANCE
SERVICE AT THE QUEEN ELIZABETH
HOSPITAL ARISING OUT OF THE
DEATHS OF MISS OUGHTNA
NEBLETT AND MRS.
SYBIL WORRELL

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker,

On the 3rd October, 1972, this House was informed that the Minister of Health had instituted an investigation into all the circumstances surrounding the deaths of Miss Oughtna Neblett of Observatory Road, Clapham, St. Michael and of Mrs. Sybil Worrell of Lennox Avenue, Goodland, St. Michael and the non arrival of an ambulance to their aid when requested.

A thorough investigation into the Ambulance Service at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the circumstances surrounding these deaths was conducted at the Senate Chamber on the 5th, 6th, 7th and 9th October by Senior Crown Counsel, Mr. S. Reid, assisted by Mr. A. F. Daniel, Senior Assistant Secretary in the Ministry of Health and Welfare. Nineteen persons were heard, of whom, fourteen were officers from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, two from the St. Michael District Hospital and three were private citizens.

The Report on the investigation has been seen and considered by the Cabinet. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Public Service Commission Act, 1961 and Regulations made thereunder, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Health and Welfare has been directed to refer the Report to the Public Service Commission with the recommendation that appropriate disciplinary action be taken against certain officers employed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

I now lay this Report on the Table of the Honourable the House of Assembly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may we have copies of that Statement circulated to members today?

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be circulated in the normal course with the usual papers circulated to all honourable members.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Hon. Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport be granted four weeks' leave of absence from attendance at the Honourable the House of Assembly with effect from the 19th October, 1972.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 34, 51, and 48 are ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention as well as to the attention of the Leader of the House the manner in which the Order Paper is now dealt with. Only yesterday evening I received the Order Paper for this meeting, and there are a number of Items under Government Business which involve large sums of money to be taken from the Consolidated Fund. I am sure that some time ago Your Honour made a comment on the attitude of Government in bringing down legislation to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: A lot of which I subsequently retracted.

Mr. CRAIG: I should like the Leader of the House to give this House the assurance that we will receive the Order Papers earlier. It is true that they have the numbers over there, but we cannot carry out our duties to the people of this country in the manner in which they should be carried out unless we can get the Order Paper in time to permit us to do some sort of research into the matters coming before us.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues received the Order Paper at midday. The House last met two weeks ago, and for a member to receive the Order Paper only a matter of hours before this meeting is not good enough. I hope the Leader of the House will give careful attention to this matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with what the hon. member for St. James

has said. I received my Order Paper yesterday evening, and it is most unsatisfactory. I want to let the hon. member know that the Government has nothing to do with the sending out of the Order Paper. He will have to lay the blame on the Officers of the House, or he will have to speak to Mr. Speaker about the matter. There was a two-week interval between the sitting of this House, and to receive an Order Paper yesterday for today's meeting is quite unsatisfactory. I would join with him in asking Mr. Speaker to see to it that in future the Order Papers are sent out earlier.

2.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: My information is that all the papers which hon. members have before them today were handed in to the Government Printery on the 4th October, 1972 and so the Speaker and the Clerks-at-the-Table have nothing to do with the fact that the papers were delivered to hon. members only yesterday or some time today. The fact is that they were handed to the Government Printery on the 4th October, 1972.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I must share the views of the Acting Leader of the Opposition, and I would say that Parliament cannot be run in this slipshod way in which members are being criticised even outside for not working and not giving of their best. What do you expect from a man who is working for eighteen cents an hour when he reads that the House of Assembly adjourned for two weeks and members returned without receiving their Order Papers. I received my Order Paper last night. The Government has some responsibility for this. I am a member of the Government party. The printing is done by the Government Printing Office and therefore its direction must come under a Minister, therefore they must be told in no uncertain terms that Parliament's work is priority work and any work sent from Parliament must be treated as a priority. I would not accept any excuse that work would be given to the Printing Office on the 4th, today is the 17th and therefore it has taken thirteen days to be done. It means by that same token that if we were meeting every week we would not have any papers at all. This is reprehensible conduct by whoever is responsible for it, and I want to say that the responsibility must rest on somebody's shoulders. It cannot be a wide open sesame where everybody must carry the blame. I feel that the Government should hold the Minister responsible for the Printing Office and directions should be issued to it. The Speaker should issue directions to the Clerk and let the Clerk understand what is the position with respect to these Parliamentary papers.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that if the Clerk....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen? The hon member cannot speak twice.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a deplorable state of affairs for which I must accept some measure of responsibility; but I am surprised to hear that papers were given on the 4th October whereas it was my understanding that the papers got there on the 10th October. There was a voluminous amount of papers and we sat on the last occasion on the 3rd, and therefore to hear that the papers got to the Government Printing Office on the 4th October is a great surprise to me. The last sitting took place on the 3rd October, and I was wondering whether all the papers had been collected and put in order to be given to the Printery the next day after a sitting which went fairly late owing to the discussion of matters on the motion for the adjournment. The fact is that it is a matter about which I felt very perturbed myself, and only yesterday I made a big stir when I realised that something was going wrong when I received my own papers. I made a check to find out what was happening. I am not responsible but I am just saying that things have gone wrong in that the last sitting took place on the 3rd and hon. members should have got their papers in a week's time. I apologise to hon. members for what has happened and I will certainly keep a closer check on things in future to see that there is no recurrence. I must say, however, that I do not believe that the papers were handed to the Government Printery on the 4th when there was such a voluminous set of papers. They could not have got there on the 4th.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister having replied, no other hon. member can speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With due respect, there is no motion before the House that I cannot speak after the Minister has replied. All I want to point out is that I do not think it is satisfactory to the House for you to say that the papers were sent on the 4th and for the Leader of the House to say he does not believe they were sent on the 4th, or to ask what happened between the 4th and the 10th, because both statements cannot be right. If you are Speaker, it must be your duty to inform us correctly, and if you tell us they were sent on the 4th, then the Leader of the House is giving the lie to you by saying they could not have been sent on the 4th.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I said I did not expect the Clerk would have got through with all the papers between 10 o'clock in the night and the next day. He may have sent some, but I am not accusing any one. I admit on this occasion that the Opposition is correct and members of my own party feel the same way; so what is wrong? Some of the papers were posted on Friday and I think some must have been held up in the post. Papers were posted to the members of the Opposition in particular on Friday. My own papers were posted on Friday and members on the Opposite side received theirs on Saturday; so it seems as if the Government members are the ones who suffered most.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was speaking when I gave way on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned about the fact that the Order Paper would have been a long Order Paper, the Severance Pay legislation would have taken some detailed study and I asked a member of the staff why we had not received the papers, and he said on Friday that he had not yet received them back from the Government Printery; so I do not think that the Leader of the House should say that the members of the Opposition had theirs posted to them. The whole procedure for sending out Order Papers needs to be investigated. Is the Order Paper to be sent out by the Government Printery itself or is the Order Paper to be sent out by the Deputy Marshal of the House? This is what has got to be settled. In fact, I think what happens is that the Deputy Marshal is called upon to take out the Order Papers at short notice and he is not even paid for it. It is an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and I think the whole thing needs to be investigated.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the Standing Orders, it is now Question Time; and the Standing Orders have not been suspended.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is subject to the usual assurance that we will have Question Time and then we will do at least some Private Members' Business. There are two items under Private Members' Business which we would like to do today; so I wonder if the Leader of the House would indicate whether this is so.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Subject to the usual assurances, if there are any matters of importance under Private Members' Business, they will be dealt with at any time before we rise.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that replies to Question Nos. 34, 51, and 48 are ready.

QUESTION RE ERECTION OF PAVILION AT NEW ORLEANS, ST. MICHAEL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

(1) Is the Minister aware that during the last session of the House of Assembly the House passed a Resolution calling upon the Government to purchase land at New Orleans, St. Michael to erect a Community Centre and Pavilion?

(ii) Will the Minister state what steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to give effect to this Resolution.

(iii) If no steps have been taken to give effect to the Resolution, will the Minister state the reasons for the failure to do so?

(iv) Will the Minister state whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the Resolution, and if so, when?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"The Minister is aware that a Resolution was passed during the last Session of the House of Assembly calling upon the Government to take immediate steps to erect a social centre and pavilion for use by the residents of the New Orleans area.

Competing demands upon resources and the time of Government have so far prevented the erection of the facility referred to. However, subject to the availability of funds for the project, every effort will be made to have this done during the next four-year development plan period."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will the Minister agree that the same way Government can find \$1.8 million to purchase the Marine Hotel they can find the money to erect this facility?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a proper Supplementary Question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will the Minister state what are the competing demands that prevent the Government at the moment from putting this Resolution into effect?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the competing demands referred to in the reply refer to the whole range of Governmental activities for which funds have got to be provided.

QUESTION RE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BRANCH OF THE HOUSECRAFT CENTRE AT BOSCOBEL GIRLS' SCHOOL, ST. PETER

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education, Community Development, Youth Affairs and Sport:

Will the Minister take steps to establish a branch of the Housecraft Centre at Boscobel Girls' School, St. Peter to provide training in Home Economics for the several persons at Boscobel and the adjoining districts — Gays, Baltic, Mount, Castle, Diamond Corner, Moor Hill and Date Tree Hill, who are desirous of becoming proficient in this art?

2. Will the Minister use his good offices in the future to publicise the fact that the Home Economics training is available to both male and female members of the community?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"Steps will be taken to re-establish courses in Home Economics for adults at the Boscobel

Girls' School, St. Peter under the aegis of the Housecraft Centre. However, re-establishment of the courses will necessarily be dependent upon the availability of suitably qualified staff and upon positive response from a sufficiently large number of prospective students. Advertisements inviting applicants for enrolment will indicate that both females and males are eligible for admission to the courses."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell us when a centre was ever established there for the teaching of Home Economics to adults.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, during the last decade courses in Home Economics were carried on at the Boscobel Girls' School.

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us if any adults were taught?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, my information is that adults were taught.

QUESTION RE SCHOOL LEAVING CERTIFICATES

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

Is the Minister aware that a certificate issued to school-leavers by the department of Education from 1928–1944 as a Merit certificate; and from 1944–1965 as the school-leaving certificate had a fair and reasonable employment value both at home and abroad?

2. Is the Minister aware that with requests from abroad still reaching the Ministry of Education for this latter certificate evidences the fact of its continuing employment value, particularly in the United States of America?

3. Will the Minister state if the New Barbados School-leaving Certificate which has been issued since 1965 has any local employment value either in the Public Service or in industry?

4. How many new Barbados School Leaving certificates have been issued at the end of each of the academic years — 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972?

5. How many children took the exam in each of the years mentioned at No. 4 above?

6. Is it a fact that this New Barbados School Leaving certificate is not a graded certificate?

7. In view of the stipulations attached thereto, i.e., achievement in four (4) passes at one sitting with compulsory English Language and one Science subject, would Government set about to accord this certificate the same recognition as the L.C.C. (Intermediate) Level certificate?

3.10 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 48 is as follows:—

1. Yes.

2. Requests for the results of the School Leaving Certificate Examination are sometimes related to employment but perhaps more frequently to plans for further education of the persons concerned, for which latter purposes the need is to assess the equivalence of these results in terms of the graded system of education in North American Schools.

3. The School Leaving Certificate issued since 1965 remains an index of the satisfactory completion of the prescribed programme of public education up to the normal school leaving age of 14 years, and as such should be acceptable to any employer seeking to fill positions requiring a standard of attainment ordinarily covered in the first nine years of education in this country.

4. Number of certificates issued — 1969: 316; 1970: 400; 1971: 521; 1972: 580.

5. Number of children taking examination — 1969: 1,673; 1970: 2,390; 1971: 2,251; 1972: 2,341.

6. The certificate is graded as to the standard attained — pass, credit or distinction, in each subject passed. An earlier scheme for grading on the basis of the number of subjects passed has been abandoned.

7. The requirement for award of the certificate is that passes should be obtained in four subjects including English Language. The syllabuses of the L.C.C. Intermediate level examinations call for higher levels of attainment than those of the school leaving certificate in the several subject areas. Generally the L.C.C. at Intermediate level would be attempted after a further two or three years of education in secondary school. It would be improper therefore to accord equivalence to these two types of examination. It is recognized, however, that there is need to introduce a local certificate which will reflect achievement at a higher level within the school system, and this development is under consideration.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister tells us that the certificate which has been issued since 1965 should be accepted by any employer, can he tell us what Government has done or intends to do to see that employers, particularly

Government agencies, accept the certificate for it is worth? (*Asides.*) I will repeat the question for the benefit of the Minister. With respect to the new Barbados School Leaving Certificate which has been issued since 1965, will the Minister tell us what Government has done or intends to do to see that the certificate is accepted by employers and particularly by Government agencies?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, as far as employers are concerned, the Government does not intend to tell them what qualifications they should accept for any positions on their several establishments. As far as employment within the Government is concerned, I am advised that, for any job which requires a good primary education, the requirements for that job are currently satisfied by the possession of the School Leaving Certificate as presently structured.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us why the School Leaving Certificate is not considered of sufficient educational value for acceptance by the Tercentenary School of Nursing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, different educational institutions or employing agencies set their own standards of requirements for their educational courses or for the work which they have to do. The School Leaving Certificate, as presently structured, caters for the completion of the first cycle of secondary school education up to the age of 14. Any educational institution or employer who wishes to accept that certificate as a standard, either for employment or for further educational development, is quite free to use that particular certificate.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that, in the Ministry of Education, when some of his Education Officers were accepted in the Teaching Service, their only qualification was the Barbados School Leaving Certificate? Is the Minister also aware that, in the Public Service of this country today, there are certain Heads of Departments whose only qualification on entering the Service of this country was the Barbados School Leaving Certificate? (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: That is more of a statement than a question.

Mr. HINDS: I want to know if the Minister is aware of what is going on in his Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that a question must be a question, and it should not contain a statement in the form of a question.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase my question. Is the Minister aware that some of his officers on entering the Public Service of this country had no other qualification than the Barbados School Leaving Certificate?

3.20 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have not had cause to enquire into the educational attainments of the officers in the Ministry of Education who have been duly appointed to their particular positions by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, some intimation was given that there would be an oral answer available to Question 55.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Minister answer Question No. 55 with the approval of all hon. members?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION RE SHCOOL MEALS SERVICE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 55 stands in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church West.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the Minister of Education:—

1. Will the Minister state on what date it is proposed to make school meals available at the St. Matthias Boys' School, the St. Matthias Girls' School and the St. Paul's Girls' School?

2. Will the Minister ensure that School Meals are served at these schools not later than January, 1973?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 55 is as follows:

"It is the Government's declared policy to extend the School Meals Service to encompass all primary schools in this country which do not now participate in the programme. In this connection a new school meals centre is being constructed at Country Road, and as soon as this is completed, the St. Paul's Girls' School will be brought into the service.

As far as the St. Matthias Boys' School and the St. Matthias Girls' School are concerned, the

service will be extended to these schools as soon as practicable."

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As a supplementary, is the Minister aware that St. Paul's Girls' School is in the constituency of the Minister of Communications and Works and not in the constituency of the member for Christ Church West?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not a proper Supplementary Question.

Mr. FORDE: Will the Minister state what date he has for the practical completion of the School Meals Service and how long after the date of completion is as soon as practicable?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would like to get the Supplementary quite clearly to make sure that I understand it. The hon. member I think referred to the completion of the School Meals Service.

Mr. FORDE: The completion of the building in country Road.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the School Meals Centre currently under construction at Country Road will be completed during the first part of the year 1973. I wonder if the hon. member would repeat the second part of the Supplementary Question which I do not quite recall.

Mr. FORDE: Would the Minister say how soon after that, he considers in terms of months, is encompassed in his term "as soon as practicable"?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I take it the hon. member is referring to the St. Matthias Boys' and the St. Matthias Girls' Schools. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to my reply to the earlier question. I repeat that as soon as practicable the St. Matthias Boys' and the St. Matthias Girls' Schools together with other schools in this country will be included in the School Meals Service.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time is completed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought that when we agreed to the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders that it was agreed that this was subject, as Your Honour put it, to the protection of the minority, and I thought we were given certain assurances of doing Private Members' Business. There are one or two items we would not mind doing and we could go on until 4.30 p.m. since the Government has a long Order Paper. We could finish in at least forty-five minutes' time or even less, and you should give us at least forty-five minutes to do these things.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is quite true that we gave an assurance, but what does one expect. We have a long Order Paper here today and the hon. member himself would feel that we should get on with some of Government Business before giving way to Private Members' Business at a later time in the sitting. It is not that the assurance will be withdrawn, but merely with twelve items on the Order Paper we would do half of them and then Private Members' Business would come at that stage which would appear reasonable to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not quite understand the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak twice on the same motion unless he is rising on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of elucidation, when the Leader of the House gave the assurance, he did not say at a later stage of the proceedings. I think we are getting to the sad state of affairs that where a member gets up in here and gives assurances that he wants to back down from them. It is totally unacceptable.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I would not sit here and allow my statements to be twisted that way. I agreed that subject to the usual assurance Private Members' Business would be done some time in the course of the sitting. With twelve items on the Order Paper, would we start with Private Members' Business? That is beyond anyone's expectations. We could at least try to get on with Government Business and still see that Private Members' Business gets its due attention.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was making a point when the Minister rose. It is not a question of Government Business. We expect that there is Government Business but the Government has its rights and we have rights and you, Mr. Speaker, spoke about protecting the rights of the minority and the Minister gave us an assurance. Why is it that fifteen minutes after giving us the assurance it is so difficult to honour that assurance?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I never at any stage said that we would start with Private Members' Business.

The question that Government Business be now taken was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT
(GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 4)
ORDER, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the First Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1972.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Order was made on the 30th September 1972, and requires the approval of the House for changes in the Establishment which have been made, and this specifically deals with the Legal Department, Archives Department, and the Cabinet, the rearrangement of jobs and the additional posts which have been created, in the Ministry of Home Affairs there is the Lands and Surveys Department, and some other amendments to the Police, Item 10. There is a change in the heading of Head 25 — Ministry of Education.
3.30 p.m.

There are also some changes under the Ministry of Health and Welfare. In the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce which is a new Ministry as such, certain new posts have been created. In the Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance the posts of Chief Surveyor, Senior Surveyor, Surveyor, Senior Draughtsman and Draughtsman are also under the Schedule to this Civil Establishment Order.

On the last page of the Schedule, the Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations, the same thing has been done there as has been done in the Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Commerce in that the Establishment for staff has been herein set out and the Information Services are now under the Ministry of Tourism,

Information and Public Relations. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might make a few observations under section 2 — Cabinet Office with respect to the Government Printing Office. I think we have seen here this afternoon enough to convince us....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I know that the hon. member is anxious to get on to the Printing Office, but I would like to inform him that the Government Printing Office is not under the Cabinet Office. He will find it under the Ministry of Home Affairs. I seem to have made a mistake, so the hon. member may go back to his speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the day will come again when the Prime Minister will be able to read and to write.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow that sort of thing.

Mr. HINDS: The printed word is for reading and writing, Sir. Mr. Speaker, we have seen before us here all the outlay with respect to the Government Printery, but those of us who from time to time hear the Leader of the House on the House on matters related to the Government Printery often remember his comments to the effect that there is not enough space in the Government Printery to accommodate a Proof Reader. It is against a background such as this that we find ourselves this afternoon looking over a Resolution which has been presented before us to bring about certain structural changes in personnel.

We know that certain new equipment has been installed, but we are satisfied beyond any shadow of doubt that installing this new equipment, the shifting of personnel and even the upgrading of the posts is not going to be the immediate answer to the main problem affecting the Government Printery. I am sure, according to the words of the Leader of the House, that there will be fully three years from now before ample room will be provided to accommodate the Government Printery. What then are we doing? Putting in new machinery, bringing in additional staff to work, but under what kind of conditions? Cramped conditions, that is what the staff is crying out against. One of the complaints has been that the Government Printer and his Deputy, some of his sectional Heads cannot oversee the work that is under their immediate

charge because of the structural arrangements of the present building which the Government Printery occupies, but we are going to bring in new machinery to fool Members of Parliament, making them believe that something is being done at the Government Printery.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. Member will give way, the hon. Member is aware of the fact that certain extensions are being done to the existing Government Printery, let alone plans we have for a new building in accordance with the improvements being considered. The Ministry of Communications and Works has prepared a plan for extension totalling approximately 1,685 square feet which would provide additional administrative office, an extension of 253 square feet for the composing room, a proof reading office of 207 square feet, an extension of 391 square feet to the General Office and an extension of 592 square feet for the binding department. I have said this already, and I have said it at a Meeting of the Debates Committee of which he is a member and he knows this is being done.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, all the Minister has said that is being done is being done on paper and nothing further. This has been going on for some time now and will continue to go on, but what we want to see is that if you are taking on additional staff that you are providing suitable accommodation for them. The Leader of the House has found himself not so long ago offering to the Government Printery that he would try and accommodate a Proof Reader in his own office, the office of the Minister of State. 3.40 p.m.

What could be more nonsensical than all of this?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The matter is now being dealt with by the Public Service Commission. The space is in my office to accommodate a Proof Reader whenever he is appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am praying that if a Proof Reader is to be appointed to function from the Ministry of State, he will never be appointed because it would be extremely difficult for such an officer to serve the Government Printery as he should under such circumstances. I am sure the senior staff would like to have the Proof Reader working on the spot. In the event of a shower of rain and you need the Proof Reader, are you going to send somebody for him

with an umbrella in a Cabinet Office or wherever he is stationed? A Proof Reader does not function in that manner. All of this is adding more insult to a situation that poses injury to the work of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, other Departments of the Government are crying out because the Government Printery still holds orders from them for more than three years and such orders have not yet been executed. Exactly what are we doing? They have now installed I.B.M. Computers, and people who are familiar with the use of I.B.M. Computers are waiting until the month of November and December to see whether these machines can stand up to the printing requirements of Government Departments. Many people who have the knowledge of this business have their doubts. Unfortunately, the machines are already installed. We see here a change in nomenclature. You now have a Designs Officer, and that is something not known in large Printeries in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. What they want is a typographer. At the Government Printery there is not that volume of colour work that this Designs Officer will be called upon to do. What you need is a man who knows his type faces. In printing language, you need a man who knows about lay-out and display, so that when a Permanent Secretary and Officers from other Departments say that they want a form done in a particular way, the typographer, as a result of his training, would be able to make suggestions to the various Officers. Eventually, you will find that instead of using a form with five or six columns you can use one which is used in another Department with four columns. There should be a better correlation or integration of the work in the various Ministries, and an officer who knows his job will be able to assist the Government Printer and make it easier for his office to function. In that case you will not hear the complaints that you hear from time to time in Parliament, provided that officers are allowed to function as they should function.

Mr. Speaker, anything that is done to improve conditions at the Government Printery must make us happy, but let us ask ourselves this question: Will the recommendations of the Organisation and Methods Department reduce the amount of overtime in this Department? The examination of the structure does not convey this to any hon. member. As it stands at the moment there are several Sectional Heads. I do not want to prevent any Sectional Head from receiving adequate compensation for any overtime work that he might do, but I think it is silly on the part of Government to have a Sectional Head at the Government Printery working overtime on

the same basis as other members of the staff. It would be better, in my opinion, if the Sectional Head were given a flat rate per week or per month as the case may be for any overtime work that he might do. Whether or not he does overtime he should be given a flat rate to cover such an eventuality, and other members of the staff should be allowed to work overtime on an hourly basis. That is the surest way of reducing the number of overtime hours that the Government Printery will be called upon to put in from time to time.

It is not for us on this side to tell Government how it should run the Government Printery, but we are aware of the difficulties of the various Departments who have been forced to depend on the Government Printery to supply their requirements.

3.50 p.m.

Now we have got machines for composing the work at a faster rate. Just follow it step by step. After this has been done there is a question of your camera room. The camera room at the Government Printery remains the same; there is a bottleneck. They have got to make two plates for one form which is a waste of time. What they need is a larger camera because we very well know that a large camera can be used with small work, but it does not necessarily mean that a small camera can do the big jobs. Whilst the Government Printery has been able to work faster at one end, until they can buy a larger camera to do the work and get the 22 inch A.B. Dick running, then I do not think we are any wiser.

There is something that worries my mind. Time must be in the not too distant future when there must be a general revision of salaries in the public service. I see here that we have a Designs Officer at a salary of \$4,320–\$5,760, one Mechanic at \$4,320–\$5,760, a Clerk/Typist at \$1,680–\$4,140, three Binders at \$2,880–\$3,420, four Binder's Assistants at \$1,800–\$2,280, but you have three Apprentices – they did not say they were Binder's Apprentices, but they may be regular compositors – getting 40 cents an hour. Unless these people live next door to the Government Printery and are fed from the Government Printery which we know they are not, what is 40 cents an hour to these apprentices today? This is nothing in my view, Mr. Speaker, to encourage people to become apprentices to the Government Printer in 1972. This needs looking into almost immediately. In the event of a general salaries review, what is going to be the position of these salaries that are now upgraded? Our Plant Superintendent is being redesignated Assistant Government Printer in the

salary grade \$7,500–\$8,760, and we have nothing against it if he is working. He has a very responsible job; so let him have his money. When you upgrade the Heads of Sections, that is all well and good; but what we are concerned about is that when it comes to the Production Officer, what is he going to do?

The Government Printery is really and truly not producing when related to the cost of equipping and running the institution. One might say that it is cheaper to run the Government Printery than to have the work done outside, because it would mean that private enterprise has got to bear the cost of equipment, the cost of a pension scheme or whatever may come along, and a lot more besides. We agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Government Printer should have an Assistant Government Printer responsible for administration, because that in itself is a very responsible task, and we do not see why the officer who is responsible for administration should not be given a salary that reflects the measure of responsibility that he is expected to discharge in his job. On the other hand, there is the officer who is responsible for the non-technical side of the work.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that consensus of opinion will be that we must give the Government Printery another chance. It is being fed from the taxpayers' pockets and you know that the taxpayers are the best milch cows this country has ever produced, but we cannot turn our eyes against the fact that with the change in titles of offices, the turning around and shifting and what not, this will mean that the various departments that are waiting to serve the public will not be satisfied. There is still a case, Mr. Speaker, where at the Magistrates' Courts receipt books are not in stock for receiving the fees from the fathers of children. How sore a complaint that must be. I am sure the Minister of Finance might have his dig at some people who get what they call judgment summonses, but I am sure that a few weeks ago a lady from St. Peter brought me a judgment summons and you could not determine what was on it because evidently one plate had been superimposed on the other in the printing, but nevertheless she could not say that she had not been served with the appropriate notice. Perhaps if she had tried to put her case before the Judge she would be out of Court or would have to go and pay a lawyer, although I understand the Prime Minister said that some of them can be found very cheap. I do not say on James Street.

4.00 p.m.

All of these things are a reflection on the Government Printery, and the sooner they can get a proof reader the better. The proof reader is a very important cog in the machinery of the Printing Department and especially an institution like the Government Printery. I would hope that some attention is paid to this in the not too distant future.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance touched on a few of the points in this Resolution, and I turn now to these Health Centres and District Hospitals. I do not remember if the Minister touched on these, but it is said that 39 additional posts of Nursing Assistant are being created, i.e., we have 39 ward maids on the unestablished staff who are performing the duties of Nursing Assistants. I want to say it is a good thing if these ward maids are now to be made Nurses Aides or what ever one might care to call them, but what we want Government to do is this, at these District Hospitals there are some Nurses with more than ten to twelve years' service who have been trying time and time again to improve their nursing education, and there is no denying this, all sorts of obstacles are put in the way of some of these people under the pretext that the younger people must have an opportunity and what not. If these older people had not gone on in their day, if I could put it this way, to render what little skill they had at their disposal to the nursing profession to the betterment of the health of many who happened to go to the old almshouses, what would we have today for the younger people to be striving after when it comes to the question of being employed? It is not fair. I feel that every person at these institutions who has served for ten years and over and who wants to go to the refresher courses that are offered at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or wherever they are held, should be admitted without let or hindrance and given an opportunity to improve their skills. At least it would be a sort of acknowledgement and appreciation of what they have done in the past.

We have at these District Hospitals situations that are taxing to the utmost the abilities even of the trained people who have received training abroad, because some of the cases have several complications. These District Hospitals cannot accommodate all the people who are seeking the type of shelter and accommodation that the hospitals are offering. We should be coming here today not merely to make provision for the 39, but I am looking forward to the day when we will be providing a better type of institution for the housing of these poor people, when we will be providing a better type of service as in the case as I have made mention on a previous occasion of the St. Philip Hospital, your own constituency, where

there are a number of deformed children, and I want to say that nurses attending those children require very special training. These handicapped children require something more than a mother's love, and one has got to be very careful in the selection for training of people to do that type of work, but yet I am confident that in the several districts of this island there are people who are by nature people who would readily respond quickly if given an opportunity, and I am sure that much of the suffering which these little children now undergo in some of these institutions could be removed in some measure.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Trade is having on a permanent and pensionable basis a Chief Price Control Officer at \$11,400 a year; 3 Price Control Officers; 1 Senior Economist and so on. In other words, they are going through the gamut of things. But exactly what does all of this mean to the consuming public? I do not think one would say that it is too early to be querying what is likely to be the ultimate result of this, because these are all posts for specialists. Price control is no slipshod exercise today. We are hoping that, when the Research Division is set up and the Economist brings his knowledge to bear upon the high prices in this community — the high prices that are killing mankind — we will see that some effort is being made, even in the remotest manner, to make us feel that some sort of control has been put on the continual spiral in the cost of living in this country where food prices are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Trade requires additional staff, and we believe this. I believe that people will agree that it first requires a Minister — a Minister who can speak out to the people who are in business and trade; a Minister who can not merely copy the practices of these people, but a Minister who can sit with his Planning Committee and see where these high-price bosses have tried to circumvent things and to throw the burden on the consuming public at times when they need not do so. If we are going to increase our Price Control staff by giving them the specialists for which they ask, then we hope we are not providing such staff to go to Pie Corner to bring a prosecution against some man for selling a tin of Corned Beef for 1d above the control price, when right on our doorsteps in Bridgetown all sorts of malpractices are engaged in. There is evidence that some of these people who are paid to do a job wilfully take themselves out of the area where they know trouble is brewing. They remove themselves from the area and work somewhere else at the particular time, because they do not want to appear to be offending certain people. We want to get away from all of this. If we are paying people to do a

job, then we want to see the job well done, and we hope that the community as a whole will benefit from all of this money that is being spent.

You will find, Mr. Speaker, that we have our Price Control Officer who will be very much concerned with advice on the subsidisation of the price of foods and matters of that sort. These, in our view, are not matters for any individual. These are matters for a body of people or a committee — a committee who would be giving careful study to the trend of things, whether exports or imports. The committee should be comprised of people who have studied trade in all its aspects and would be in a position to advise the Government to come to the rescue of the consuming public at a particular time. I feel that, some good could result, if this matter is properly organised, and the whole scheme of things is gone into as it ought to have been gone into.

4.20 p.m.

Now, I see here some transfers as a result of this re-allocation of subjects. The post of Assistant Secretary has been transferred from the Ministry of Home Affairs to the Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance with effect from 1st April, 1972. A post of Administrative Assistant has also been moved from the Ministry of Trade to the Ministry of Education.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, may appear to be very good; but it would seem that a thorough examination of the staffing structure of the Ministry of Labour and a study of the staffing structure of the Ministry of Trade would convince us that there is much to be desired. Yet you will find, Sir, that there was apparently some good reason for transferring the post of Administrative Assistant from the Ministry of Trade to the Ministry of Education, when at this time the Ministry of Trade requires additional administrators. We would like to see something done about all of this.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to speak on any of these other items. I leave it to other honourable members who have been studying them in some detail. However, we see that there is a provision for six supernumerary posts in the non-gazetted rank of the Police Force in order to institute an accelerated promotion scheme.

What accelerated promotion scheme will this bring about? You could have some accelerated scheme of promotion in the Force, and we need it. But we need men in the Force who are not suspect by their superiors. That is the first thing, Mr. Speaker.

We need men in the Police Force who can really and truly sit down and map out a plan of action as a team. What I am saying, Sir, is this: It does not now happen, and it cannot now happen in the Police Force in the present structure. So you will see, Sir, that this provision for six supernumerary posts is merely touching the hem of the garment. It is not an answer to the numerous rapings, mobbings and the sophisticated crime that we hear the Assistant Commissioner speak about.

We are satisfied, Sir, that the six supernumerary posts really require some young men; but if one were to study the statistics of the Force over the past 10 to 15 years, one would see that these young men have been using the Force merely as a lever or stepping stone or bridge to getting somewhere else. They have not been making policing a career; and it is strange, very strange, Mr. Speaker, that you find three or four men who have gone up from the ranks and who have reached the top and they cannot find it possible to come up with a single suggestion at any point.

They can do nothing. They cannot make a suggestion or take any measure that will encourage the younger men to make policing a career. Why is that? That is something that calls for much deeper and closer study than has been given in recent years. The situation is not good at all; and the sooner we study it the better it will be for us all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should have been on his feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was on my feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should have been on his feet. My eyes did not catch the honourable member. The honourable member will take his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That may be true because Your Honour was looking into the book. Your Honour was not looking in my direction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member take his seat? Honourable members should rise promptly. The Government's business must be conducted with despatch. Will the honourable member take his seat?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not quite understand.

Mr. Speaker rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will take his seat. I deliberately looked around to see if the member for St. Peter had finished speaking, and all honourable members were seated. It is not my duty to sit here and wait for ten minutes before honourable members rise. *(Aside)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir —

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member for the City of Bridgetown to withdraw that statement immediately. Will the honourable member for Bridgetown withdraw from the Chamber immediately? Will the Shorthand Reporter ignore the aside which, I am sure, was audible to your ears.

Mr. Mottley withdrew from the Chamber.

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

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LOWE — 13.

NOES: Mr. HINDS and Mr. CRAIG — 2.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I just want to point out that both Items 1 and 2 are matters to be dealt with in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Leader of the House now make a new motion incorporating Items 1 and 2?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Items 1 and 2 which are Money Resolutions be dealt with in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the House withdrawing his first motion and substituting the second motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with Items 1 and 2 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 13

A Resolution for the sum of \$163,482 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution, as it says, is asking for the amount of \$163,482 to continue the additional mains and standposts laying programme for the year 1972-73. In the Estimates Head 102 — Capital, Ministry of Communications and Works, Item 17, the amount of \$150,000 was provided and so quickly did the Ministry of Communications and Works carry out part of the programme laid down for 1972-73 that in three months' time this amount was spent. The programme has not been continued for the last three months because there is no money, and in order to implement the intention of making water available to every home in Barbados additional works have been included to meet the demands which are very great.

Furthermore, the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department has received a bill for the sum of \$40,000 in connection with amounts for stores, etc. which were not paid when the financial year started. Consequently, it is necessary not only

to have an additional amount of money, but \$40,000 and another \$12,000 which is needed to complete these projects. The Ministry cannot complete these projects and spend the money, the need is very great, the resources are limited, and the Ministry endeavours to spread the whole requirements over every parish. In the first programme for this year St. Michael, Christ Church, St. Philip, St. George, St. Thomas, St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. James were included and the calculation was that those projects would come to \$149,264. As I said, the allocation was \$150,000. We have calculated in the new scheme to cover the parishes of St. Michael, Christ Church, St. James, St. Lucy, St. John and St. George in the laying of mains and standposts to the tune of another \$100,482 so that you will see if the House grants this allocation this year alone we will be spending the sum of nearly \$150,000 plus \$163,000 which will be \$313,000 on mains and standposts. To be more exact, we will be spending the sum of \$266,000 roughly, leaving out the figure of \$40,000 which is now being taken care of and which is in relation to bills from the last financial year.

I endeavour as far as possible to meet the needs of the entire community, and my job as Minister of Communications and Works is to see that the maximum amount of people in this community get water, so that very often you may find the demand from the public for water in a village with only five houses and I cannot give any village in this country with five houses water to the detriment of a village with 100 houses. I make no apology for that. The Government is committed to give every person this facility, but money does not grow on trees, the Government does not have a tree at the Garrison from which it can pick the money, so that people will have to wait in due course, but I would like to give them the assurance that as long as this Government remains in power their needs will be met. I know that every person thinks that his water is more important than the other person's water because he does not know the need, but I want to let persons know that the basis on which the priority is established is the amount of houses that the expenditure put out will serve. There may be five or six houses in one village and as many as thirty or forty in another village, and my job is to give the maximum number of people water so I cannot justify giving five houses and not forty. The public of Barbados will be eventually served, and I think they need not have any apprehension at all that this Government is committed to give them this needed facility. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$1.8 million from the Consolidated Fund to supplement the Estimates Part II — Capital. The Hon. Minister in charge will present this Resolution. He is the Minister of Lands and Housing.
4.40 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this amount of \$1.8 million, as the Resolution states, is required to supplement the Estimates. Indeed, it is required to purchase a property known as the Marine Hotel. This property is comprised of over fourteen acres of land. For your information, Sir, I have passed a copy of the plans to the other side. As I was saying, the amount we are paying for this property is \$1.8 million. A brief calculation will show that the amount which is being paid for this property is less than \$3 a square foot, and this is exclusive of all the buildings, the tennis court, swimming pool and so on that are on the property. It also includes, Mr. Chairman, the furniture and fittings and they are very expensive.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of this Honourable Chamber, I should like to give an indication of the kind of furniture, fittings, kitchen equipment, crockery, cutlery, linens, beds, chairs, air conditioners, lifts, garden equipment and everything else in the building. In other words, we are acquiring the property virtually as a going concern. All that is required of the Government, if the intention were to use it as an hotel, would be to open it and allow guests to go in. The kitchen equipment, deep freezes, stoves and so on are all there. If it were the intention to use it as an hotel it could be used at this very moment. There are 164 single beds; 1 double bed; matching mattresses and twice as many pillows; 85 Ratan Chairs; 161 Upright Chairs; 9 Morris Chairs; 19 Basket Chairs; 6 Bamboo Chairs; 2 Tub Chairs; 6 Upholstered Chairs; 85 Desks; 64 Dressing Tables, etc. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. There are garden tools; cocktail glasses; crockery; cutlery; the bar; bar equipment; a Tennis Court; and a Swimming Pool, which can be used by the Ministry of Community Development when they so desire in order to instruct young children in the art of swimming. In fact, there is a course now being carried out at the Marine Hotel.

First of all, it is intended to move the Hotel School from St. Leonards to the Marine Hotel. Not much alteration is intended to be carried out to the building for this purpose. Not much would be needed for the purpose of siting offices there. It is

intended that this Hotel School should provide for some guest accommodation, so that persons who are being trained in the art of Hotel Administration will have a residential area where they can have full training in this discipline.

It is also intended to convert the main Dining Hall into a Conventional Hall with full Conference facilities. It is believed that the Hall could seat 200 or 300 persons. It is intended, too, to move various Government Ministries and Departments there: the Training Division, the Statistical Department, the Ministries of Tourism, Housing, Legal Affairs and External Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, in our opinion, this is a first-class acquisition. The amount of floor area we have acquired is over 74,000 square feet. We are planning to build in Fairchild Street a 10-storey building as well as an annexe of three floors amounting to about 140,000 square feet. In other words, it will be twice as much as the Marine Hotel, but the estimated cost for the construction of this building is over \$6 million as things are now. We are, indeed, acquiring here half of the floor area for one-quarter of the price which it will take to build those 13 floors in Fairchild Street.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has any acquaintance with Government accommodation will see how very necessary is this acquisition. Virtually every Ministry is packed almost like sardines. It is not possible for the various officers in the Ministries to carry out their functions with the efficiency that is necessary in Government Departments or indeed in any Department, because of the tight accommodation that exists.

I should also like to say that about four or five months ago we had intended to convert two blocks at the Garrison into office use. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to give you and this Honourable Chamber the estimate that has been provided for us by the Ministry of Communications and Works. First of all, the estimate for stripping the building was over \$40,000; to renovate it and to bring it into office use, the estimate was approximately \$465,000, but to be precise it was \$464,899. That is to bring Block B at the Garrison into use for only two Ministries: The Ministry of Legal Affairs and the Ministry of External Affairs. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that, in the light of the facts given to this Honourable Chamber, the conclusion would be that the acquisition of the Marine Hotel is, indeed, a very good buy, and I so commend it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I heard the Minister reading out the list of beds and mattresses, I wondered exactly what business he was going in for. It sounded like the Swiss soldier reading out the list to the Bulgarian baroness of the hotel he had recently acquired in Switzerland, but the Minister has brought us in Bernard Shaw's play, "After The Man." However, the Minister has brought us back to reality by explaining for what the Marine Hotel has been acquired.

The first point I am going to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the acquisition of the Marine shows up how desperately wasteful the Government has been in a lot of previous acquisitions. The immense amount of money which the Minister himself has said the Government is prepared to pay to house one or two Departments, whether it is possible, as in an instance like this to buy a large property for a sum of money which I, for one, cannot call excessive. I am going to deal with that in a minute. What I would call excessive is where you can spend \$2½ million on converting the Marine Hotel into office space — over 1½ acres of office space. Why is the Government undertaking.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Government is not spending any \$2½ million in converting any building at the Marine Hotel into office space. The Government is paying \$1.8 million for the Marine Hotel; there will be very little alterations done to the building and, as a matter of fact, it can be used for offices right now, I think the hon. member misunderstood me.

Mr. ADAMS: It is not difficult to misunderstand the Hon. Minister.
4.50 p.m.

I think that I heard the figure of \$465,000 mentioned.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to point out that at the time that the Minister was reading, he might not have been aware of what the Public Works would charge. The estimate for converting a single block at the Garrison for the Ministry of External Affairs and the Legal Department alone was over \$460,000.

I gave specific instructions that no money is to be spent on the Marine House, as I think the Minister called it, which would be like Chaguaramas — a conference centre and hotel — with 14 bedrooms accommodating the Ministry of Tourism, the Legal Department, the Ministry of External Affairs, the Training Unit and the Statistical Office because we need buildings for the Regiment at the back of the Garrison by the Light and Power Company.

What the Minister was demonstrating then was that for Block B alone – I wonder why he did not pause when the honourable member for St. Thomas and his colleague for St. James were involved in business which clearly did not concern this House at this moment. It might have been of great pith and moment to the honourable members, but they certainly were not listening to the Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: I am glad that the Prime Minister has explained in two sentences what the Minister of Lands took a whole speech to explain. Certainly the \$465,000 – I caught it – I obviously misunderstood the Minister. I am obliged to the Prime Minister for explaining. I will advise the Prime Minister that I am as fully capable of listening to the Minister of Lands while talking to the honourable member for St. James as he was while sleeping. He at least has never had to wake me up in court. He will recall what I mean.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to get the record straight. If I sleep in court, at least I sleep successfully. I have never practised at the Bar of Barbados when the honourable member was a member of this Bar.

Mr. ADAMS: The Prime Minister knows what I mean. To get back to the question of the Marine, and to land acquisitions, a lot of money has been spent by the Government on land acquisition. How does this acquisition compare in relative cost with what the Government has recently paid for a prospective new building for the Ministry of Agriculture? How does it compare with what the Public Works is prepared to make the Government pay for a Ministry of External Affairs and a Legal Affairs office? How does it compare with a ten-storey building in Fairchild Street?

That is something to which I would have adverted. The Minister spoke about an estimate of \$6 million. Does he appreciate what is at stake when he makes that part of his speech and says look how much we are paying for the building in Fairchild Street and how little we are paying for the Marine? That is our argument, not his.

I am glad that it is not \$2½ million. I am glad that you did not add on \$480,000. If the Government knows that it can get the Marine for under \$2 million why is it planning to burden the taxpayers with a \$6 million building in Fairchild Street – and which, for all we know, will probably cost \$12 million?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member. We do not have

to justify anything as a Government. We explain, and any action that we take can be justified by posterity or the present generation – those who think straight.

As a result of the offer – this is the first hotel that has been offered to the Government of Barbados – we acquired the hotel, happily at a price below what they were asking. I will tell the honourable member something outside – not personal – which I did not explain on the floor of this House, in so far as the financing of this \$1.8 million is concerned. As Leader of the Opposition he is entitled to know.

I should parenthetically warn the honourable member that the agreed formula should not be disclosed to the subordinates on his left.

As I was saying, Sir – (*Asides*) The Leader of the Opposition is part of Her Majesty's Government which you are not. (*Asides*)

But you have no official post in the eyes of Her Majesty the Queen, the head of this Government. (*Aside*) There is no such post. He embarrasses honourable members on his left by being rational sometimes. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not prepared to accept this behaviour. I am speaking to all honourable members inside this Chamber.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We will get on. There are some things that can be disclosed to the Leader of the Opposition that honourable members on this side cannot know, because he is part of the Government. When you listen to his speeches you know that he is part of the Government.

As a result of the acceptance of our offer the Minister has been discussing knocking off four floors of the proposed building. The history of this building is that the National Insurance Board insisted that they should have a building of their own, put up with their money; and meeting after meeting the National Insurance Board put in their request.

We looked at it, and then we decided that it would be better for them to lend money to the Government to put up a building which would house the Central Bank, the Savings Bank, the Barbados Development Bank and other financial institutions because the Treasury is overcrowded. I suggested that it would be better, after consulting the Cabinet, to borrow the money from them and lease back the building or part of it to them than

for us to pay for the whole building and land of 140,000 square feet. That is on the drawing board.

Now that we have acquired nearly 75,000 square feet of additional area, obviously we can modify our plans for the prestige of the National Insurance Board. But I say this: you cannot get the Public Works Department to build as economically as the buildings which were put up 50 years ago, and which have probably paid for themselves.

I agree entirely that wherever we can acquire substantially built buildings and property it is easier for the Government to do that than to put up new buildings; but there are not many more left in Bridgetown. We have acquired Albergedie which abuts and bounds on the property of the Marine Hotel. This is a considerable amount of land - about three or four acres.

We need more land on which to build, and we have something which is equivalent to a land bank. We have now at least four acres where we can put up the Government Printing Office. In other words, we would acquire land if we buy good sized properties.

I just rose to explain to the honourable member that as a result of this acquisition we can reduce the expenditure of going up in the air with the new National Insurance building.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Prime Minister should have introduced this Resolution and not the Minister for Lands. Perhaps there are some secrets the Prime Minister keeps from his colleagues and therefore he may well feel that there are secrets I should keep from mine. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has no more or less constitutional status than the Deputy Prime Minister, because I do not see the term "Deputy Prime Minister" in any document of State other than the *Official Gazette* from time to time, but I wish to leave alone the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

The Marine Hotel does not have certain facilities which have been dwelt on, and it is fascinating to hear that the Hotel School is now going to have hotel rooms for practical work. Perhaps these rooms will be occupied from time to time so that they can carry out this work. I would like to say before I sit down, because I did not intend to speak at any great length on this matter, that we have managed to speak here today without any of us paying tribute where tribute is really due. Although I have no contact whatsoever with the gentleman in question, politically or otherwise, except to say good morning or good afternoon, I

think I may have some idea of what the Prime Minister means when he speaks of the private matters and I will not go into them, but I think that tribute must be paid to the Goddards because it is a matter of some public record that this price is less than the asking price. It is also suggested that there was an offer higher than this, there are other factors to be considered, and I have nothing as far as I know in common with the Goddards, so if I say something in their favour you can believe me because they are not contributors to any party. I regard this particular deal as partly an act of philanthropy because the price is generous. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You are a real Jekyll and Hyde).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to be silent.

Mr. ADAMS: I wanted to leave the hon. member alone, all I want to say is that the price is low. My argument is that the price is low, and if some hon. members on that side cannot understand it that is a matter for the judgement of their colleagues as recently expressed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please get back to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Am I going to be called a Jekyll and Hyde in here, Mr. Chairman? (Hon. F. G. SMITH: A hypocrite). A hypocrite? These are the remarks I am hearing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately I have not heard them.

Mr. ADAMS: Obviously the hon. member is jealous, somebody has been asked to withdraw from the House and he wants to be asked to withdraw again. The owners of the Marine Hotel have given the Government a very favourable deal and the people of Barbados should be grateful for it. I hope it will control the Government in some of its further acquisitions. My understanding is that a list of the acquisitions should be laid on the Table of the House from time to time, but I have not seen such a list since this House has existed, and I would ask the Minister of Lands to lay such a list at an early opportunity. I believe we would all want to know what properties the Government has bought and the prices paid for them. I believe there are hon. members on that side who would be as glad to know. All sorts of rumours go about about the Government spending this sum and that, I have heard that the million dollars which is already there is earmarked for something else and perhaps this afternoon the Minister would be able to give us an idea of what has been spent out of the million dollars which was the original vote so far.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On the point of the acquisitions, the law used to provide in the same way that a terrier should be kept by the Director of the Public Works Department which is now the Ministry of Communications and Works. The Department of Lands and Surveys is in the process of compiling this list, and some of the hon. members would find that they are squatting on Government land right now, because there is too much Government land that nobody is looking after. There is a lot of land on President Kennedy Drive which belongs to the Government and all over the island there is Government land which is being squatted on. There is land next to the Fire Station at Weston, St. James that a former member of this House used to collect the rent for the Northern District Council, but there should be not much difficulty in compiling a list of all the properties that Government has acquired during the past ten years, because I should also like to demonstrate that we pay certain prices for it and the market value of the land is more than twice and a half what was actually paid. I do not know of any legislation, but I would be very glad within the next month to provide the members of the House with a list of all properties acquired by the Government in the last ten years.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Marine Hotel is situated in my constituency, and I welcome the acquisition of this property by the Government. I do so for many reasons. One of these reasons has already been stated by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it is that I think it is a very favourable price which Government has paid for land in an extremely commercial area with the price of land in that area being what it is today. Secondly, I believe very strongly that the Government had to step in in this case if it were necessary to preserve for Barbadians a very historical part of the development of the Tourist Industry. In the third place, I think it is true to say that if there is a family which has shown - regardless of what complexion - that they are interested in the welfare of Barbados, they happened to be the Goddards' family.

I know that an approach was made to the Government concerning this matter, because the family felt very strongly that, if necessary, it should be maintained by Barbadians and owned by Barbadians, and I think it is, therefore, fitting that it should be owned by the Government. I should like to tell the Minister, however, that there are various Government Institutions like the St. Matthias Schools which are bursting at the seams, and a part of this 14 acres could be properly used for public services in this respect.

I should like, again, to emphasize in this House that my constituency, like a lot of the Island, has very pressing, housing problems. The Marine Hotel abuts and abounds very closely the St. Matthias Housing Area or the Pleasant Hall Housing Area. I trust that the Government, having acquired this land, will come up with concrete plans for extension of the Housing area properly and the provision of certain other social amenities such as playing grounds which are needed in this part of Christ Church.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to explain something to him. He did mention the St. Matthias Boys' and Girls' Schools which are bursting at the seams. There is some overcrowding at those two schools, but the hon. member, I am certain, will be pleased to know that tenders are being invited for the construction of a new Secondary School which will be situated at the Garrison, and children in the 11 - 14 age range will be transferred from those schools into the new Secondary School at the Garrison. These schools are in his constituency.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am very much aware that there will be some transfer, but I am sure that even in the infant range, below that age and also some of those who will not be transferred, there is a case now for proper facilities at those two schools which can be accommodated by proper extension across the way of some of the 14 acres that we are now talking about.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's constituency abounds mine. I do sometimes look after my constituents, and I trust that he will do the same thing for me in due course. I want to sound one warning about the acquisition. I am not satisfied when Government purchases properties that at some stage in the future we will hear that the properties are being sold and this House is not being notified, because as the existing legislation stands subsidiary bodies or public corporations such as the Agricultural Development Corporation can dispose of public lands, because they are quasi public bodies, without coming back to this House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is not possible for the A.D.C., the U.D.C., or any Corporation to sell any Government land. They can only sell their own lands. For them to sell any land, the land will have to be vested in them. For the Government to vest land in them, then the matter will have to be brought before the House.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will follow me, he will see the point I am

making. The A.D.C. or the U.D.C. can only acquire lands in this Island either when it is vested in them by virtue of the legislation, or vested by virtue of Cabinet and the Government passing on to them public property to which there is no consideration other than the consideration which has passed from this House, and voted by this House. In my view, although they are separate legal persons, they actually have a duty and a trust to keep intact public property. Something must be wrong with our Land Acquisition laws, if a subsidiary public body can dispose by sale of public lands whereas the Crown if it wants to lease lands must come back to the Legislature — not merely disposing of lands but even by leasing. I say this is basically wrong, as has happened recently at Graeme Hall, and that it should stop, because it always leads to all sorts of rumours and all sorts of talks. I trust that the Government will bear this in mind and, if necessary, bring in the proper type of legislation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I just want to draw to the hon. member's attention that the Agricultural Development Corporation Act provides that the Agricultural Development Corporation can dispose of its property. If the A.D.C. had the funds to purchase property it could do so without coming to the Legislature to ask for permission to do so. What has happened initially is that the A.D.C. did not have the funds, and this House purchased the property and vested it in the A.D.C.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, obviously, the Minister is following my statement very carefully. It is that power that I am saying is wrong. I am not disagreeing with him where the legal power arises. I am saying that where it is public land, we should make sure that subsidiary bodies like the A.D.C. do not have more power than the Crown itself has. Something must be wrong, because the tail is obviously wagging the dog, and this cannot be right. Therefore, on this point it is necessary for the Cabinet, which, subject to the power of the Legislature, is the overriding power in this land — the Cabinet itself cannot give a lease to anyone unless it comes back to this House; it cannot dispose of any public property unless it comes back to this House, but we have the subsidiary bodies with powers that can lease and dispose of public land as they like without coming back to this House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the U.D.C. builds and sells houses; the Housing Authority builds and sells houses. This is the authority which is given by the Legislature to these bodies. The Legislature with the approval of Cabinet and all concerned have given authority to the A.D.C. and the U.D.C. to perform that type of

function, and there is nothing wrong with that. The Legislature has given the A.D.C. the power, so it is not necessary to come back to the House for permission to do certain things. What the A.D.C. has to do is to put in its Annual Report the fact that the land has been sold, and at that stage every member of the Legislature is advised of the action taken by the A.D.C.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, whereas the Urban Development Corporation's business is to deal in housing and, obviously, for the purpose of convenience the amount of delegation to that body will be greater than the amount of delegation of another body whose business is not to deal with developing land for housing, to that extent it is unnecessary for the A.D.C. to have these powers. That is the point I am making. It is unnecessary for the A.D.C. to have these powers, if the Minister wants to hear me on this point.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember that, during the course of the Estimates, I raised this question and I pointed out that it is wrong to have public lands being disposed of, to private enterprise for purpose of speculation in circumstances where there are still a lot of public needs to be satisfied. If necessary, the Government should give consideration to amending the relevant Act. In due course that transaction will be subjected to greater scrutiny in this House. I want to give the Minister due warning, but I am saying that I hope in the case of the Marine I will not see later that it is being vested in anybody like A.D.C. or someone else and being disposed of in a manner in which A.D.C.'s land at Graeme Hall is being disposed of now. I hope that it will not happen, because, if necessary, I will make a public sacrifice for that purpose.

5.20 p.m.

But this is the point I am making. When we are dealing with public funds, everything might be right, but it must also appear right, and the best place when you are disposing of lands, that have been acquired, is the House of Assembly where it can all be above board. I am not making allegations against anyone; so I do not want the Minister to jump to his feet every time I mention the point. It sounds to me as a matter of principle that the degree of delegation given to Statutory Corporations in some respects is unnecessary and too wide.

Having said that I do not want to introduce any further rancour into the debate on this matter except to say that I hope the Government will use this trust property wisely, and since it is in my constituency I make no bones by hoping that the people particularly of Christ Church West will get

the first consideration in any use that is being put for housing. I hope in using the hotel part of it in the Hotel Training School that some of the persons who may have been displaced will be given first priority in any new employment that is being created in that area, and although I am sure the acquisition is in the interest of the Island as a whole, I think one must remember that there has been a historical association between the people in that part of the parish of Christ Church and the Marine Hotel so far as employment opportunities are concerned, and I trust that they will not be ignored when any employment opportunities are being considered and being brought about in that part of Christ Church.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the last matter first. The hon. member who has just sat down said he did not want to introduce any further rancour into the debate. I listened to his words very carefully. He had introduced rancour in it already, but he reminds me of a little mongrel, I use the word advisedly.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw referring to any hon. member of this House as reminding him of any little mongrel. The only mongrel I know he would know where he exists, and I am asking you to call on him to withdraw the remark.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not finished my simile. I was using a figure of speech. When I finish my simile he can then say whether he objects or not. I said when he makes statements like that, that he reminds me of a mongrel who takes up a bone that the big Bull Mastiff has tossed on the floor satisfied with a full belly and gone outside, and he runs in then, and takes up the dirty bone and wants to toss it around.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to the implication in the hon. member's speech that anybody in this House is like a mongrel taking up a bone and taking up a dirty bone. The only dirtiness is in his mind and the only mongrelism is in his person and in his family.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not have to rent a family. I can go back to the 1700's and I can trace my genealogy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in connection with relatives, therefore both hon. members have contravened Standing Orders, and I as Chairman am ruling now that we will leave it just like that and deal directly with \$1.8 million for the Marine Hotel.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand the sensitivity of the hon. member, and I am sorry that I made him feel badly, and I apologise for making him feel badly. I did not want to reflect on any member of his family. He can reflect on mine. I could not choose my parents but he could choose his. That is the difference between the two of us. He had an election and he could choose his parents; I inherited mine.

He said he did not want to introduce any further rancour, then he makes a political statement of the people of Christ Church being able to enjoy their traditional relationship, and I want to deal with the traditional relationship of the people of Christ Church *vis-a-vis* the Marine Hotel right here and now which he wants preserved.

First, to get the air clear, I am very glad that some hon. members had the decency to acknowledge that the Government did something in the best interest of the finances and the accommodation of the nation; so I want to pay tribute to them. But now when he drags in the Agricultural Development Corporation, I want to get the facts straight. There is a certain gentleman who writes in the Press whose name everybody knows - his initials stand for the emerging lower classes, - who wrote a scurrilous article suggesting that the Agricultural Development Corporation had gone into some secretive deal and disposed of Government land entirely at an unrealistic price to a certain private developer. It was pointed out by the Agricultural Development Corporation to the hon. member for Christ Church West who obviously is now taking up his trail that that land had been advertised in the newspapers on more than one occasion, and that there were two offers made for the land. One came from a company whose main directors is not unconnected with the Presidential Seal of the United States of America, whose sobriquet is not unconnected with the emblem on the Presidential Seal of the United States of America. If you know what that emblem is, you know to whom I refer; a Bridgetown businessman; and you know what kind of bird is on the Presidential Seal; I believe a client of the hon. member for Christ Church West. We know what the characteristics of that bird happens to be. I do not have to specify.

They offered to pay for the land in ten years and the other group who applied and put in an application offered to pay for the land in six months and it was sold to the latter. Every disposal of property by any Statutory Corporation is referred to the Minister for the Minister's notification and implied approval. There is no law which says the land can only be sold with the consent of the Minister concerned for lands or the Cabinet, and I do not know of a single case in

which land was disposed of without the approval either of the Minister or Cabinet. If the hon. member for Christ Church West, - who does not want to introduce any further rancour into the debate - can accuse the Minister for Lands or myself or the Leader of the Opposition for introducing rancour, or snapping up a lot of ill considered and best forgotten trivialities, the member for Christ Church West now says that you do not want any land disposed of because a lot of surreptitious deals may go on. I can give him my assurance that no land can be disposed of and if he wants the Minister to come in here and state that the Agricultural Development Corporation has disposed of this land or that land, or every property the U.D.C. sells at Cave Hill that his party did not have the foresight or the vision to acquire for the middle classes, the working classes and other classes, we will bring it in here and say who in the Government, the Opposition, up in the country or down in town has bought a house at Cave Hill if he thinks that is the business of the House. We have nothing to conceal.

The property at Graeme Hall was acquired by Government at a price which we refused to pay, and I wonder if the hon. member knows anything about the case. The vendors including one of the trustees took the matter to arbitration before the Court, and the Court made the Government pay a price which the Government was unwilling to pay, that is, the Court made us pay more than we thought the property was worth because it had been advertised all over the world for £91,000 by the same trustee who said that £91,000 was not enough six months later.

5.30 p.m.

Those are the circumstances under which we acquired Graeme Hall, but like many other Government Corporations, the Agricultural Development Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, - and this is where I come in now - the Urban Development Corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and any of these other statutory bodies who have business with the public and who are supposed to make a profit, not one of them had one penny of equity capital put into them and the result is that they operated from the beginning on bank overdrafts. When we acquired this three hundred acres at Graeme Hall, it included approximately 196,000 square feet, it also included the 53 acres which the ADC had itself closed off and planning permission has been given prior to 1959 for those lands to be sold and developed, so it was on the basis of that that the Courts said we had to pay more, and then the ADC on this marginal land had to borrow a lot of money to finance its other operations throughout the island, and it got

to the stage where it would be impossible for them, like BWIA and BOAC, ever to balance their books because the ADC was working for Barclays Bank, and it was under those circumstances that the Ministry directed that the ADC make application to put itself on a proper footing that the land could be sold and the 53 acres which had been approved before the property was bought and before we were even in office, and we said those lands could be disposed of and it was advertised in the newspapers.

The gentleman whose initials coincide with "emerging lower classes," when he found out that the property had been sold to the highest bidder on the best terms he said that the advertisement was only of a small size and therefore you could not expect anybody to read it. You are wasting your time if you lose a pair of spectacles or a bicycle to take three lines in the classified section, about a quarter of an inch, instead of taking a bigger space, because according to the chief feature writer of the *Advocate* newspaper when you take that size advertisement to say you have property to sell you cannot expect anybody to see it. You are wasting your time advertising in the *Advocate-News*.

All that has been gone into, the gentleman who wrote nonsense has been made to look silly, and now at this late date, just like the hon. member wanted us to put up branches of the Savings Bank in three places - Oistins, Belleplaine and Speightstown - and we had branches in fourteen places including those three, ten years before he came into the House of Assembly. This is the kind of foolishness that representatives of the people come in here with today.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, I never asked for branches to be put up at fourteen places, and furthermore they have *Post* Offices and not branches. Just to correct the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I enjoin the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to check the speeches on his side, because I said the hon. member had asked that branches of the Savings Bank be put in Belleplaine, Oistins, and Speightstown and he did not know when he was asking that, that there were branches at fourteen different places in the island including those three places. That is the quality of representation that some of the unfortunate people of Barbados have to endure when members of the House of Assembly do not do their homework. We do not mind E.L.C. who is a propagandist and the other side who come in here and try to score cheap points off the

Government, but all we are asking them to do is to check their homework. They have people like E.L.C. who always have black people they can rent out to political parties.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is trying to insinuate that the statements I made in this House are due to E.L.C. I would like to make it absolutely clear that I did not have to get information from E.L.C. or the hon. member, and thank God my brain is as good or better than the hon. member's and I would not come into this House and talk nonsense. I have been misrepresented in my speech. I said there are certain statutory bodies that do not need the legal power to dispose of land, and I went on to say that at Graeme Hall, one statutory body whose business is not dealing with land, has disposed of land in circumstances where the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that the Act gives the body authority to do so. I said if this is so, it should be so because Parliament itself has to deal with leasing land. If the Hon. Prime Minister wants to launch a personal attack on E.L.C. he is entitled to do so, but do not give the impression that I want to bring in E.L.C.'s ideas or anybody else's. Just as the hon. member was elected in St. John either by their ignorance or their wisdom by the people of St. John I was also elected by the people of Christ Church West and he has not got any monopoly on anything.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said he has a brain which is as good as mine but I would only ask him if he uses it. When I made reference to the fact that they have people who have been politically dispossessed in this Island I was not referring to E.L.C. I was referring to Mr. Brooks.

Mr. FORDE: I thought the hon. member was referring to Mr. Bernstein or Mr. Pillersdorf.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I note that the hon. member said he wanted to maintain the relationship between the former owners of the Marine Hotel and people of Christ Church, and I take it he means black people like me, because as the Leader of the Opposition said, when you talk about a black person you cannot mean a person like him.

Mr. FORDE and Mr. ADAMS rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I have never made that remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to understand I am on my feet.

Mr. ADAMS: I apologise, Sir, I did not see you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are going to stick to the Resolution for \$1.8 million and stop this wrangling.

Mr. FORDE: Before we do that, Sir, let me make the position clear. The Public Order Act in this country prevents people from referring to others in derogatory terms so far as their race is concerned. If the hon. member has a white car and a Jewish name, I have a black car and a black skin and I believe I am as good a representative of the black race as himself.

5.40 p.m.

I like people regardless of their racial characteristics. I do not have to change my name to "Barouch" or "Fordouch", nor do I have to claim any Jewish ancestry in this House, because I can stand on my own two feet as being born from poor people in this country and not be afraid of it. If he is afraid of it, I am sorry for him.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We do not change our names to, we change our names from. I said that the hon. member ended up on what he considered to be a lofty note of maintaining the traditional relationship between the Marine Hotel and the people in Christ Church. I want to assure the hon. member that this Government has no intention of maintaining this traditional relationship, because the traditional relationship that I knew when I was a school boy was that the black people from Christ Church or from any other parish were not even allowed in to the Marine Hotel. I have asked and he has specified what he meant. He said: "Employees of the lowest order." (*Asides*) He did not say employees of the lowest order, he said employment wise, but I am saying employees of the lowest order.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister to name it "Barbados House". It has to be a centre that we are proud of; it is a centre where the daughters and sons of the domestic servants will learn to be not only Waitresses and Maids, but from Desk Managers, Chef Cooks, Pastry Chefs, Bookkeepers, Accountants and so on. We are not maintaining the traditional relationship. Even up to the time when we bought it there has never been a black Manager at the Marine Hotel, and we are not going to maintain any such relationships. We want every black person from Christ Church or any other parish to feel that the "Barbados House" belongs to him when he walks into it.

When we have visitors from overseas we will have the Hotel Trainees serving and preparing meals, meeting them at the front desks, greeting them and so on at all levels, I would like to change it from the Marine Hotel to "Barbados House". There will be a complete break with the past, because there is nothing marine or any tradition that was up there that I want to preserve. It will be free to the people, in Christ Church, or from any part of the Island. Let us get our philosophy straight. It is unfortunate that what he considers to be a lofty violation should end up as a miserable whimper from the past.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to rise again on this, except that the Prime Minister has a brain which he says he uses, but he uses it in such a manner that he is capable of misrepresenting things that people say. He wants it to go in the records of this House that in my speech I was asking that any form of racial discrimination which was practised at the Marine Hotel or anywhere else should be continued in the parish of Christ Church or anywhere else. The context in which I made the statement is that traditionally people in Christ Church West have always obtained employment at the Marine Hotel. The fact that the Government has not yet got a black Manager at their Hilton Hotel might be due to the policies of the Government and to the Prime Minister's attitude, but it would be unfair for him to come into this House and try to mislead the country and the House by insinuating that I am asking that the unfortunate, as he says, people of Christ Church West should continue the traditional relationship with the Marine. The only manner in which the people of Christ Church West have been unfortunate is that they had the commonsense to return one B.L.P. member, myself, and the people of St. John did not join with them in the unfortunate condition and throw him out. That is the only reason in which they have been unfortunate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Massa!

Mr. FORDE: The Prime Minister can behave as badly as he wants, by getting up and saying "Yes, Massa!" and making statements outside of the House. I believe that is due to his normal nature; it runs in his family, Sir. The point I am trying to make is that, in Christ Church West many people, as the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister will tell him, from that part of the constituency in Christ Church have always been employed at the Marine regardless of the situation in which they have been employed. I went on to point out that, in future if there are employment opportunities available they should be made available to some of the people who may have

lost their jobs if there have been severance and they have not yet been re-employed. Let us get the record straight.

I have heard that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central had to get the record straight already for the purpose of Hansard, and he used words in relation to the hon. member that I do not want to use in this House. I have also heard the hon. member for St. Michael West getting the record straight in relation to him, but I do not want the Prime Minister to believe that he can come in here and misrepresent me and leave the House with the record as it is. That is what I want to make straight in the House.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$1.8 million do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these two Resolutions be now read a first time.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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 these two Resolutions be now read a second time.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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 these two Resolutions be now agreed to.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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 Order No. 4 standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister be the next Order of the Day. It is to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1972

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969.
5.50 p.m.

Your Honour will remember that as a result of certain decisions which were made in my Budget Speech of that year, this Act was brought into effect to provide for a tax of 2½% on the transfer of any property whether the property was by way of shares or by actual conveyance and transfer of land itself. Then subsequently the Property Transfer Tax Act was amended to provide that where property such as I have described was transferred to a person other than a national, resident or citizen of Barbados that the effective rate of tax should be 2½% on the vendor and 7½% on the purchaser. Prior to that amendment a purchaser paid 2½% if he was not a resident or national or native of Barbados. The situation today is that a vendor in any event always pays 2½%, but a purchaser if he is a Barbadian pays nothing; but a purchaser if he is an alien, using a generic term, pays 7½% bringing the effective rate of tax up to 10% in the case where land is sold to a non-resident or non-national of this country.

Like all legislation, as soon as you pass it, especially where the payment of money is involved, the members of the legal profession, the accountants, and the financiers seek ways and means of evading the tax within the letter but certainly contrary to the spirit of the law, and we have discovered that there are certain defects in the existing legislation — loopholes you may call them — whereby not an accurate assessment has been made in all cases of the true market value of the property transferred, and this is because the power was vested in the Registrar General of the Island, and there was no proper provision made for effective valuation of property in order to assess whether the true tax was paid or not.

The discretion was in the hands of the Registrar who is a legally trained person, but certainly not trained in the processes and mysteries of land valuation.

What brought this to a head as far as I am concerned is a case where the transfer of property was over \$6 million on which a tax of \$600,000 should have been paid, and to my recollection — I can check it because it would be here — the total amount of tax was just under \$46,000 instead of \$600,000, and the officer responsible for assessing that tried to justify it not on the grounds of a rational explanation but on the grounds that the law vested him with the authority and did not make any provision for anyone else to do the assessment and therefore whatever he did was well done. As far as I am concerned what he did was not well done and what we are doing in this amendment to the Property Transfer Tax Act is to ensure that proper valuations are made and that no — I deliberately use this expression — bogus leases and back to back leases concocted by the members of the legal profession will allow any foreign company or any local person for that reason to avoid paying his true incidence of tax under the legislation which we have.

I want to say that it is considered by certain eminent authorities even the High Court of Justice in England that it is the duty of any citizen to pay as little tax as possible provided it is done legally. I maintain that human condition is so fraught with avarice and acquisitiveness that people do not like spending money for the maintenance of the country; certainly on their own pleasures they do not mind spending money, and therefore I am saying that any legal device they can resort to and get away with according to judgments delivered in the High Court of Justice in England there is nothing illegal about. I do not know if they went into the question of morality, but impliedly what is legal is not immoral to avoid paying tax. So I do not want you to take it as any personal criticism of any individual member of the legal profession, but it is certainly unpatriotic to assist a foreign company in saving \$550.00 worth in taxes. That could build at least half of the St. George Comprehensive School.

What we are doing here is amending the Bill to plug up these gaps whereby the revenue is drained away in legal casuistry, and by the failure of officers to interpret their duties in a way which would redound to the credit of the country.

Now there have been other problems in that the University of the West Indies has acquired property for members of its staff and we are seeking to exempt the University of the West Indies from the payment of the tax as a purchaser. In other words a Barbadian does not have to pay the tax as a purchaser; only a non-resident, non-national or alien has to make that payment of 7½%. The University has bought houses for staff some of which are Barbadians, but in spite of the fact that you may have Barbadians living in the houses of the University which is an institution supported by us as one of the contributing Governments and not by any behest or grants or anything like that, the University has to pay the tax because there was no provision made to exempt them from payment.

The second purpose which I have already enlarged upon was to prevent loss of tax in the case of a series of transactions between the same persons or connected persons relating to the transfer of shares where the aggregate amount of value of the consideration, that is, the price paid for the shares, would exceed \$25,000.

The third provision is to enable the Minister of Finance to refund the whole or any part of the tax which is payable or paid by a person if he considers it equitable to do so. This does not mean that the Minister can exercise his discretion to dispense with the payment of tax if somebody says he is buying a house for \$50,000 but he does not have any more money in the Bank and that he voted for the Government or anything like that. The way in which the discretion of the Minister is exercised is along the traditional grounds, charitable ground or scientific, educational and so on which we find under all taxing legislation. I do not know of a single case where there has been an appeal *ad misericordiam* on compassionate grounds for the dispensation from paying the tax which is deductible.

We are also making provision in this amendment, Mr. Speaker, to permit where the Government is acquiring property either under compulsory acquisition or otherwise to deduct at source from the payment of the consideration in which the Government is called upon to hand over the proper amount of land transfer tax at source.

In the case of the Resolution which we have just passed, it is estimated that the property transfer tax payable on the acquisition of the Marine Hotel would be between \$45,000 and \$50,000, so that what the Government would normally hand over to the vendors of the

property would not be \$1.8 million, but \$1.8 million less the amount of property transfer tax which the vendor is supposed to pay which has not been calculated accurately, and there are various other little imposts that will go on. I just want to make that clear that under this legislation that will be deductible at source.
6.00 p.m.

I do not want to elaborate on that, but since the introduction of this tax we collected in 1970-71 \$1.67 million in property transfer tax, in 1971-72 we collected something in the vicinity of \$1.5 million which is \$3 million for those two years, and in 1972-73 we have estimated we will collect in addition to the stamp duty another \$1.5 million which I have every reason to believe we will receive. The Objects and Reasons set out clearly the reasons for these amendments. There are 13 clauses to the Bill including the short title and the effective date of the amendment, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak at very great length on this because I may very well be one of the legal practitioners to whom the Prime Minister was referring who is giving advice on it. This very week I have been in the course of giving advice on it and therefore I do not wish to go into it but I have to mention this. To some extent I imagine, although I have no financial interest in the particular transaction myself the burden of my argument will affect the position of one or more of my clients. The burden of my argument is this. The Act is not just closing loopholes for the future, but by the most regrettable piece of drafting the Act is seeking to impose this closing of the loopholes retroactively. Section 13 of the Act states:

Effective date of certain amendments.

13. The principal Act —

- (a) shall be deemed always to have had effect as amended by section 2(a) of this Act;
- (b) shall be deemed to have had effect from the 31st March, 1970 as amended by sections 2(b) and 5(c) of this Act.

I am told by a solicitor, not Mr. Brooks nor indeed Mr. Turney, that the date of 31st March,

1970 has been selected so as to catch a particular transaction which was recorded shortly after that time. On principle I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, this is wrong, this is straightforward retroactive taxation. If you find a loophole in an Act like this, the purchase price should be adjusted to take account of the fact that there is no property transfer tax. When those people have taken certain action upon the basis of being able to avoid perfectly lawfully the incidence of property transfer tax, they may have adjusted their price accordingly and the contract may have gone through, this Act is now giving the Registrar power to re-open transactions over a period of four years and also making certain transactions taxable which were not taxable at the time that they took place. This is wrong and I am inclined to believe it is against section 16 of the Constitution, and for that reason I am going to be forced to vote against the Bill.

I am as interested in seeing tax Bills properly drawn. We come in here and say that the draftsmen do not know what they are doing and yet in a case like this not a word presumably is going to be said by the former Attorney General on that point, but the draftsmen made mistakes and I am perfectly happy to see the mistakes straightened out but not retroactively. If in any way my vote for this Bill was going to allow something that would not be constitutional to become constitutional then this Bill cannot receive my vote. I do not believe it would be easy for me ever to vote retroactively for a Bill unless there was a warning to the people at the time that what they were doing was likely to be taxed. I do not know if the Prime Minister knows who are the parties to the transaction, I have heard that a very small tax was paid, but I think it is very unfair for the Registrar to bring this case up because it is to my knowledge that it is at the initiative of the Registrar that some of what is in this Act has come into being and I think it is extremely unfair for the Minister to suggest that an officer responsible for the administration of so important an Act like the taxation Act has been in any way remiss but nonetheless this transaction is there, I do not know the details and therefore I cannot give an opinion and it is too delicate a matter for me to give opinions standing here. The retroactive provisions have not been touched on at all by the Prime Minister. His reasons for wanting to have the Act made retroactive in these particular respects where there has been a land acquisition transfer and where there has been the transfer of shares have not been canvassed in the slightest. Even if they are canvassed I am not going to vote for it, but it should be understood that in dividing the House on this matter it is being

divided on a constitutional point and not upon the general principle of the Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am sorry the hon. member for St. James is not here because he would have heard what the Leader of the Opposition had to say. The hon. member chose his words very carefully. It would be unconstitutional to impose criminal penalties for something which at the time did not constitute a crime in the eyes of the law of this island, but I do not want to rake up old things, no less a legal luminary than his late ancestor gave notice that he would impose retroactive taxation just before the breaking up of the Federation.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Sir. I think the Prime Minister will give way to a point of explanation. The Prime Minister is not a historian. He often does not remember what he says in the earlier part of the debate. His memory is very good on what happened 50 years ago in St. Croix, because he can remember that at the age of two-and-a-half he went to school accompanied by no one but a Great Dane dog with an umbrella; but his memory of recent history is less vivid than that.

My understanding was that the Leader of the Federal Government stated, which was a fact, that the Federal Government could impose retroactive taxation. I have said that I hope I would never vote for retroactive taxation except in the special circumstances where there is a need for it. You warn people not to do something, because if they do it they will be asked to pay next year when the law is passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I could not resist the little excursion into history. I am not saying anything derogatory; I am merely stating facts, and I did not condemn or upbraid anybody for having made that statement. I am merely pointing out that a Government has power to impose retroactive taxation. Whether the Government has good reason for doing it is another matter, but there are cases where people know that they are doing things which are not right. This is a case in which they were informed by no less a person than myself that there was no objection to the transfer of the property to a foreign company, because we had no law against it, and I added these words intuitively not even thinking that they were trying to drag me into the matter. I said provided you pay the \$600,000 that belongs to the Government, I am very happy. It was in these peculiar circumstances that I was surprised that the Registrar and the Solicitors for the parties then devised this

back-to-back mortgage business whereby the tax was avoided.

Now, I want to make my position clear. Constitutionally, there is nothing wrong in imposing retroactive taxation. I have never felt very strongly about it one way or the other, but I do not see the Government being deprived of revenue. It is a different thing altogether where you create an offence like some of the African Presidents do now from day to day. They create offences after the deeds are done, and then they try somebody and execute him. That is a different matter, because you are dealing with a man's life and liberty. Where a man schemes and tries to avoid the payment of tax which the law clearly intends that is a different matter.

Sir, we have made our mistake. The House made a mistake; the people who should have paid the tax made a mistake; and there may be more than one. I was going to suggest that, since the hon. member for St. Thomas has disclosed that there is a transaction in which he has had to advise, we should make the effective date the day on which the Bill was introduced. I do not see that it will serve any useful purpose going back further and, after consulting with as many of my colleagues as possible, I am prepared to make the effective date the day on which the Bill was introduced or the day on which it is passed. It will serve no useful purpose going back to people to say that the tax should now be paid. \$600,000 is a lot of money.

Sir, I have listened very carefully to the hon. member for St. Thomas and, although I do not agree with the route at which he has arrived at his conclusion, we on this side have arrived at the same conclusion on the basis of equity. It is not that we have any sympathy with the wrong-doers or the nonpayers of taxes, because our tax is deducted at source. In the peculiar circumstances, if it does not affect the hon. member too much, we will make the effective date the day on which the Bill was introduced or the day on which it is passed.

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

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

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 be postponed.

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

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

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the first one that we need look at. There is no reason why, after this Bill is passed and the effective date of the coming into force of the Bill is the 17th October, 1972, we should remove that condition that is if the Registrar discovers it within four years. The reasons why I say so is that for the purposes of death duties or for the purposes of income tax, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue can go as far back, I believe, as five years. In some cases it is three years, but I cannot distinguish the cases at the moment. I believe that, both in death duties and in income tax, if the Commissioner of Inland Revenue discovers within that period that the tax has not been paid, he can call on the taxpayer and readjust the tax in a direction for or against the tax. Although we have given expression to the 4-year period, I should like that to remain in the Bill. It would now take effect from the time the Act is passed. The Act comes into force today, therefore, I would expect that it would not refer to transactions four years back from yesterday, but within four years from now.

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

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.20 p.m.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 13 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I see nothing wrong with Clause 13(a). It is 13(b) "shall be deemed to have had effect from the 17th October, 1972".

I beg to move that Clause 13 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody is suggesting that those who have had their property compulsorily acquired under the Land Acquisition Act should be exempted. I think they have always thought they had to pay, because Section 2(b) refers to persons whose land is compulsorily acquired by the Government. It is section 5(c). Hon. members on this side would prefer the whole thing to be today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is why I suggested 17th October, 1972. I do not think we can collect any additional tax under 2(b).

Mr. ADAMS: I was not sure of the effect of 2(b), Mr. Chairman.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think we will make one date. We have to cut our losses and call it "wally".

The question that Clause 13 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE AIRPORT SERVICE CHARGE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill as a result of my proposals to increase the Airport Service Charge from \$2 to \$3 and \$5 from 1st July, 1970. The people who collect the money made representations that the amount of costs which were deductible — this is a kind of remission given to the airlines for the book-keeping entailed in the collection of the tax; we do not have to employ people to collect it — was inadequate, and the Bill as it is now drafted proposes that a commission of 5% of the charge should be paid to the persons who collect the tax as long as they are non-governmental persons, and the effect of this is that if we do charge the Airport Service Charge on any future date at any time from now that we will not have to change the amount of the fee which would be deductible. There are only three short clauses. There is only one operative clause to the Bill, and that is Clause 2, and the first one deals with the short title and the last one deals with the commencing date of 1st April, 1972. This is not a Bill for taxation; this is a Bill where we will be paying out money and that is why we have made it retroactive.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.
6.30 p.m.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Prime Minister. I beg to move that this be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, we would ask the Government to postpone this Item. The Prime Minister was not in his seat earlier today when comments were made about the late arrival of the Order Paper, and at this stage we would prefer to postpone Items 6 and 7.

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

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

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

THE RUM DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is a very short Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I am very sorry there is no provision for dealing with all the Bills in Committee at the same time thus saving the sort of jack-in-the-box action which prevails sometimes. I hope the new Standing Orders will make provision for this. The Bill seeks to exempt articles requiring rum in their manufacture or preparation made in bond or in a distillery in Barbados from the payment of excise duty. These articles refer not to rum alone but to things like essence or falernum, and we must exempt these from the payment of excise duty once they remain in bond, but if they are re-exported duty is payable. If they are put into circulation in the market duty becomes payable because they come out of the bond.

The manufacturers have claimed that they are at a disadvantage in relation to other manufacturers in the CARIFTA Agreement, because our harbour goods are now liable to payment of excise duty thus making the locally manufactured goods less competitive than similar ones imported from the CARIFTA area. It does appear therefore that when these articles are released on to the market they will also be free from duty because manufacturers from other countries do not pay excise duty on rum. The leeway will be made up of course by the consumer taxes, the consumption tax which will be paid, because this is how we get around the revenue losses which are suffered as a result of the Free Trade Area Agreement.

It is proposed therefore by clause 2 of the Bill that all articles requiring rum for manufacture or preparation distilled in Barbados, will be exempt from the payment of duty from the date on which the Act will come into effect, and this will put us on a more competitive position with the countries outside who export rum to Barbados. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to suggest that it is time that Barbados should have some national export board to help promote Barbados rum overseas. I think we are all well aware of the fact that the taste of it is not particularly bad, and I would like at this stage to urge upon Government to get it promoted more overseas. I see the Prime Minister has the knack of getting things done, as he did in the recent industrial dispute, and I would like him to urge upon the Ministry of Trade to have an export committee set up for the purpose of at least pushing more of our goods overseas. I made the comment since we are dealing with this Bill at this particular time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not really think the hon. member expects a reply. Rum in Barbados is manufactured by about two or three families and for ten years we have been speaking to them about developing the export trade in rum and they are not interested. It is as simple as that. A firm in England made an offer to promote Barbados rum and the contract was made with the distributors in Barbados well in advance, and when they sent for the first 200,000 gallons of rum they sent them 30,000, and if you go into the United Kingdom you will see that they are blending Guyana rum with Barbados rum, so there is nothing that anybody, that I know, who has been brought into being in this world and who is a rum manufacturer in Barbados, can do about the situation, they are very happy in their situation and unless we nationalise the rum industry, nothing will be done.

6.40 p.m.

The Minister of Tourism has spent years trying to get them interested in putting forward our prime product. One of the suggestions I made to them after a trip to Canada and my discussions with the Liquor Licensing Board in Ontario and in Quebec was along these lines. They said that the Barbados rum was selling 50c cheaper than the rum from Jamaica and Cuba, and as the Barbados rum was cheaper than the other brands some people thought that it was no good. I came back here and invited them to increase the price to 50c over the cost of the other rum and they did nothing about it. I feel that there is a case for putting the rum in more attractive bottles. You can have your ordinary rum in the shops, but the rum for export should be made more expensive. The manufacturers know this.

Now various large distillers — I do not want to call their names — who are well known all over the world — came down here from time to time and offered to do something to help the rum industry, but the people over here do not want to be assisted. There is nothing that I can do, that you can do, or the member for St. James can do in this matter. I remember a former member for the parish of St. Thomas said on the Floor of this House, when sitting on the other side, with us, that there is no physician in the world who could write out a prescription for ignorance. That is the whole situation. You cannot write out any prescription that will bring around the rum producers in Barbados to expand their market and, therefore, I do not undertake that task.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be misquoted. I quoted a remark of the Prime Minister speaking of Mr. Corbin.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I said that a former member of the House, when he was sitting on the other side with us, made the remark that there is no physician who has been able to write out a prescription for ignorance. That is all I have said, and I agree with him. If you can find a doctor who can do that, I will take him to the rum producers.

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

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who 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, and passed. Its title was agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the District Auctioneers Act 1904 (Act 1904-3) in order to —

- (a) transfer responsibility for the exercise of certain functions from the Minister responsible for home affairs to the Minister responsible for the judiciary; and
- (b) bring the auctioneers' system of issuing receipts and keeping accounts into greater conformity with the system employed by Government Departments.

This is just a tightening up. There are no specific cases of defalcations that have been brought to my attention as the Minister of Finance, but the Auditor General feels very strongly that the Act as it is worded does not give him a sufficiently tight control over the District Auctioneers. We have had comments made by the Judiciary on the matter and, as a result, this Draft Bill has been prepared to give effect to the recommendations of the Auditor General. There is not much in it except that the Auctioneers will now have to keep receipt books supplied to them by the Accountant General, and he will have the power to call on the Auctioneers from time to time to produce their accounts for inspection and audit.

Now, there are other provisions relating to what happens on the completion of a sale. The Auctioneer has to hand to the owner of the goods distrained on a receipt from a particular

receipt book and to enter particulars of the sale and all receipts in an account which will be kept separately and not in some old exercise book, as I understand was the practise of some of them in the past.

The Registrar and the Auditor General have power to call upon the Auctioneer to produce the books under Clause 4A. (1) of the Bill.

Clause 4A. (2) makes provision for the production of the accounts to the Auditor General whereby he makes a report on the audit to the Minister responsible for the judiciary; and

(3) makes it an offence to refuse to comply with the lawful request made by the Registrar or the Auditor General, and provides a penalty for failure to do so.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
6.50 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Parliament I introduced into this House a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act to bring it up to date in a number of respects. That Bill was given a second reading and sent to a Select Committee. The Leader of the House came to the Select Committee and the Bill was put into shape, but when it came to the report of the Select Committee, the previous Clerk had lost the Select Committee's proper copy and therefore for two years we knocked about trying to get a report on that Bill. We did not even hold a new meeting, and eventually the Bill lapsed with the last Parliament. Now I am appalled to find, Mr. Speaker, that where on all sides members agreed that that Bill was necessary, the draftsmen have drafted an amendment to the District Auctioneers Act which takes no account of the abuses sought to be corrected by the earlier Bill. The draftsmen must have known because a copy was sent to them. I can only believe that this proceeded upon the basis that people thought the Act had already been amended. I cannot think there was any other basis.

First of all, as far as I recall — because unfortunately I gave my copy as corrected by the Select Committee to the member for the City — I think these are the abuses and I will come to the biggest last but the smallest first. The Bill was passed in 1904 and made provision that Charles

Sydney Edwards should be District Auctioneer for St. Peter and St. Lucy. That should be deleted. It is a waste of time to have that any longer. I suppose Charles Sydney Edwards is dead these 50 or 60 years. Then there was a particular matter which is not dealt with in this Bill which is this, and it is a very dangerous matter indeed: there are two transactions in a levy. First of all goods are levied on and then there have to be instructions for sale. You will get a situation where an execution creditor levies on somebody's goods but never goes back to have them sold. The district auctioneer may have taken up the goods because he could not find the debtor at the time or because the debtor would not sign for them, and the District Auctioneer then keeps the goods. He can neither by law give them back to their owner nor by law can he sell them without sale instructions, and it is to my knowledge that a Government messenger in a particular Department had his motor car taken away and about two years ago I heard it had then been taken away for four years. He had his motor car taken away on a judgment which he claimed was never due, he was the wrong man, but he made the mistake of not going to Court and defending the case and so on, the car was taken up by the District Auctioneer of District "A" who took the advice I believe of the then Attorney General or of the Law Officers and he was told that he was neither in power to give back the messenger the car without payment of the money, nor could he sell the car. In the meantime the judgment creditor had discovered that he had the wrong man, he went to England, never gave sale instructions, and to the best of my knowledge the car rotted away in the police yard.

This is one of the abuses which the Bill which I introduced last session sought to avoid. The greatest abuse of all as far as District Auctioneers are concerned is the fee contained in section 16. I think the Prime Minister has the relevant volume. How monstrous is it that we should be putting penalties of \$25 a day on a District Auctioneer for not keeping books by up-to-date accounting methods when the largest fee entered there in section 16 is 4/6, a fee set in the year 1904!

I said in an earlier speech that it was impossible at the time to find a District Auctioneer for District "F" after the defalcations of the previous one, because there was one who was dishonest and carried away the money, and the Hon. Mr. Lloyd Smith who was his surety had to forfeit his bond for him. He carried away the money and left the Labour Party all at the same time; but they could not find a replacement

for this District Auctioneer, and Mr. D'Arcy Scott out of duty had to take on the District Auctioneer work in District "F", because as Mr. Scott said the travelling expenses for going to the spot where a board and shingle house may be situated for the purpose of selling it was 4/6 and he would have to go with a bell ringer and a clerk to take down the particulars and one other official to Belleplaine or Walkers or Cambridge in St. Joseph to sell a house all for 4/6, and if it were not for Mr. Scott you would not have got a District Auctioneer at all.

There was some talk that the Government was going to bring the District Auctioneers under the mantle of the administration of the Magistrates' Courts directly and was going to have a uniform system of sale, and therefore I did not reintroduce my Bill, but I am very surprised now to find that this Bill comes without any reference to the past, and I just want to say before I sit down, because I am going to move that it be referred to a Select Committee, that Mr. Coleman Griffith, the District Auctioneer of District "E" approached me and asked me when were the fees going to be raised and my Bill reintroduced. I have also spoken recently to the District Auctioneer of District "A" and that of District "B", Mr. Scott and Mr. Swire, and so it is a broad spectrum of District Auctioneers who feel that they are helping the Government, they are not making anything for themselves, and where the notice to produce is 1/6, the attending and taking possession of goods is a difficult business. I have been a witness once when the Provost Marshal tried to take possession of goods and with my own eyes I saw a Police Corporal go to the door of a man's house and as he opened the door I saw a cutlass or some weapon come out, because when I later examined in Court about it I could not say what it was, and I just saw the Corporal throw back his head and the weapon passed just in front of his throat and eventually I had to give evidence. The wielder of the weapon was acquitted principally because I said I could not recognise the weapon afterwards, which I could not as it happened. I just saw it move as quickly as a flash and by that time I was back by my motor car. But that is only by the way. That suggests the dangers which are attendant upon this business, the attempting to take possession of goods when somebody may chop off your hand or your head, all for 3/9, less than a dollar. You cannot tell a District Auctioneer to keep books in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Rules of 1964 at 1/6 and 3/9. That is a waste of time. Mr. Speaker, I believe that rather than do it many of the District Auctioneers would give up the business and nobody would then be able to collect debt up to the jurisdiction provided for.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now referred to Select Committee.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I nominate the following hon. members to serve on the Select Committee:

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central; the hon. member for St. Michael North West; the hon. member for St. George South; the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Thomas; and the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ADAMS: Would the Leader of the House not wish to be on the Committee? He was on the last and it was his guidance that assisted the Select Committee greatly last time and they were his suggestions which prevailed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: And myself, Mr. Speaker.
7.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Order is Order No. 10 which is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Final Appropriation (1968-69) Act, 1969. It stands in the name of the Prime Minister, and I beg to move that it be the next Order of the day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1968-69) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Final Appropriation Bill was passed in this House and subsequent to that it was discovered that certain small sums amounting to \$729,996, although the House has passed these subsequent resolutions for the appropriation of these funds for the service of the island, through some error or omission had not been included in the Final Appropriation Bill. They are set out in the Schedule to the Bill as follows:

Head 3 — Parliament, the figure should be \$51,730 instead of \$46,735; after Head 16 the following should be inserted: "Head 17 — Training Division \$990;" Head 24 — Lands and Surveys, the figure should be \$2,648 instead of \$2,148; Head 26 — Fire Service, the figure should be \$17,459 instead of \$3,090; Head 28 — Prisons, the figure should be \$6,600 instead of \$4,600; Head 38 — Ministry of Education, the following should be inserted immediately after Item (7) as Item (8): "(8) Public Relations, \$730;" after Head 44 the following should be inserted: "Head 46 — Old Age Pensions, \$6,340;" Head 48 — Ministry of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries, the figure should be \$1,272 instead of \$1,200, and the sub-total should be \$3,007,000 instead of \$2,977,004. The grand total would then be \$7,080,454 instead of \$7,050,458, which is an overall increase of \$729,996. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply on the Bill, Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

The Schedule was postponed.

The clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee of Supply. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, this is a short Bill which is to amend section 10(1) of the Health Services Act, 1969 (Act 1969-38) to empower the Minister to make regulations for the control of the importation of

drugs. Section 10 of the Health Services Act, 1969 will be amended by inserting immediately after the word "and" appearing at the end of the second line of paragraph (p) of subsection (1) the words "the importation of any drug and". I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

7.10 p.m.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

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

On the separate motions of the Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, seconded by the Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the Leader of the House, I want to know what the position is and whether we should adjourn for two weeks. We adjourned for two weeks last time, and members did not receive their Order Papers and supporting documents more than 24 hours or 48 hours before this meeting. It is true that we have about three items on the Order Paper, Nos. 7, 8 and 11, which were not dealt with at today's sitting, but there is no point in bringing hon. members at 2.30 in the afternoon or any other time to deal with three matters which, as far as I can see, are noncontroversial. We have given notice of some

Bills and Resolutions today and, again with the concurrence of the Leader of the House, I do not want to come back next week. The Leader of the House will have to decide if he wants hon. members to come back. It is no point coming here if we are going to find that the papers have not been circulated.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure members on both sides want to know what the position is. If these papers can be delivered to members on Friday it would not be unreasonable to ask them to proceed with the money Resolutions which they will have had at least three or four days to peruse. I think we received our papers last night. It was fortunate that we were having a Cabinet meeting yesterday at six o'clock or we would not have received them until today, unless the officer who takes around the mail condescended to get on his motorcycle and drive around last night delivering the papers. I can sympathise with hon. members who want to do their homework. The responsibility is neither mine nor the Leader of the House. We wish to know if there is any just cause or impediment why we cannot get our Order Papers in time, and they should so now declare or hereafter hold their peace. Let us go home for another two weeks or three weeks as the case may be so that we can have ample time to study our papers.

Mr. Speaker, the House cannot meet on this *ad hoc* basis when we have no work to do. We have enough here for a reasonable sitting of the House next Tuesday, if we can get the Order Paper. On these three Bills, which we have not dealt with today, I cannot advise the House that there is sufficient business to bring members back here next Tuesday. I am anxious to get the Government's work done, but I have no intention of coming down here to spend 15 minutes. There is no great urgency about these Bills, but we could have dealt with them today. Of course, we had to refrain from doing so because of the dilatoriness in the receipt of the necessary documents.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not share the Prime Minister's confidence by any means that the Training Bill, the Severance Pay Bill and so on are not going to occupy the attention of the House for a sitting. Nor by any means do I believe that that is insufficient to occupy the House for a sitting. I merely mention that, because obviously I am as concerned as anybody else. There was a meeting of the Cabinet last

night. There was a meeting of the Opposition last night, too, but we found it impossible to consider all of the items. Of course, the Cabinet had seen the Bills before, but we happened to get our papers yesterday.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that the Cabinet does not meet on business before the House. It is the Parliamentary Group that meets to discuss that. It happens that in the Parliamentary Group the members of the Cabinet only received their papers shortly before we held the Parliamentary Group meeting. We were prepared to deal with them, but the other side does not want to proceed. I should like to warn members that the Minister would not be ready to proceed with the Severance Payment Bill on Tuesday next, but, if there is enough in the Training Act, I am quite willing to come back and answer questions next Tuesday. However, if the debate on the Training Act peters out and we do not get the other documents, then we will be left high and dry. My suggestion is that we could deal with them two weeks from now, because of our experiences.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally agreed that an adjournment for two weeks would be in order to enable all of the documents not only to be produced, but to be delivered to hon. members.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. There will be a Resolution to advance money to the Central Bank which will have to be dealt with before the end of the month, and I will be asking hon. members to deal with it in all its stages next Tuesday. It will be a Resolution for about \$170,000 which will be advanced to the Central Bank for the purpose of acquiring property and so on. In the circumstances, I will have to ask the Leader of the House to take a chance and to adjourn the House until next Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the Prime Minister has said, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 24th October, 1972, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

7.20 p.m.