

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th January, 1973.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the meetings of 12th December, 1972, and 19th December, 1972, have been circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes confirmed. I now lay the Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1971, prepared by the Accountant General.

Messrs H. deB. FORDE, L. S. CRAIG and J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following document

The Report of the National Insurance Board on the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme for the period 1st January, 1971 to 31st December, 1971.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following documents

1. The Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November 1972.

2. The Memorandum on the Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on land and for connected purposes.

Mr. A. MORRIS started the Chamber and took his seat.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I am commanded to lay the following:

1. The Statements showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the period June/September 1972.

2. The Statements showing Money Order transactions through the Crown Agents for, Overseas Governments and Administrations for the months June/September 1972.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. P. M. Greaves laid the following document by Command:

The Report of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme for the period 1st January, 1971 to 31st December, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following

1. A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of \$3,297,000 U.S. from the First National City Bank to International Sea Foods Limited, for the purpose of enabling the latter company to purchase boats for use in its shrimping enterprise.

2. A Resolution to grant the sum of \$40,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part II-Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 25, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:

3. A Bill to make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

4. A Bill to amend the Extradition Act, 1870 of the United Kingdom Parliament.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:

5. A Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on land and for connected purposes.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICES

Mr. FORDE:

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House notes the Government's foreign policy or lack of it."

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Will the Minister state what is Government's policy towards the recognition of the People's Republic of China by this Island?

2. Does Government intend at any time in the near future or at all to accord recognition to this State? If so, when?

3. If Government has no such intention.

will the Minister explain the reasons, if any, for not wanting to accord such recognition?

4. If the Government does so intend to accord recognition, will the Government state the reasons

therefor?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Will the Minister state if there is available a list of treaties, both multilateral and bilateral, to which Barbados is a party?
2. Will the Minister publish for the information of this House and the public of Barbados the treaties or a list of the treaties which the Government of Barbados accept as binding on Barbados?
3. Will the Minister make a statement for the information of this House concerning the work done by Professor O'Connell and his team of Barbados' treaty commitments? In particular, will the Minister state the cost of the project to Barbados, the nature of the work done, whether the work for which the Professor and his team were engaged has yet been completed?

Rt Hon. E. W. BARROW and Hon. A. DaC EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister;

1. Will the Minister make a statement or cause a statement to be made in this House with respect to the recognition of Cuba, stating in particular the reasons for the opening of diplomatic relations with that country?
2. Will the Minister also make or cause to be made in this House a statement in connection with the recent visit to Cuba of a Civil Service Mission, and the results, if any, of the visit?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that all the avenues in Hart's Gap are in need of repairs?
2. Will the Minister state on what date, if at all, it is intended to commence such repairs?
3. Is the Minister aware that September Square in particular is in a very bad state of disrepair? Will the Minister state if, at all, and, if so, when it is proposed to carry out repairs to the roads in this area?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions-

Is Government aware that livestock owners and particularly keepers of small stock who have cultivated the dependence on Balanced Animal' Feeds and feed products in the rearing of same, have been severely handicapped through the absence of an adequate supply of such feeds?

2. Is the Government aware that for several weeks the public could not get Balanced Animal Feeds and Feed products to buy in quantities or at all and, that such a scarcity gave rise to the employment of black-marketing practices in the trade?

3. Is it a fact that one of the large local Feed Mixing Plants has ceased operations, and another is due to close shortly?

4. Will Government set in motion the necessary machinery to investigate the circumstances which led to the closing of the Camco B.A. Feed Plant; the effect such closing is having on the livestock industry in this country; and will Government take immediate steps to provide an adequate supply of Balanced Animal Feed or substitutes to assist small livestock keepers who depend on the rearing of backyard animals to help eke out an existence, and for the assistance of the industry as a whole ?

Messrs. F. L. Walcott and C. L. Bolden entered the Chamber and took their seats.

REPORT OF THE DEBATES COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the honour to present the Report of the Debates Committee of Parliament on the matter of the Interim Payment for the Staff of Parliament. Copies have been circulated to all honourable Members for your perusal. 2.40 p.m.

REPORT OF THE DEBATES COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON THE MATTER OF THE INTERIM PAYMENT FOR THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT REPORT

The Debates Committee has the Honour to present the following Report on the matter of the Interim Payment for all members of the Staff of Parliament.

The Debates Committee met on Monday, the 11th day of December, 1972. The following Members were present :-

His Honour C. A. E. Hoppin, J.P., M.P.

(Chairman Acting)

Hon. C E. Talma, C.B.E., M.P.,

Senator F. C. Goddard,

Evelyn E. Greaves Esq., B.A., Ed.M., M.P.,

Senator the Hon. G. C. R. Moe, Q.C., M.A.,

LL.M.,

J, B. Springer, Esq., M.P.,

J. M. G. M. Adams, Esq., M.A., M.P.

Mr. Eswick of the Establishments Division was present by a special invitation.

The Committee unanimously agreed to grant the staff of Parliament the Interim Payment on the same conditions as those on which the Interim Payment was granted to members of the Civil Service :

CONDITIONS

(1) The Interim Payment is to take effect from the 1st day of April, 1972.

(2) The Interim Payment shall reflect an overall increase over existing salaries and wages of 18% being approximately 25% at the bottom and 10% at the top.

(3) No Member of the Staff of Parliament shall receive more than \$120.00 per month as an Interim Payment.

(4) Interim Payments shall commence from the month of December, 1972.

(5) The necessary provision shall be made in the 1973-74 Estimates for any arrears due to members of the staff of Parliament in respect of the period 1st April, 1972 to 30th November, 1972 inclusive.

The Secretary was instructed to inform the Cabinet Secretary by letter of the decision of the Debates Committee, so that the matter of the Interim Payment for the staff of Parliament may be brought before the Cabinet" for the appropriate action to be taken to give effect to the decision of the Debates Committee on the above mentioned matter.

This was all duly done, the matter was presented to Cabinet and it was agreed to by Cabinet in accordance with the terms and conditions laid down by the Minister of Finance when he dealt with this matter. That is the Report, and as all members are aware, this Committee is responsible for the running of Parliament and comprises both members of the House and the Senate to see after the conditions and employment of staff, salaries and discipline etc., so it is left for the Debates Committee to report and then move a motion or a Resolution to give effect to its Report. I will have to move at a later stage today, after members have had an opportunity to read it, that the report be adopted. I would not like to hold up this matter, and I would like to have this Resolution dealt with later on in today's sitting. The very composition of the Debates Committee is such that there should be nothing controversial in this matter.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON A BILL TO AMEND THE DENTAL REGISTRATION ACT, 1923

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to state that a Select Committee was appointed to consider and report to the House on a Bill to amend the Dental Registration Act, 1923. That Select Committee met yesterday, and the Report is now being prepared and may be ready in about an hour's time. I am seeking permission to present the Report later in today's sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That permission has been granted.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Extradiction Act, 1870 of the United Kingdom Parliament be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on land and for connected purposes be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had certain discussions with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and as a result thereof I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

I would like to mention that in future our Sittings will commence at 12 o'clock in order that the matter of suspending Standing Orders will not arise. I have already mentioned it to the Prime Minister, to certain other hon. members and to Your Honour, but this will happen in future because we do not actually suspend Standing Orders so as to prevent the Opposition from dealing with any matter of urgency, because the Standing Orders are so suspended subject to the proviso that if there is an urgent and important matter which the Leader of the Opposition may want to deal with, he is at liberty to deal with it, but in order to avoid that sort of apparent confusion for which the Standing Orders as such have not been particularly specific, I intend to make sure that the Sittings commence at 12 noon in the future. We have been meeting at 2.30 p.m. more for the convenience, I would say, of certain Members but certainly not for the convenience of Government Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries; they are paid to come in here at 9.00 a.m. or 10.00 a.m. Perhaps Your Honour and some other members may find 12 o'clock more convenient than 10.00 a.m. I just want to explain our position. For my part, I will come here at ten o'clock and get out at six. If there is a lengthy Agenda, I could come in here at 10 a.m. or 10.30 a.m. and get out about seven o'clock. 2.50 p.m.

I beg to move that the several Standing Orders which I have already called now be suspended for today's Sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH entered the Chamber and took his seat Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken to the Leader of the House, and he seems to have been able to extract more from the Conversation than, perhaps, was intended, because I am still not quite clear in my mind how long we will have to debate Private Members' Business. I understood that the Leader of the House was not quite ready with the Standing Orders. We, on this side, have two matters which.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is not that I am not quite ready. The Standing Orders are here to be dealt with, but we wanted to give hon. members a little more time to study them. I thought I would serve notice, and in a few weeks' time we could deal with the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate what the Leader of the House has said. Hon. Members on this side have studied them, and we propose to move certain amendments. There are a number of matters under Private Members' Business which we would wish to pursue today. It does not rest upon us to pursue them to determination one way or the other, since we cannot control the number of people who will speak, but we could say that Private Members' Business No. 3, which relates to a motion of censure on His Honour the Speaker, should be dealt with as early as possible. His Honour the Speaker is, I am told, ill at the moment, but in any case he would not be able to take the Chair. It is a common tradition of Parliament that motions of censure are dealt with expeditiously.

Private Members' Item No. 5, relating to the appointment of a National Commission to enquire into and report upon the status of women in Barbados, has been on the Order Paper for a very long time, and it is important that a start be made in order to preserve its position upon the Order Paper.

Item No. 8, which relates to the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952, ought to be given priority. In due course, I will be moving that this be the first Item. All of these Items, on this side, we wish to deal with in some aspects today. It may very well be that the hon. member for St. Michael West wishes to pursue his vote of censure on the Minister of Labour today as well. If he will approach me and tell me what his intentions are on the matter, I will be glad to assist the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union in any way I can.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Is the hon. member debating a motion? Asking for leave is not debating a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Before I could say anything the hon. member rose.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry if the hon. member for St. Michael West cannot hear. I heard a motion put that the several Standing Orders be suspended, and I heard the motion seconded. Must I be interrupted because the hon. member for St. Michael West cannot hear or cannot understand? It is time that the new Standing Orders, as drafted, be brought in to deal with people who persist in breaking the Rules by making fraudulent points of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am flabbergasted to hear the hon. member say that he has these important matters to deal with. He came over here and assured me that he had nothing to deal with, and within a few minute's time he has made a somersault!

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is always uncomfortable, to say the least, when hon. members disagree on the Floor. I never told the Minister that. Neither the hon. member for St. Michael South West nor the Minister can say.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member sat in this chair and told the Leader of the House that he is in no position to deal with anything under Private Members' Business today.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very sorry. Before now I have had an experience with the hon. member for St. Michael South West....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the House desires an explanation from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, so that we can get on with the business. These matters are usually dealt with on consultation, and it is patent that the hon. member left his place, came here, and sat down in my place - the only time he has ever occupied it, incidentally. He came and sat down in my place, because you know that the hon. member is not frequently constrained to leave that side inasmuch as he would like to

come over on this side. Two responsible members of the House have given an assurance that the hon. member said that he was not in a position to proceed with any matters under Private Members' Business. It is impugning the integrity of two of my Ministers for the hon. member to suggest that he never said so. I will seriously have to consider relieving the Government of their services, if he can establish that they are wrong.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am actually amused. I remember on one occasion - (Asides.) We can stay here until 4.30 p.m. and you will hear my answer. First of all, I will deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South West who has repeated exactly what I have said except in one important particular. I said that I was not in a position to deal with the Standing Orders today. I have had experience before now with the hon. member for St. Michael South West, a sincere man, no doubt about it, but very apt to be mistaken and very wrong in his recollection. Upon one occasion when the late Sir Grantley Adams, the then Leader of the House, led the Opposition out...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I understood the hon. member for St. Thomas, who is the Leader of the Opposition, he informed us that it is the Leader of the House who told him that he was unable to proceed with Standing Orders. Now he is saying that he said he was not in a position to deal with Standing Orders and that the hon. member is accurate in so far as he has substituted any matter on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business for Standing Orders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a very important matter here to deal with, and I suggest that the question be now put.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister gets up and asks me to explain myself. When he sees that I can give an explanation, can he ask that the question be put? I do not believe, Sir, in your discretion that you will put the question. Just let us get this clear. If it is one thing that legal training gives you it is the gift to recall what a person says and what you say. That is normal for any lawyer and the Prime Minister, perhaps, more than most.

My remark to the Leader of the House was that we were in no position to go on with the Standing Orders. His answer was that he did not intend to deal with them and he would fix a date to do so. I told him that we had some amendments. At that stage one of the Ministers was giving a Government Notice. I observed that the attention of the Leader of the House was concentrated upon the necessity of giving another Governemnt Notice. As he was rising to his feet, I got up and left him. Incidentally, I did not solicit that seat; the Leader of the House called me to sit down there before I got to my seat. I said no more to him, because he was standing giving a notice.

If there are two hon. members who I believe will not deliberately tell a lie on the Leader of the Opposition, it is those two hon. members, but they get things wrong. The hon. member for St. Michael South West, sincere though he is, gets things wrong sometimes and urges on his sincerity. I could not say that of.....(HON. F. G. SMITH: "Do mention me.") 3 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said not to mention him. I will not say that I could not

commend his sincerity, but, Sir, this is why I rose and said that the Leader of the House seems to have extracted a greater understanding from our conversation than I was able to extract. All that we cannot deal with is the Standing Orders, and the reason why we cannot is because we wish to move some amendments and today may not be the most convenient day. The amendments are here prepared. Now, Sir, what I am asking..... I had better just get this also correct. The Leader of the House did say that the first item which relates to the loan will be done today. I have also gathered that the Report of the Debates Committee will be done today. I was trying to tell him that there is some question about the report of the Select Committee on the Dental Registration Bill and therefore we on this side will be opposing its being dealt with today, because there is some difficulty over the Select Committee. I am informed by the members of the Select Committee on my side that they were summoned very late and could not go, and yet the Select Committee carried its conclusions to a determination. I do not know of this, but there is some....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minister has already reported, and the report will be presented later.

Mr. ADAMS:

We will have to deal with that when it comes. That is all I can say. Now what I am suggesting to the House on this motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders - we will in the ordinary way support it since it relates to the time - table, - is that Private Members' time will run perhaps a little longer rather than shorter this time, since there is only one item of Government business as far as we know, and it is uncontroversial, subject to the speeches that may be made; so there is only one Bill and I do not anticipate that the Report of the Debates Committee will take the House any time, and I am suggesting that at the very least until 5 o'clock Private Members' Business be allowed to be pursued, because there are three items to the least with which hon. members on this side have come prepared to deal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is already a motion before the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Let me say this one thing. I understand the predicament in which the Leader of the Opposition finds himself. If you want to know whether I would choose not only on numerical basis the word of the two Hon. Ministers on my right to that of the hon. member; but I know his predicament because in discussing this Order Paper today with the Leader of the House, I informed him that it is very important that the Inter-American Development Bank Loan should be preceded with, with despatch, and I would like the Standing Orders suspended. I also warned the hon. member of something which it is apparent the Leader of the House is not aware of, and that is that the hon. member for Christ Church West had invited people here today to hear him declaim on women's rights, and I explained to the hon. member that under no circumstances, whatever the women may think of their priorities in Barbados and the anxiety of the hon. member to please his constituents and every woman of the Island, could we subordinate his invitation list to the priorities of Government in so far as economic development is concerned, and I commiserate with the Leader of the Opposition, having gone back over on the other side to find himself faced with this kind of insurrection; but I think the question should now be put.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position is that I have not invited any ladies to be

present today. I do not have to give any explanation to the Hon. Prime Minister, but whenever ladies are present in this House to see their rights being defended by me, I am happy to see them exercise their public rights in coming to the House and at least letting the Prime Minister know that they are interested in the business that is conducted by this Chamber.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to clarify the point that the Hon. Prime Minister did actually mention to me that the situation which is taking place would actually be coming on two hours after I had spoken to him, and here we have seen it because he said that the hon. member for Christ Church West would be pressing to deal with this particular item owing to the fact that certain invitations had been issued.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, just to get it quite clear, the first item under Private Members' Business we are seeking to deal with is what the Rules say has priority, the second reading of a Private Members Bill, and I said so in my speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a further point of order, the disposal of Private Members' Business is entirely up to the Leader of the opposition. It has nothing to do with what the Standing Orders say. The Leader of the Opposition can notify the House and we have no right to change his priority, so what is he making his voice heard unnecessarily for at this juncture? Can we proceed and put the question?

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I am not repeating the remarks I made, but this is the stage, I am suggesting to the Leader of the House, for assurances to be given. It is not unknown, and I by no means believe that the Prime Minister is a leopard who has so changed his spots that he is capable of doing Government Business and then leading the Government Members out so that we cannot get a quorum to discuss the right of women or anything else. I do not think it is impossible by any means that Government Business would be put in so that Government Members can leave and take away our quorum, and this is the reason why Private Members' Business is dealt with before Government Business, because Governments well know that their Members have a tendency to go home when what they consider is their business is finished. We want to be protected against that.

The Prime Minister has taken note of certain invitations being issued and so on. We want to be sure

that the people whoever they are who have come to the House or however they have got here will at least hear what they came for if they want to hear it put a certain way. I can hear the hon. member for St. Michael South-Central saying "not today". I know he hates the rights of women. His voice has always been raised against women. He is the only person who voted against the first reading of a Bill to allow the husbands of Barbadian women to live in Barbados. I expect that from him.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what does he know about my relationships with women? I have never been any particular friend of his; I have never gone out in two-somes with him. He knows absolutely nothing about my relationships with women.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am only saying what he says in here. He speaks against the rights of women. I do not know anything about his relationships with Women.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will both hon. members please take their seats?

Government Business is the instant order of the day.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am speaking, Sir. I was interrupted on points of order, and with respect the motion has not been put.

I was perhaps paying more attention to an unworthy interruption than it was worth. I cannot deal with that. We want some assurance about Private Members' Business.

Sir, there is another matter. Private Members' Business must be discussed today because another matter which the Leader of the House and I discussed related to Item No. 1, the winding up of the Budget Debate. All these matters have to be dealt with. We have accommodated the Government as the Leader of the House has said in a letter on thirteen occasions, and I am asking the Leader of the House if he wants Government Business taken out of order so as to stop Private Members' Business being done - we are in Private Members' time now with the Standing Orders not suspended - to tell us when we will have our time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

In view of the Standing Orders being suspended there will be no Private Members' Business unless an agreement can be reached between the Leader of the House and yourself; but Private Members' Business is passed as far as I am concerned.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I just want to say this I do not know what the hon. member is discussing because the House without any division has passed that the Standing Orders be suspended. As I understand it, when you suspend the Standing Orders it is the prerogative of the Leader of the House or the Government to put the motion that Government Business be the next Order of the day. 3.10 p.m.

The reason for that is that the Standing Orders have been suspended and therefore Private Members' Business is not taking place at this time. When we are finished Government Business there is nothing wrong in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or somebody from the Government side asking that Private Members' Business be the next Order of the Day; what assurance does the hon. member wish from us, that we will stay in here - and I am not going to lead out anybody, the only time I did that that was when I belonged to the other Party and I led out nine out of sixteen.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, when the Speaker of his own Party did not like something he did.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not know about that, Sir, was the hon. member in the House? The only people I have ever led out were people of this Party, when I lead, I come as Minister of Finance to deal with certain specific measures. I am under no constraint to sit down in here and listen to anybody debate anything that I am not intimately concerned with, I am on call either in the Speaker's Chambers or in my office. When I finish my business I will be leaving. I will stay for as long as time will allow, but I will not be leading out anybody, I will be doing something that I am accustomed doing every Tuesday, so do not let us mislead or lead anyone on this matter. I made a motion and I would like the question put.

The question that Government Business be the instant order of the day was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon'bles.C.E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, P. M. GREAVES, F. G. SMITH, L. E. SANDIFORD, P. G. MORGAN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Messrs. W. R. LOWE, F. L. WALCOTT, A. MORRISON and R. StC.WEEKES- 14.

NOES:

Messrs J. M. G. M. ADAMS, L. S. CRAIG, H. deB. FORDE, W. C. B. HINDS and C. L. BOLDEN - 5

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE LOANS (INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK) ACT, 1972.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Constitution of this Island provides that all monies to be raised (and spent, parenthetically, not. that that is in the Constitution) must be raised with the consent of Parliament and

not otherwise, and by Parliament is meant the House of Assembly which votes and supplies the money for the Government of this country.

The reason why we come with this Bill is in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, because even a guarantee is considered to be a measure of raising funds for the supply of this Island. There is a popular superstition that the Minister of Finance signs cheques, a lot of civil servants do but I do not, and that when money is to be spent I can spend it or authorise money to be spent in any fictitious manner. Every single sum of money spent out of the Consolidated Fund of this Island must come out of the Treasury and it must come out of the Treasury only when the Accountant General is satisfied that the expenditure has been authorised by Parliament, so that I found myself in the amazing predicament some time in 1964 when Mr. Bramble, the Chief Minister of Montserrat, and Mr. Bradshaw, the Chief Minister of St. Kitts-Nevis -and at that time even Anguilla - was in the position to sign a special warrant for \$250,000 on any morning in their offices, but when I ran out of stationery during the month of February 1964, the Minister of Finance with a budget which was equal to the sum of all the budgets of all the Lesser Antilles, had to come to this House to request provision for \$27.38 to buy stationery for my office.

Only at election time people talk about corruption in the Government and carrying away money, and I would really like to know how it is done, because even when we want a guarantee for the repayment of a loan as we are doing here today when people are lending us money, we have to come to get approval for the borrowing and the paying back of the money, and that is the reason why we come with this Bill. I could make all the negotiations I like with the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank or any other international institution, or even any of the Governments overseas like the Government of Canada which has from time to time made very generous allocations by way of grants and loans to the Government of Barbados, but at the end of all that it is still necessary for me to come to the House to get permission to do what I have negotiated. We are proposing to borrow the sum of U.S. \$2.8 million from the Inter-American Development Bank for the purpose of financing the expansion to the Barbados Community College.

As you will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Community College was established in the teeth of the opposition of the members of the opposite side and certain snappers-up of ill considered trivialities in the teaching profession, particularly the Barbados Union of Secondary Teachers, who were disappointed because they were not appointed to the staff of the Community College. I think the result has demonstrated that there was a need for an institution of this kind to do sixth form teaching in Barbados, to do pre-university courses. We have some 75 private secondary schools, about 19 are approved by Government and a similar number have subsidies granted to them by Government to assist in their teaching programmes. Most of these schools do not have sixth forms, and the students cannot take "A" level examinations unless they can get proper tuition, and it was for this reason that the Community College was established. It is true that the Headmasters, and to some extent Headmistresses, of the so-called first grade and second grade schools - two terms which I think we have eliminated from the Education Act - were opposed to the establishment of the Community College, and it is popularly believed that their opposition was due to the fact that they did not want to see their first XI teams beaten by the exodus of graduates from the fifth forms. They would like to retain their stalwarts for two or three years on the kind of athletic half-scholarship basis that we find in the United States of America. 3.20 p.m.

They were not concerned about the general level of teaching in this Island. The Community College is now established and, I believe, there are now over 1400 - I do not know if the Minister of Education can correct me - students. (Asides.) There are over 1800 students at the Community College, and I was thinking of the Polytechnic. There are 800 students on the roll of the Polytechnic. This means that there are 800 people who felt that they could benefit from further years at school doing "A" level subjects or Pre-University entrance tuition as against, probably, twenty, forty or fifty who were accommodated by the Government's schools before.

Sir, the demand for a Sixth Form education by people who could never have enjoyed it before compelled us to extend the facilities and to build a new Community College at a place formerly owned by a member of this House in the Nineteenth Century, a former Chief Justice, the late Sir Conrad Reeves. The Government had the foresight to purchase, some eight or nine years ago, this land for a sum far below what the property would cost today. It is ten or eleven acres of land. The blocks have gone up; the buildings have virtually been completed or are on the verge of completion, and the money which we are seeking to borrow from the Inter-American Development Bank is to assist in putting up the other buildings, and so provide the full range of subjects in the curriculum of the Community College.

The funds are coming from the funds of special operations in the Inter-American Bank, and there is a commitment fee of 1/2% to 1% per annum on the portions of the loan which is not disbursed. This is normal procedure. The period for which the loan has been granted is 35 years from the date of

the contract. This is much more generous than anything which we are getting now in the way of public loan, and the total amount of the loan which is \$2.8 million, must be disbursed within a four-year period.

Members will also be interested in knowing what the rate of interest is on this loan. The rate of interest on the loan is 1/4% per annum. Considering the long period over which the loan has been granted namely for 35 years, all I can say is that I would like to be able to carry out the Development Plan at such a low rate of interest for such a long period of time. We will probably be able to do three or four times as much as we are doing now under our current financing of the Development Plan.

There are seven relatively short Clauses in the Bill which contain the conditions and provisions which I have described. One of these Clauses is the Short Title. The second Clause is the interpretation. Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 provide for the implementation of the Agreement, and Clause 7 deals with arbitration. With those few, brief introductory remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 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,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Hon. Leader of the House be granted permission to deal with the Report of the Debates Committee of Parliament on the matter of the Interim Payment of salaries for the staff of Parliament. 3.30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF DEBATES COMMITTEE REPORT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Report has been duly circulated and owing to the composition of the Debates Committee as I have mentioned already, I think that generally speaking, the Report can be accepted as such.

I beg to move that the Report of the Debates Committee of Parliament on the matter of the Interim Payment for the Staff of Parliament be now adopted.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE INTERIM PAYMENT FOR STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to introduce a Resolution to give effect to the Report of the Debates Committee which has just been adopted so that as from 1st April, 1972 the salary scale applicable to the Officers of Parliament and employees of the Debates Committee shall be added and interim payment reflecting and over-all increase over existing salaries and wages of 18% being approximately 25% at the bottom and 10% at the top as set out in the Schedule to this Resolution.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that no officer shall receive more than a maximum of \$120 per month as an interim payment;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such interim payment shall commence as from 1st December, 1972, and that the necessary provision be made in the Estimates 1972-73 for any arrears due

in respect of the period April to November, 1972.

The Schedule sets out the various officers who are entitled and the amount involved.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I just want to rise on a point of order. It is normal when we come to the House for an appropriation that we do not come for a rate. What has happened here today is that the House has adopted the Report of the Debates Committee on the level of remuneration for members of the staff of Parliament. There is no Money Resolution; there are only rates. As Minister of Finance therefore, I cannot entertain the motion which has just been made unless I had a specific sum. The Ministry of Finance will take note of the Resolution and make the necessary adjustments and come here with a Supplementary Estimate for the specific sum. So I would suggest that the hon. member withdraw his motion. I am sorry I rather encouraged him into doing it because I thought there was a specific appropriation at the end of the Resolution; so I would prefer this to be left over. I give the undertaking that I will have the necessary figures computed and deal with the matter next Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for the day.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 23rd January, 1973, at 12 noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 3.37 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd January, 1973

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C.

WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L EASTMOND; Mr. H.deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B. Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read. THE LAYING OF DOCUMENTS DEFERRED

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay documents at a later stage in today's Sitting,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House is asking for leave to lay Government documents at a later stage in today's Sitting. If there are no objections leave will be granted.

Hearing no objections, leave is granted. PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution which reads as follows

WHEREAS it is written in the Preamble to the Constitution of Barbados that the people of: Barbados declare their intention to establish and maintain a society in which all persons may, to the full extent of their capacity, play a due part in the institutions of the national life;

AND WHEREAS by the said Constitution it is further declared that every person in Barbados is entitled to certain fundamental freedoms irrespective of sex etc.;

AND WHEREAS the better to effect these lofty ideals it is necessary, from time to time, to take stock so as to ensure that the women of Barbados at all times receive, in all aspects of the life of the Island, no less favourable treatment than is meted out to the men of Barbados;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to appoint without delay a National Commission to inquire into and report upon the status of women in Barbados and to recommend what steps ought to be taken by the House and the Government to ensure and maintain for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Barbadian society; and in particular, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to inquire into and report on:

- (a) The citizenship and immigration laws, policies and practices so far as they affect women;
- (b) The position of women in the civil and criminal laws, and specifically the laws governing matrimonial property, marriage and divorce;
- (c) Income Tax and Estate and Succession duty legislation in so far as the same affects women;
- (d) Labour laws and the role of women in the labour force of the Island;
- (e) The employment, placing and promotion of women in the public service and in the private sector.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said Commission be mandated to report to the Government within a year of its said appointment and in any event not later than March 1974; and that the said Report be laid on the Table of this House immediately thereafter.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. ADAMS:

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

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Is the Minister aware that the supply of water to Shop Hill, Melrose and adjacent districts in the parish of St. Thomas is now extremely poor; and what steps is he taking to remedy this situation?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

What plans does the Government now have for a new post office in St. Thomas?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state when construction of the public bath at Porey Spring in the parish of St. Thomas was completed; when it will be opened; and what is the reason for the long delay in opening?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Will the Minister take early steps to effect repairs to the highway leading from Russia Village via Pleasant Vale and Bushy Park in the parish of St. Thomas to Sugar Hill?

Hon. P. G. MORGAN and Mr. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. FORDE:

I beg to give notice of the following question-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that since the coming into force on the 8th day of June 1965 of the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act 1965-34, no regulations have been made under Section 8 of the Act for fixing the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry or generally for carrying out the purposes of this Act?

2. Will the Minister state whether it is intended to make such regulations? If so, when?

3. Will the Minister state the reasons for the delay in making regulations under the Act?

Hon. A. Doc. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. HINDS:

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. What portion of the work of revising the laws of Barbados has been attempted? What portion completed, if any?
2. Is it a fact that much of the work which has already been revised cannot now be accounted for? In other words, is believed to have been stolen, misplaced or mysteriously disappeared?
3. If the answer to No. 2 above is in the negative, would the Minister state exactly where is the completed work? If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state what action has been taken, i.e. whether or not the assistance of police forces, both at home and abroad, has been enlisted in an effort at recovery or detection?
4. What is the total sum spent on the Law-Revision exercise to date?
5. If there is reason to believe that portion of the work already revised will have to be gone over a second time, what is the estimated cost of this portion of the work?
6. Is revision of the Laws of Barbados still being proceeded with or has the work been halted?

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the Report of the Select Committee which was set up to consider and report on the Bill to repeal the Dental Registration Act 1923. Copies of this Report will be circulated to hon. members.

I would also like to give notice that I will move a motion for the adoption of this Report later in today's Sitting.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat. 12.10 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, we can also give notice about that Select Committee. We are going to ask the Minister to return the Bill to the Select Committee, because I understand that the Select Committee was summoned at a somewhat late stage when the hon. member for Bridgetown was engaged in a murder trial and the hon. member for Christ Church West was out of the Island. I would urge on the Minister, at this stage, to consider that before he asks hon. members to proceed with the Bill.

DEFINITE MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent importance. The matter I propose to raise is the closing down of Plessey Memories Limited at the Seawell Industrial Park and the displacement of over three hundred workers. I think you have received a letter from me to this effect.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have received it, that will be resolved at the appropriate time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether this matter could now be considered urgent, inasmuch as a decision was taken and the plant will be closed as from the end of January. Is that urgent?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Yes. In my opinion it is urgent, but whether or not it will be discussed at the appropriate time has to be decided in the, proper place. Hon. members will note the Provisions of Section 16, 2, and 3 of the Standing Orders

"Before the commencement of the sitting the matter, for discussion shall be reduced to writing and handed to the Speaker. The Speaker shall refuse to allow the claim unless he is satisfied that the matter is definite and urgent."

I am so satisfied.

"3. If the Speaker is so satisfied and

(a) leave of the House is given; or

(b) if such leave is not unanimously given, at least nine Members rise in their places to support the request;"

I think, at this stage, I will seek the pleasure of the House to see if it is unanimous, or nine members rise in their places to support the request, whether or not this matter will be discussed at 6.15 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, with one voice disapprove of this matter being dealt with at this stage or at any stage in that the matter is finalised and finished and nothing that happens here today can influence Plessey Memories Ltd. The Cabinet, the Prime Minister, and the appropriate Minister have already done their bit. The position is that nothing can be done in capitalising on the misfortune of certain people.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Rules of the House are here for everyone to be guided by. I would like an indication from the

House under Section 16, 3, (b)

"If such leave is not unanimously given, at least nine Members rise in their places to support the request;"

Is it the pleasure of the House that we proceed to deal with this matter?

HON. MEMBERS (GOVERNMENT): No.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will at least nine members rise in their places to support the request?

At this stage the following members of the Opposition rose in their places to support the request :-

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. H. deB. FORDE? Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Five hon. members having risen, I declare that the hon. member does not have permission to deal with this matter under Standing Order 16. The matter is closed.

ORDER OF THE DAY GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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 on these grounds: Although the sittings, in future, will start at twelve noon in order to see that Private Members' time is reserved and that they have an opportunity to deal with their important matters, the fact is that we have very many important bits of legislation to deal with today. If Private Members want to come back tomorrow it is all well and good, but the fact remains that we have a lot of important Government matters to deal with and, unless we suspend the Standing Orders, we may have to remain here until, probably, ten or eleven tonight.

The object of sitting from twelve noon is to be able to get home at a reasonable time, so that the Reportorial staff and the staff generally would feel that we have finished at a reasonable time. This is done in the interest of all concerned. That is the intention of the Government, but if hon. members on the other side want to deal with a Plessey matter, which they consider of urgent public importance, and which is finished, or to make some other manoeuvre like that for cheap publicity, then that is a different matter. The fact is that urgent, important Government business has to be done, if not today, tomorrow, and we will come back here tomorrow at ten o'clock to finalise our business. I have not spoken to the Leader of the Opposition in connection with this matter, and he has not spoken to me. Apparently, he is afraid to speak to me.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition, after last week's misunderstanding, will not be speaking to the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order!

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

That will not embarrass me in any way; it will not hurt me. I am merely explaining, for the benefit of his colleagues, that he has not consulted me. I am stating here categorically that I have not been approached by the Leader of the Opposition nor have I approached him. In consultation with my colleagues, and by virtue of the fact that we have a heavy Order Paper with a lot of intricate and important legislation to deal with, if you want to come back tomorrow to deal with them, you can have your Private Members' time now. If, on the other hand, you want to get the Government's business implemented and important business dealt with, then you may consider the matter in a favourable manner.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. L. S. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took his seat

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, last week the Leader of the House said that the suspension of the Standing Orders was causing a disturbance....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member need to go back to last week? The question is that the Standing Orders be suspended.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, last week he said that the House would meet today at twelve. In effect, so that there would be no necessity for suspending the Standing Orders. You can refer to the debate, Sir. Now, the first thing that happens when the House meets at twelve noon is that the Standing Orders are suspended. We are objecting to it, and we are not going to vote for it. If the Government wants to suppress the rights of Private Members, then let them do it with their majority. Let them face facts and not tell untruths. If

they do not want Private Members' Business discussed; if they want to prevent the Resolutions which stand on the Order Paper in the names of hon. members on both sides of the House under Private Members' Business, let them vote, in effect, against discussing them.

I am very glad that the Leader of the House this week has not misunderstood anything in the conversations which we have had today which will allow him to get up and say that I did not want Private Members' Business discussed. We are going to vote against the suspension of Standing Orders. 12.20 p.m.

We are voting against any suspension of the Standing Orders, and we will speak against the motion to take Government Business. We are demanding in the light of events not only of last week, but of events of a great number of weeks that Private Members' Business be dealt with today. The Leader of the House apparently can find time to write and tell the newspapers that for thirteen weeks we have shown no wish to discuss Private Members' Business. Well let the records show that we are expressing a wish to discuss Private Members' Business today. We have started at 12 o'clock and we have two extra hours. The Reportorial staff is employed to sit here until 10 o'clock under Union agreement. Ministers, the Leader of the House has said, are paid to come here and start doing Government Business at 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock in the morning and so are Parliamentary Secretaries, and as far as I- know, except for two hon. members, the House is full of Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and paid officials of the House of Assembly. On that side

Ministers are paid to come and work. Private Members have their duties to their constituents and to the people of Barbados, the women of Barbados and so on. There are certainly two items at least of Private Members' Business which demand discussion, if you can be relieved from the Chair. I said last week when you were not here that it is not fair to the Speaker to allow a motion of censure to stand over on the Order Paper week after week, so that if you miss it one week, you have to take it up the next week or the week after that.

In any Parliament where business is conducted properly, the Presiding Officer sees that in the interest of the respect of members of the House any motion which points to his or their discredit should be dealt with expeditiously. It is in the face of this and without any knowledge of what hon. members are going to do about the Government Business that stands on the Order Paper that the Minister got up to suspend the Standing Orders. For what purpose are you suspending them? It is just to prevent Private Members having a say? We will be speaking and voting against any measure that is to take away Private Members' rights today or any succeeding days.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Leader of the House has said that there has been no communication between himself and the Leader of the Opposition which led up to his request for suspension of the Standing Orders, I would like to hear from the Leader of the House what business he intends doing today before I can decide whether or not I should support the request for suspension of certain Standing Orders. I do not think in the circumstances it would be considered a reasonable request, and we do feel that all hon. members on this side would certainly like to be informed before they can come to a decision as to what is best.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, we intend to deal with each item of Government Business which appears on the Order Paper except the one which has been referred to Select Committee, the District Auctioneers Act, and the Dental Registration Bill which the Leader of the Opposition did intimate that he intended to say something about the Select Committee, but we intend dealing with all the other items. The main thing is that we have a very voluminous Bill, the Land Tax Bill, 1973, which will take some time in passing through this Chamber, and there are also certain Resolutions to be dealt with. There is a lot of work to be done and anybody who reads the Order Paper would agree to that unless he ignores the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House intimated that he is prepared to deal with every Item of Government Business except the District Auctioneers Bill which has gone to Select Committee. I received my Order Paper - I agree that it is not the fault of the Government - at 1.22 p.m. on Saturday, and you are expecting us to come here to deal with this Land Valuation Act today. It is true that you have the numbers, but I am quite confident that there are members on this side who can make a contribution to a Bill of this nature. It is not a small Bill; it is something which affects the general public one way or the other. We are well aware of the fact that the Government has to collect their taxes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will hon. members observe the Standing Orders?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the Leader of the House rose and moved a motion which was seconded by the Minister of Home Affairs. The hon. member for St. Thomas spoke and the hon. member for St. Peter spoke. Nobody else got up and the Hon. Leader of the House replied. It is out of order therefore for any other member to speak after the mover of the motion has replied.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My interpretation of it is that the Leader of the House was not at the time replying but was just volunteering information.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the Leader of the House who moved the motion did reply and he can so affirm.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What I am saying is that my interpretation of what the Leader of the House did was not tantamount to a reply, and that is my ruling.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order,.....

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member please sit down?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr, Speaker, I think Government Members would appreciate the fact that there are members on this side of the House who can make a contribution to this bit of legislation. We are well aware of the fact that there are 49,000 parcels of land which this is going to affect.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, and I am not breaking the Rules of the House when I rise on a point of order, what I am saying Mr. Speaker is that the Leader of the House has replied.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member Kindly sit down? This is the third time I have given my ruling that I do not deem what the Hon. Leader of the House said a few minutes ago to have been a reply, and that is final.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I want to make it clear that I did Actually reply. I gave a reply to the point made by the hon. member for St. Peter and I did not intend saying anything further because in presenting my motion I gave the reasons.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that there is quite a sum of money to be collected by the Government, and since I have made it clear that we on this side can make a contribution to a bit of legislation of this nature, we are asking the Leader of the House not to continue with this today. It is not really fair to us or to the public as a whole. I am sure all my colleagues here received their Order Papers around 3 o'clock on Saturday, and you are coming here because you have the numbers at your disposal to ram this bit of legislation down our throats. I am appealing to the Leader of the House not to deal with this bit of legislation today so that we can be in a position to assist him.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5r 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P.M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LOWE - 14.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 6. 12.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this stage I may conveniently give notice of the various matters of Government Business which have to be given notice of. With your permission, I am asking for leave to give these notices at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection, these notices will now be given.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of

\$7,346 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73 No. 24 which form the Schedule to this Resolution, and on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I give notice of a

Resolution to grant the sum of \$82,349 of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Order stands in the name of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution for the sum of \$40,000. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO. 25 Hon. C. E. TALMA In moving the passing Of this Resolution, I wish to state that the Addendum sets out the entire matter very fully, but with the present tempo with which the Opposition is proceeding I could perhaps give more detail. The position is that an offer of a complete 1401 I.B.M. Computer Unit has been made to the Government by the First National City Bank.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I suggest to Your Honour that the Leader House is out of order. This is the House and not the Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Supply. on. G. G. FERGUSSON I beg to second that. Mr. ADAMS Sir, the Leader of the House moved that Your Honour do now leave the Chair Perhaps he may wish you to leave the House.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and that the House Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and went into Committee. Mr. LOWE took

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I object to the Hon. Minister asking for leave to deal with the Resolution which stands in the name of the Prime

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. Chairman, you of all will remember that when the late Sir Graftley Adams was in here he objected to Resolution. : Mr. CHAIRMAN I would like the hon. member to realise that when Sir Grantley brought it up the Minister was Present did he made the statement that unless I had started I could not carry on, so there is absolutely no comparison between the two. I am Waiting on the Leader of the House to Proceed.

Hon.C.E.TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I have already asked leave to deal with this Resolution. This is a Resolution for the sum of \$40,000, and the Addendum sets out very clearly the purpose of this Resolution.

The Position is that an offer of a complete 1401 I.B.M. Computer Unit has been made to the Government by the First National City Bank. This machine is identical to the existing 1401 Computer installed at the Data Processing Unit, and the offer is Considered to be advantageous since it would replace the need for the 447 tabulator and certain other ancillary equipment now rented by the Statistical Services. In rationalising this matter it was pointed out that there is need for the speeding up of the output of statistics, and the constant increase in the volume of Original documents from which the statistics are to be processed is responsible for relieve these additional coding and key punching staff as well as machinery for this additional Staff to operate will be required; The saving which could immediately be effected by the termination of the contracts of rental of the 447 tabulator, the 514 reproducing punch and the 077 collator exceeds the cost of this additional staff and the cost of rental of the relevant key punching equipment. For example, the monthly cost of the rental of such equipment is as under as compared with the monthly cost of additional staff and rental of machines: 2 coders @ \$ 140 E.C. .; \$280 2 machinex operators @ \$140 . 280 rental of 2 key .km punches @ U.S. \$90 400 \$960, say \$1,000 per month.

12.40 p.m. A saving will be effected through purchasing this 1401 IBM Computer. The Addendum is fairly well set out. If there are any further questions on this matter, I will be quite willing to answer them.

I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$40,000 do now pass.

Dr. the Hon. JR., R.B.. CODDLE:

I beg second that.

Mr. HIND3:

Mr. Chhairman, when it comes to the question of the IBM Computer and so on, one has to take into consideration, firstly, the age of the instrument. What information does the Minister have at his disposal regarding the age of the Computer? Secondly, is the Minister in a position to tell us whether or not he is inviting this Honourable Committee to engage in what we will call a law-suit? It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is now trying to get advice since he has introduced the Resolution. .

We are informed, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, that this Computer is presently held

1 by a debenture by the First National City Bank,

I and that this instrument by which the which National City Bank holds this Computer is presently . being challenged in the law courts of this Island.

Now, what is the Government's position? Is it right for the Government, at this stage, to be going into this kind of thing? In truth and in . fact nobody knows whether the First National City

Bank is right in holding the Computer. The First

National City Bank not only holds the Computer, but the Leader of the House has just said that the

First National City Bank has offered it for sale to the Government!

Now, matters in connection with this Computer are in the hands of a Receiver. All of this is the type of information that the Minister should be bold enough to put before this Committee. I do not say he should be honest enough. I feel that he should put this type of information to the Committee before asking hon. members on his side to cast a vote one way or another. What has the Minister to say about the matters which I have just raised? I cannot see how a Minister, who has the interest of the taxpayers at heart, could come to this Committee and ask us to spend \$40,000 in purchasing a law-suit, when you might, eventually, have to spend another \$40,000 if you want to come out with your skin clean. I want to hear what the Minister has to say on these matters.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, before you put the Question, I think the Committee is entitled to know whether the Government is satisfied that the First National City Bank has a valid, legal title in relation to this 1401 IBM Computer. I understand that there was in the Supreme Court of Barbados a case called H. O. Edwards Electrical Company Limited Vs International Systems Associates, and on the first hearing of that claim, the First National City Bank put in a claim stating that they were entitled to the Computer and that claim was disallowed. They have subsequently put in a second claim relying on a debenture and a hypothecation made in the U.S.A., and that case is still being adjudicated and sub judice. I do not think it would be right for this Committee to give the appearance of passing money for something on the title of a matter that is still before Her Majesty's Judges.

If this is the same Computer, and we have reason to believe that this is the same Computer, it would be much better to investigate the matter thoroughly before committing the Government to purchasing this machine. I am not involved in the litigation, but I know other members of the House who are involved in the litigation and, obviously, would not want to speak on the matter. From being present around the courts, I know that this matter is being hotly litigated. If this is the same Computer, then the Government should really take warning, because they may very well find themselves closing a deal in relation to which there is a dispute as to the title and ownership. I think we are entitled to ask for some assurance on this matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been said or brought to light by the two hon. members who have spoken, more especially the hon. member for Christ Church West, a prominent practising Attorney-at-

Law, I would prefer to wait until the Minister of Finance comes to deal with this matter. He is expected to attend the House today, and I am asking for a temporary postponement until the appropriate Minister is present, because he is more au fait with it. Since hon. members, who have just spoken, have indicated that the matter is sub judice, it is only right that I acquaint the Minister of Finance of what has been said here.

I beg to, move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad for the information which I have heard today. I will not be so churlish as the Leader of the House to exclude the hon. member for St. Peter as one of the elucidators of the information which suggests that we should not proceed further.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I said both hon. members who have spoken. I said that twice, but the hon. member does not listen. I complimented both of them.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the point, which the Opposition initially made, that the Minister of Finance was the person who should deal with this matter has now been taken. I am glad that the Leader of the House recognises it. You have to recognise it when the water is getting deep. We will vote for the postponement of this Resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I believe I know more about this particular Computer than.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You are completely out of order. We are now dealing with the postponement of the Resolution. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am talking on the motion for postponement. Am I entitled now to speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You are entitled to speak on the postponement.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the Hon. Leader of the House has come around to postponing the debate on this particular Resolution. I believe I know more about this particular computer and the legal suit involving it than anybody else in here, even the Prime Minister, because I dealt with the original case in which the judgment was handed down, and I know all the manoeuvres in respect of this particular computer; so I am saying that when the Opposition opposed the Leader of the House in dealing with this Resolution, they were on firm grounds that the Leader of the House does not

understand one thing about this Resolution and the computer, and I think it is time that the Government Bench understands that when the Opposition says things, they have more information than the Government has about the matter.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed, 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 progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE HIGHJACKING ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item 3 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, the Objects and Reasons set out that this Bill would make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft signed at The Hague on 16th December, 1970, and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

The position, Sir, is that this matter has been considered by Cabinet some time ago and it was agreed that Barbados should ratify the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft signed at The Hague on 16th December, 1970, but in order to give effect to certain provisions of the Convention and to enable Barbados to ratify this Bill, it is necessary to pass this measure as prepared by the Attorney General's Chamber. This is really just to legalise the situation by passing and enacting the Bill. There is nothing much to this Bill.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that we all in here would agree with this Bill, but I would like to know what precautionary measures we have at Seawell as they are having precautionary measure at other international airports to deter possible hijackers. There are measures used at Heathrow and John F. Kennedy Airports, and I would like to find out what measures we have here since we are also an international airport. I think this is something which the Minister should be in a position to tell us.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I expect the hon. member has finished his speech

Mr. CRAIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Government has taken appropriate steps to have certain of their officers in the constabulary trained for this type of work, and some of them have been trained and are actively engaged for security reasons. I do not care to call the names, but there are officers trained for this particular type of work, and are actually operating at the international airport at Seawell.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, is this the Minister's final reply? I would like the Minister to state right away because there is something I want to say.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I waited to see if any other hon. member wanted to speak, and that is why I asked the hon. member for St. James if in fact he had finished his speech, and then the Minister got up and replied.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G.:

FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, Clause 3 appears to relate to offences which normally would come within the ambit of members of the constabulary, to use the Leader of the House's phrase. Could the Leader of the House possibly say at this stage for what purpose is it thought necessary to Conceal the identity of members of the Royal Barbados Police Force who are dealing with this or to conceal the measures which are being taken

against hijackers? Hijacking is an offence which is deterred by publicity. If a hijacker goes up and sees a Man in uniform wearing a large sign marked "Anti-hijacking Patrol" and carrying a metal detector and looking at every passenger, to my mind it is likely that he will find an excuse to go to the lavatory and not get on the aeroplane at all. I have seldom heard anything which seemed less logical.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but when he is attempting to make what I said appear ridiculous, I never said anything about uniform or having any marks on uniform. If that is the sort of thing you have in mind, it is very preposterous and wrong. I said a member of the constabulary, but I did not say how he was dressed.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Minister once again shows his lack of comprehension of things which I have said either to him or more publicly; so hon. members can now judge whether what he said I said to him last week was said or not having heard his comment on my speech here. 1.00 p.m.

I am suggesting that the hijack patrol should be identified and be identifiable and he is suggesting otherwise, and I am suggesting it is better to identify because somebody who is going to do something wrong is less likely to do it if he sees somebody just there waiting to take the necessary precautions. Many hon. members, especially Ministers, will be familiar with the anti-hijacking precautions. (Asides). I had better let the hon. member for St. Michael West speak. The Japanese who attacked the people at Tel Aviv airport were at least deterred from doing any attacks aboard the aircraft, because they put their weapons in their luggage which is not detected by the anti-hijacking patrol. Hon. members who have travelled through airports in big countries recently will be aware that they have men and women feelers, if you can call them that, and they feel you to see whether you have a gun, they look at your bags to see whether you have any metal and so on. Common sense tells you that that must deter potential hijackers, and I believe that the incidence of hijacking has in fact fallen within the last few months. The last twelve months have seen fewer successful hijackings than the twelve months when they were at their height.

A lot could be said about this, hijacking started in the West Indies. It started in the Caribbean when the United States encouraged people to steal planes from the Cuban airlines to escape from a regime they did not like. It spread to the United States, and this is the hemisphere for hijacking. Barbados should not be left out, obviously, and I am suggesting that you take obvious measures at Seawell Airport and not conceal measures as the hon. member said. Only this morning I heard a broadcast by the Canadian Minister of Civil Aviation explaining why it is necessary for all countries in the western hemisphere to take very severe measures to try to stop the hijacking beforehand. We would want it stopped before it reaches the stage of the offences of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, culpable homicide - which is not an offence known to Barbados law, but never mind that - and you want to stop it, and the best way of stopping it is to show that you have precautionary measures right there in force. I would like it stopped before anybody hijacks a plane in Barbados. We have never had an aeroplane crash here, and I will be very glad to think that we do not have an aeroplane hijacking either. I know that some members of the Cabinet have actually been subjected to the experience of hijacking.....(Hon.F. G. SMITH: Not so, Mr. Steve Emtage and Mr. Jean Holder but not a Minister). Why do not hon. members who wish to contradict me get up and say so? Senator Moe and Mr. Holder were hijacked. Mr. Chairman, I will check on this and believe me, Mr. Chairman, if I am wrong I will seek and opportunity to tell hon. members, I only know what I think I read in the paper, that is all, that there were all then civil servants

on a plane that was taken to Cuba. I may turn out to be wrong, but it is equally possible that the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Michael North West may also turn out to be wrong. I hope that if it is they who turn out to be wrong that they will give the House the same pledge that they will come and say they are sorry and that George Moe was among those who were hijacked, but anyhow it is not of any importance.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that whereas he is perfectly correct in stating that obvious deterrents should be there, whether in the form of a person in uniform carrying some mark on his chest that he is the detective on duty to stop these things or something else, but also that goes hand in hand with a rather more discreet kind of inspection. At the moment at Seawell you can see from time to time various airline officials who have these progn-looking things which they run over a person's body and over their hand baggage to see if they have any metal things, and this is the obvious kind of inspection which is being done by some of the airlines. I have seen BOAC and Air Canada do it, I do not know whether any of the others do it or riot, but at the same time I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that if there happens to be some person of a detective force of one kind or another posing perhaps as a man carrying luggage or hurrying from one place to another, mixing amongst the passengers, it is better that he is undetected and is trained to observe, and just as the Customs people catch people smuggling more by observing and by tip-offs than by opening people's luggage, I think that this type of detection is obviously necessary too, and I think that that was the kind of detection to which the Hon. Leader of the House referred. Both kinds of deterrents are necessary.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a very important measure. Those organisations, one of which is the organisation to which I belong, took a great deal of trouble in getting this matter brought before the International Civil Organisation, and they put forward resolutions some of which have been accepted by the Governments, and I am very pleased that this was one of the international instruments that the Government here has acted upon very expeditiously. I am very pleased about it.

I think that this is an international matter, and I do not think it is really any Barbadian matter, it has a lot to do with the community itself, people who travel, but I think people who travel are entitled to travel with a certain measure of safety, and this Bill is going to give some protection to those people. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that things have abated, and I think one of the reasons that has caused the abatement in these hijackings is the fact that some of the countries who have been taking hijackers in have decided not to take them in as they did before. If a hijacker knows he is going to get a home he will risk it, but if he knows there is no home for him he will stop it. It is a very serious matter, I have seen all the airports around the world using all the precautions, and hon. members say it is better to have people stuck up there that you can see them, but this is not usually done. When you go to an airport you see everybody's luggage being checked as a means of protecting everybody in the plane, and I am very pleased that the Government has acted quickly on this matter, and I hope that other international instruments will be treated in a similar manner by the Government.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Information spoke about the system which is now being employed at Seawell International Airport. As far as I have been reliably told, the only airline using this system of detection is BOAC. 1.10 p.m.

I happened to be at the Airport at the time, and the system which is being used, in my humble opinion, is one which is not only going to delay and frustrate passengers, but it is going to cause them to give us a worse reputation than we have had in respect of flight-time in and out of Barbados.

I was in England about a year-and-a-half ago and I saw a most sophisticated system whereby people passed under a tunnel where the slightest bit of metal could be detected, and then an intensive search would be done. The system which is utilised at Seawell is one in which a man moves an instrument up and down in front of a passenger in the hope of detecting something. It is commonly known that passengers are complaining about the late arrival and departure of aircraft flying in and out of Barbados. If we intend- to keep Barbados as an International Airport, then something should be done to speed up the method of checking passengers with a view to finding out whether they are carrying something metallic or not when passing through Seawell Airport.

There is another point I should like to raise, and I have said it in this House before. There is a body of opinion, and it seems to be the opinion which exists among black people. If you and I go to Seawell Airport, you will find the Customs Officers and everybody at the door shouting at you: "Where are you going?" However, if you happen to be a person of another ethnic group, you are allowed to walk all over the Airport and nobody will ask you whether you are a passenger. I have said that M.P.'s should have some sort of identity to show to Customs Guards and so on so that they will know that they are looking after the people's interest.

Sir, at the Airport you can see a white person with long hair down his back; two old slippers on his feet, and he is allowed to walk all over the place. If you are talking about hijacking, then the Government should take a serious look at this matter. (Asides.) The hon. member for St. Michael West says that it sounds like a lie. I would like him to look at the Minister of Information and see whether he is not shaking his head indicating yes. He and I were at the Airport the same evening when a man stopped him and asked where he was going. Another man was allowed to pass, and I asked why the other man was allowed to do so. (Asides) I am nobody, because I am black. So long as you look black, everybody will shout at you. If you look like a Beatnik, you can walk all over the place and nobody will shout at you. Last night I saw about three of them going to the door of a BO AC aircraft and nobody said anything to them.

Sir, I believe! used the VIP lounge only once. I believe that if I knocked at the door, they will ask me to leave, but I still represent Barbadians.

You are talking about hijacking, and yet you are still allowing all sorts of people to walk all over the place. One of these days you may hear that a plane is blown up at the Airport in Barbados.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Sir, I am not saying that the point made by the hon. member for St. Joseph is not true, but he cannot lay that at the Government's door. He cannot be suggesting that the Government tells the Customs Guards to let in White people and keep out Black people! If persons in certain positions are not conscious of their obligations and what the purpose of their job is, and they are unable to exercise that function impartially, without fear or favour or ill-will, then the hon. member for St. Joseph cannot blame the Government for that. The matters mentioned by the hon. member for St. Joseph should be drawn to

the attention of the Comptroller of Customs, the Airport Manager, and the Director of Civil Aviation. I do not think the hon. member would go that far as to suggest that the Government has told Customs Officers or Customs Guards that they must keep out Black people and allow White people to pass.

Sir, we have just had Independence and, in my own experience in Barbados, I have found that, not only in the Customs Department but throughout Barbados, you can still get that Colonial mentality in certain civil servants. You can take the people out of Colonialism, but you cannot take Colonialism out of some people. This has not happened because it is Government's policy, but because some people have not yet learned to understand that this is their native land. As a preacher said this morning: "God has given us this good land for a heritage!" Some people are still continuing this old-time 'White man go through; Black man stand back.' I will see that the matter is drawn to the attention of the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation, the Comptroller of Customs, and the Manager of the Airport, so that this accusation made should be stopped.

I should like to say that I had the honour of representing Barbados in Montreal when they were dealing with this question of hijacking in 1968. Seawell Airport is passing through a phase of development. If you go to Seawell every other day, you do not know where you were yesterday and where they will put you the day after tomorrow. You have read that there is a phase of development, and, until you have finished your construction, security at Seawell Airport, I concede, will be very difficult to handle. Changes are taking place at Seawell day in and day out, and it is very difficult to control the movements of people. The American Airlines have certainly indicated to the Airlines flying into America .CAB has told them that they must take certain precautions at ports of departure to ensure that there is no hijacking.

As far as Government is concerned, we are fully conscious of the possibility of certain acts taking place. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, no country is free from the possibility of hijacking. We would like to think that the possibility of hijacking in Barbados is minimal. We are not unmindful of the fact, as the hon. member for St. Joseph has pointed out, that there is a need for security. In addition to this, the hon. member for St. Joseph talked about a tunnel. Now, the Airlines themselves have been complaining that if they are forced to spend millions of dollars on protection, it must necessarily mean an increase in passenger fares. That has been mooted, too.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would not like the hon. Minister to get up and defend the Airlines by talking about what this protection is going to cost. I say so on the ground that if it is good enough to be done at London Airport and in New York at John P. Kennedy Airport and the fares have not been increased - as a matter of fact, the air fares between America and the United Kingdom have been dropping. Why must that affect the Airlines passenger rates between Barbados and anywhere else?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am not defending the Airlines. I have put forward an argument raised by the Airlines. I have not given the Government's view. I have put forward the view that the Airlines have publicly said so. I am not an advocate for any Airline; I do not get any retainer. The hon. member knows that the views were expressed, and he has read about the matter. The Airlines have put forward the view that any costly measure in detection - this is the Airlines' business and not the business of the Government - will necessarily mean an increase in fares. 1.20 p.m.

All I am saying is that the Government is taking precautions as far as the Airport is concerned. We do not protect airlines. If the country into which they are flying demands certain basic precautions, we have to give them, but the Government is conscious of the need for precautions, and I do not want the hon. member to get up and say I am defending the airlines. I am putting forward what I read like what he has read. I am not saying they should not be made to do it.

The question of air fares is for I ATA which is a body completely outside Government except that we as a Government can tell him through our

Licensing Authority what our fares are; but the Government of Barbados has nothing to do with air fares, and I have no defence for airlines. I am only putting forward the view which they have put forward. I do not care whether it is true, I do not have the statistics, but do not get up and accuse me of putting forward what is good for London. I say if it is good for London, it is good for Barbados. If it would prevent hijacking in London, it can prevent hijacking in Barbados. I am not going into the cost. All I am saying is that as a Government we have set up our security. The airlines, because of the American Government's demands are stepping up their security, and when the airport is fully developed we will take further precautions if hijacking has not been completely outlawed by certain governments taking the action we are taking today, because this is vital. A lot of hijacking as was said earlier in the debate takes place because certain countries give haven. Algeria, Egypt and Thailand and other nations give refuge and consolation to hijackers. Well Barbados today is going on record as saying that we are not giving any refuge to hijackers; we are going to punish these offences in keeping with the accepted international standards, and I can give hon. members the assurance that as far as the Government, not the airlines because I am nothing to do with them, is concerned, we have set up our security within the sort of physical structure of the airport which is not easy to police as it stands. I can only hope and pray that Barbados, up to now with its clean record of non-hijacking, will continue to enjoy that privilege. But it only shows that however good security might be, something can still happen. America has had security for years and up to last week people still seized planes; so I do not think it is a fool-proof system. It is just like security for a Monarch. It is never a fool-proof system because if the airlines in America, London and Canada are spending this money and people can still hijack aircraft, you can see that Barbados is not altogether exempt from this possibility.

We have done our best and the Bill itself is an indication of Government's desire to join those nations of the world who look on hijacking as a dastardly crime, a crime against humanity, a crime perpetrated and imperilling the lives of people who have a right to travel free, and especially in these days when airline travel for busy persons is a cheap means of transportation, then of course I think the Opposition will agree that we have taken a step in the right direction in bringing this Bill before Parliament today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to give the assurance to the hon. member for St. Joseph that I have made a special note of the alleged discrimination at Seawell, and I will.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, I would like the Hon. Minister of Information to get up and tell the House if what I have said is not true, because I have pledged never to mislead this House, and fortunately he was the witness. I want the whole Government Bench to understand that what I said is absolutely true, and I

would like the Minister to get up and say if I am lying, because the Prime Minister has said that if he catches one of them lying, he will deal with them. It is no alleged discrimination.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

A lie does not demand corroboration. If the hon. member does not trust his own integrity that what he said will be accepted, is he laying down that he must have corroboration?

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Leader of the House said "alleged", and you know as well as the world as an ex-lawyer what "alleged" means.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said he was not defending airlines, but I would ask hon. members to remember that early last year a certain member in this House got up and talked about the Telephone Company and how good it was, and the next thing we heard about was an increase in the rates; so when I hear that if you put in security you will get an increase in fares, I have to hold my hat tight. I will fly before the increase comes.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that under Section 3 of this Bill several members have seen fit to make long speeches. As a matter of fact if it was not led off by the Leader of the Opposition making a point I think that was very well taken, several members perhaps on the Government side would have kept quiet. I would like to say that you will note that section 3 refers to the Civil Aviation (Tokyo Convention) Act, 1972. When that measure was before this House I believe it was I who then asked the Leader of the House about ratification of this Convention, and at the time I do not think the Leader of the House was even in a position to state whether there was such a Convention or whether Government was aware of it, and it only shows you that when you make a valid point, you draw it to their attention and it takes time.

The hon. member for St. Michael West is really mistaken to think we have been at speed in ratifying this Convention. We have not. This legislation is already on the statute books of many countries including the United Kingdom, and like anything we are always behind them, rather late against little people. There is a tendency by some and very lucky that we have not had hijacking members of this Chamber whenever they get the circumstances in the West Indies, because whenever opportunity to attack small people to do so, and; we realise that we are starting diplomatic relations they do not attack persons in high positions. With other countries and all of a sudden go abroad 1.30 p.m.; and discover that we have Jewish names, we always attached to ourselves the eyes of many more. The hon. member for St. Joseph made an people who would stoop to hijacking members of attack on the little man at the airport, and he said the Government or even hijacking aircraft that these people were stopping people from normally coming in and that they practise racial discrimination. People find it very inconvenient to I would like to say on this that it is a defend such a person, and I want to say worthwhile measure and we must now go the full categorically that that is not true. I have gone to hog. The Government must not only say that it is the airport and seen white people standing up on going to support any measure for anti-hijacking or the outside. These men are impervious, they stop that it will not be giving asylum to people coming people right and left if they do not know them, here under these circumstances; it must support and it is not on the basis of any colour. Because he the International Trade Union of Pilots and be! was up at the airport and a white man went vocal in giving them support when they protest through

he would accuse the little man of this. I do strongly against hijacking of aircraft. I have not not accuse people of things of colour, I have heard the Government express a view on this at all the hon. member for Christ Church West say he on the occasion when they were asking for an likes people whether they are black, white or blue, international strike, and I hope that they will go so do not tell me you are going to take on a little much further in the future and try to lobby for fellow at the airport about allowing white people these people in particular on points such as this. in and stopping black people, because I do not want to mention that even when people die I will only end up my comment on this part sometimes they do not want black people to bury of the Act by hoping that the enforcement them, so it does not matter. Everybody is buried provisions will prevent any such crimes as are by a black man and you do not say all black people mentioned in section 3 from occurring in or near must bury black people. I know some prominent Barbados or in aircraft registered in Barbados. I black people have died and have not been buried have heard many assurances given by Ministers to by black undertakers, so why make a fuss about this House and whenever there is a statement made that and say they did not get a black undertaker? I have heard how much the Government is doing about this and about that; but I think even a casual You always use this manner when talking of glance at Seawell will show that the security there the little man, because you think he is standing up is slack. I am not criticising the members of the there because he is afraid of people in positions of C.I.D. because I believe this duty is rather onerous authority. This seems to be more symptomatic of for them, but I believe there is a strong case for the the society than it is symptomatic of a man who is a Government to have in its Civil Aviation Customs Guard who is likely to be victimised easier

Department two or three people who are specialists than maybe somebody higher up. The hon. in this field. The cost of it could be tacked on to member for Christ Church West spoke about the some of the dues paid, by the airlines themselves, complaints, and I have done more on these things and they should be made available for flights both than the hon. member, I have participated actively within and outside the West Indies. Quite in this. My organisation has written the Prime frequently I travel within the West Indian Minister on this matter, so I do not have to get up territories and I am sure that within the last year and speak on these things. We have taken strong on all, except flights going outside the West Indies, measures when they happened here in Barbados, there have been no security checks made, and I do When a man was killed at the Airport nobody not think this is good enough because there are real made much fuss about that and I realised that this dangers. Merely giving answers to the House saying was a matter of carelessness, but I can do that that the Government is conscious of this and is because I am not afraid of saying these things, so it doing this and that is all right, but any real detailed has to be quite clear in people's minds that the examination of the situation would show that it is false idea of picking on the little fellow is a matter almost cursory, and there are really no proper of cowardice, a little man who is a Customs Guard provisions, and we must accept this. Signing the and who lets white people come in, and the hon.

Convention is not enough. I think we have to do it member for St. Joseph knows very well that he has and not merely tell people you are doing it. gone to the airport and said because the Minister was there and a white man was not stopped that Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not like something was wrong. What does that mean? That to delay this and more so when attacks are made he allows all white people to come in and stop black people. I have gone to the airport and seen white people standing and waiting until their relatives come in and he knows that is true, so why pretend that when white people go up to the airport the Messengers or a Customs Guard bow and curtsy, but it is something with some black people that if they were different people there, the same little black man that is poor and

undefended, an hon. member of the House of Assembly would try to put it up that he is such a so-and-so that he is going to allow all white people to come in here and stop black ones from coming in, and with the kind of language the hon. member would denigrate our people for, but the only way you can speak about our people is when you are speaking to them in that manner, so the only way he could make reference to how he would speak to you is if you are going to speak in a manner that you cannot understand. That sort of denigration is what is doing this country a lot of harm, looking for the little people to try to cry down all the time. All I want to say is that the man who is going to practise discrimination is not a Customs Guard, but up and down this country you see it being done. Why do you not go and see the places with which the hon. member is associated? I am going to say that you are practising discrimination because you joined with white people to run a business; why do you not look for black people to run a business with? This kind of thing is nauseating, and you always try to hold on to the little man to see if you can cry him down.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, anything I do I do openly, I do not do it in an underhand manner. The hon. member who just sat down if he were . honest to his own conscience would not only ask himself but he would ask his associate who was also turned back at the airport, or he would ask the Minister of Information and he would get his information before getting up, but the hon. member believes that because he is a Trade Union representative, every time you speak the truth about people in Barbados he has to say it is not true. He will tell you so, but he will not go and ask questions. He is the leader of the Trade Union, it is in his power, his position, and he has the facilities behind him to investigate and to institute all sorts of means and ways of finding out if the people he represents are giving honest work and dealing with black people in Barbados different from the way they are dealing with white people. Why does he not ask the Minister of Information or the Minister of Communications and Works who said just now that you can take black people out of colonialism but you cannot take colonialism out of black people?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I said you could take people out of colonialism, not black people.

Mr. BOLDEN:

He said civil servants, how many white ones are there in Barbados? This shows, Mr. Chairman, the two-way actions of politics in Barbados today. If you are afraid for the Minister of Information I am not afraid of him, tell him the truth or ask him, and I challenge him to say that I am lying, and I will challenge you and any one of the Customs Guards you can find out there. When you talk about picking on small people, I represent more small people than you represent in your personal capacity, and I represent them freely. You do not want to hear the truth about them, you are making fun.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I know it is bound to hurt.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Nothing hurts me, it hurts him.

Mr. WALCOTT:

It hurts him so much he cannot sit down. Do you think I am afraid of any one of the Ministers in here? The shadow of my body does not even darken any of their houses or their offices, I do not have to be

afraid of the Ministers, or you, or anybody in here. You have to look around you before you talk about honesty, you cannot talk to me about honesty, you have to have a little introspection and reserve those words for elsewhere.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, under what section of this Bill does that fall?

Mr. WALCOTT; I am going to deal with you too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am giving neither side any latitude.

Mr. FORDE:

I can deal with the hon. member and with the whole side over there.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I said, and I repeat it, if you want to know about honesty you have to look within your own patty,

Mr. FORDE; On a point of order, the hon. member must withdraw his remarks if he is insinuating and stating by implication that anybody here, and in particular referring to me, is dishonest because I have never seen any greater distorter of the truth than the hon. member. He cannot talk about anybody being dishonest.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am not even going to ask the hon. member to withdraw that, I will repeat that the hon. member must look around him first before he speaks about dishonesty. I will not say anything in here that I cannot say outside; some people have to wait till the 11th hour then to make up their minds about what to do but I do not have to do that. 1.40 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Joseph has a way of attacking these little people. I have been to the Airport, and I have seen White people standing outside and not going inside. It is not a question of accusing a Customs Guard of allowing White people to go in and keeping out Black people. It is not fair to them. I am saying that if a White person went in and a Black person was not allowed to go in, it was not a question of a Customs Guard working on any basis of discrimination. I do not like what the hon. member has done, because the only way in which he can describe the Customs Guard is by using the vulgar, stupid language which the hon. member has repeated.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I think this has gone too far. I also think it very unreasonable of the hon. member for St. Michael West when somebody makes a complaint - it is a specific complaint; he has named a witness who has not denied that something did happen - to turn a debate on security at the Airport into a debate on the honesty of the hon. member for Christ Church West or on the propensity of the hon. member for St. Joseph to attack little people. It was wrong of the Customs Guard to let the hon. member for St. Michael North Central through, if he were not a passenger. I beg your pardon, Sir. I believe hon. members of the House of Assembly do have a custom's privilege, but it was wrong of the Customs Guard to stop the hon. member for St. Joseph, if he knew he were a member of the House of Assembly. To say that the

hon. member for St. Joseph should not take objection because he was a little man, to me, is only to encourage the same foolishness and the same potentiality for misunderstanding in the future. Are we only to complain when somebody does us something wrong, or does something that he should not do?

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I never said that. When the hon. member made his speech based on colour, I said that the people up there are not stopping people based on colour. A specific case cannot be contributed to a matter that the people are stopping you because of colour. It is a fact that White and Black people have been stopped.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that anybody who thinks about it rationally will realise that it is more likely the Customs Guard will let through somebody White than Black, for the simple reason that more passengers are White. When the Customs Guard sees a White man entering the passenger lounge, he will be inclined to think that he is a passenger. To me that is a matter of commonsense, and not a matter of colour or anything else. If you do not know a man, and you see him walk confidently into the passenger lounge and he looks as though he is a foreigner - with great respect to the Minister of Information, he does not look like a Barbadian. There are White people in Barbados, and they do not look like the Minister of Information. He does not look like a Barbadian, and you must take that from a coloured Barbadian. A Customs Guard at Seawell Airport is not going to look at him, no matter what his passport says, or what the electors of Christ Church North Central have mistakenly said - he does not really, to my mind, at Seawell, strike you as a Barbadian trying to gate-crash or anything else. No doubt the Customs Guard is accustomed to letting hundreds of White people pass because they are passengers. No doubt a White passenger may be going to France or London.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is uncalled for. Of course, it must be relevant, because we are dealing with offences at the Airport and controlling them. I think it is important that where an hon. member brings something to the attention of the House - as I say, members of the House of Assembly, to the best of my knowledge, still have the customs' privilege at Seawell Airport. The hon. member brings a specific case, so why attack him? It might never have happened if the Ministry of Civil Aviation, as it used to, had sent out the passes and so on. There is a little blue pass that goes out to members which they used to show to the Customs Guard, and the Customs Guard would let them in to the prescribed area. (Asides.) The hon'. member for St. Michael West, perhaps, still has his. I have never had one at all, but I know that these passes exist. I believe my mother still has one.

Mr. Chairman, let me put forward a suggestion that, to avoid letting anybody feel that the Customs Guard lets in White people and does not let in Black, those Black persons who are entitled to go there are given a pass so that the Customs Guard will have no more worries. You must tell the Customs Guard that he must not assume anybody to be a passenger no matter what is his colour, unless he shows a ticket valid for that flight. These are suggestions which I would have thought would have come from those responsible in answer to the speech made by the hon. member for St. Joseph. The hon. member, sitting at the end here, has been subjected to so much abuse that could not be relevant to this question.

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

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, again I am appealing to the Minister to try to get a Barbados Extradition Act passed instead of relying on the United Kingdom Parliament Act. It is almost impossible for members to have copies of the Extradition Act of the United Kingdom for 1870 to be able to make any valid and worthwhile contribution to the debates on these matters.

Again, I say that when the Civil Aviation Tokyo Convention Act came before this House, I mentioned and drew to the attention of the Honourable House at the time that we are relying on United Kingdom legislation that is absolutely out of date, and there is no reason at all why we should not have our own Act. This is a valid case of not being able to get Colonialism out of the heads of some people. If you want to see it, it is right in the legislation there. That is the sort of concrete working suggestion that I would like to see being acted on. Even in England, today, the Act is out of date. I refer to the Extradition Act of 1870. They have modified their legislation and brought it up to date, but we are continually legislating in this House on the basis of amending their legislation, referring to their legislation and doing nothing about it. But you can hear a lot of mouthings from other people when you come into the House about how much they are doing to eradicate Colonialism.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Sir, I should just like to say that the point made by the hon. member is well taken. I should like to assure him that only last week there was a meeting of Commonwealth Law Ministers in London in which he knows that this whole question of fugitive offenders, extradition and hijacking was discussed at the final session of the Law Ministers at which the Honourable Attorney General of Barbados was present. I hope that now this matter has been aired, and the Attorney General has had the benefit of the views of his fellow-Attorney Generals and Law Ministers in London only last week, we will get quicker action on our own Extradition and Fugitive Offenders Act. It has just been discussed.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was 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. G. G. FERGUSON:

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. 1.50 p.m.

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

THE EXTRADITION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The next Item is Order No. 4 which is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Extradition Act, 1870, of the United Kingdom Parliament.

Again, Sir, this Bill will amend the Extradition Act, 1870, of the United Kingdom Parliament to allow the powers exercised by Her Majesty by Order in Council published in the London Gazette to be exercised in respect of Barbados by the Governor General by Order published in the Official Gazette.

The Attorney General has advised that in the light of the provisions of Clause 4(2) of the Hijacking Bill which we have just passed which refers to the application of the Extradition Act, 1870 of the United Kingdom Parliament as applied to Barbados by Order under Section 2 of that Act in the case of a foreign state which is a party to the convention but which has not concluded an extradition treaty with Barbados, it is considered necessary to amend the United Kingdom Extradition Act, 1870, as applied to Barbados to allow the powers exercised in the Act by Her Majesty by Order in Council and published in the London Gazette to be exercised in Barbados by the Governor-General by Order published in the Official Gazette. That is all there is to it.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, now we really have fallen between two stools. The Hijacking Act which we have just passed makes it necessary for the Extradition Act to be amended, but instead of amending the Extradition Act in the Hijacking Act, you go to all the trouble of amending the United Kingdom Extradition Act, an Act that is not even among the laws of Barbados, so that the only reference to Extradition that you will ever have in the index of our laws as passed by us is an Act to amend the United Kingdom Extradition Act. This is a waste of time, and the Act we have just passed should have contained the provision we are asked to pass here, if you were going to pass an Act relating to extradition, if you were going to put the House of Assembly, the Governor-General, the draftsmen, the Government Printer, the Clerks of the House and everybody else to the trouble of making a new title among the Laws of Barbados, you could have taken just a little extra trouble and passed an Extradition Act of our own. What is the point of wasting time with an Act to amend an Act of the Parliament at Westminster when in fact what we need is our own Extradition Act as a whole? Nobody could oppose this. It is only a matter of commonsense that the advice coming from the Attorney General is correct, but it is a waste of the House's and the Printer's time. All this should have been contained in the last Act with which we dealt, or let us have a new Extradition Act altogether and save the title in the laws of

Barbados.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND, 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.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I think hon. members would like a recess for obvious reasons.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention something which occurred before I had taken my place in the House in respect of Order No. 1. For Order No. 1 of Government Business the House went into Committee on a Resolution to grant a sum of \$40,000 out of the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Can we get the procedure clarified? What point are you raising? Is it a motion to recommit Order No. 1?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not think Your Honour understands what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am trying to get the procedure straight.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not asking that that matter be resumed at this stage, I am drawing to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the Orders of the House particularly with respect to order and to Order No. 1. It is my understanding, and I hope I am not misrepresenting the proceedings of the House, that the House went into Committee on Order No. 1 to move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$40,000 out of the Consolidated Fund. The Addendum states that this money is for the purpose of acquiring a second computer for the Data Processing Unit. (Asides) I am Minister of Finance and this stands in my name. I understand that when the matter went into Committee, some members of the House said that the subject matter of this resolution is sub judice, whatever that means, because it means a different thing on different days, and the matter was not proceeded with. Since Your Honour is in the Chair, I want to make it clear once and for all that there is no procedure whereby this House can be notified by anyone that something is sub judice, and therefore a suspension of Government Business may be entertained because somebody gets up and says the computer is the subject of an action for damages or recovery or something like that in a court of law. Parliament in Barbados is supreme to the extent that even if what has been said is true, that this Parliament could pass a law not only abolishing the action, but Parliament could pass a law saying that we do not need any law courts in Barbados at all because Parliament is supreme, and the Supreme Court of Judicature Act is a creature of the Parliament of Barbados. If two or three parties are engaged in litigation over a matter and the Government comes in here for money, that does not stop the litigation; all Parliament is being asked to do is to appropriate money to acquire a particular item of property, and nowhere in the Resolution did it mention any litigation. I do not understand what kind of tomfoolery goes on in Parliament nowadays, because I have had the misfortune to sit down here and listen to legally qualified people on the other side come and ask questions to provide evidence for cases in which they were engaged in the courts. On another occasion a member referred to a matter which was before the court and said that the Government did not have any case and they did not talk about sub judice then. The member apologised afterwards to me but I told him he should know better. I am not going to call his name because I do not want to start any wrangling or contention here. What I want to make clear is that Parliament is supreme and there is no procedure whereby the Chief Justice, the Lord High Chancellor, any barrister or any tout around the law courts can come in here and stop Parliament from doing its work by saying that something is sub judice. I want to make it clear because if that is so, I have no right in here, this is not the place for me.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House do now resume Committee of Supply I would like to clear the point that when the question of the I.B.M. Computer was brought to my attention I merely asked that further consideration be temporarily postponed until such time as the appropriate Minister had come in. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am going to move an amendment to that, but speaking upon the same basis of order as the Prime Minister had spoken, I would just like to mention that the words "sub judice" were not Used by any member on this side, that what members on this side .said was that you should be careful that the Government does not find itself buying a computer from somebody who cannot give title. I think it very wrong that the Prime Minister should come in here and speak for five minutes on a matter which occurred when he was not in the House and on which he is obviously misinformed. No member on this side said anything about sub judice. I thought it was an unfortunate phrase because what was said clearly on this side was that there was some doubt in whom the title of the computer rested. Now, I am moving an amendment to the motion that the House do now resume Committee of Supply. I am moving an amendment to delete all the words after "that" and that the words "Private Members' Business be now taken" be substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I cannot allow that amendment.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the Standing Orders have already been suspended, so he is entirely out of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

How is it out of order, Sir? The several Standing Orders have been suspended, I could not move it if the Standing Orders were in force. If the Standing Orders were in force, the motion that would be out of order would be the motion of the Leader of the House, therefore it is up to the House to decide its business. If we had not suspended the Standing Orders we would have Private Members' Business now it is true, but the Standing Orders relating to the Order of business of the House are suspended and I am moving an amendment upon the basis that there are matters on Private Members' Business, which at some time we would wish to have discussed. I am not going to deal at length with it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER; I cannot entertain the hon. member's amendment because it is totally unrelated.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is a counter motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

How can it be a counter motion, with due respect, on a subject which is totally different?

Mr ADAMS:

Your Honour has ruled me out of order and unlike the Minister who has now left his seat I will not challenge Your Honour's ruling in the slightest. I am going to speak against the motion on the grounds that we should be doing Private Members' Business. I am not going to detain hon. members at great length, but if hon. members say that the House is run for the Government and for private members, let them be honest and let them determine which they will take at the present time.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has forgotten that the motion to suspend the Standing Orders has already been taken. That was voted this morning, that we

suspend Standing Orders for today's Sitting, so it is an automatic situation for Your Honour to call the Order of the Day. It is not a motion, because the Standing Orders have already been suspended.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member is as bad as the Prime Minister, he was not in the House and therefore he did not hear what was said.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would want entirely to endorse the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down and to rule that since Standing Orders have already been suspended this is not now the time to entertain a motion on Private Members' Business. Private Members' Business will come in at its appropriate place at the end of the day.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am not contradicting Your Honour, I am congratulating Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what is the hon. member now speaking?

Mr. ADAMS:

On the motion to resume Committee of Supply. Your Honour perhaps is one of the only two or three members in the House who realises that Orders of the Day include Private Members' Business as well as Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already made a ruling.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am speaking on the motion before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I made a motion after the Standing Orders were suspended that Government Business be the next Order of the Day and we are now in Government time, so the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is entirely out of Order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I would just like to add one final word to this, I am not trying to sum up or anything like that, the position is that having moved that Government Business be the next

Order of the Day.....(Asides) The only point he can be rising on now is a point of bad manners.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Prime Minister is not on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at one and the same time, and I would encourage all hon. members to let us get on with the business of the House expeditiously.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I defended the hon. member - only in here, I would not say that I would find myself constrained to defend him in another place - on his right, having elected to do Private Members' Business, to dispose of the Order Paper under Private Members' Business as he saw fit. I reminded him that this was his right, a fortiori it is the right of the Leader of the House, having secured the consent of the House, to proceed with Government Business and to inform Your Honour of the Order in which he would like Government Business taken. It is as simple as that. 3.10 p.m.

They come in here to show off, and that is nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point of order is made.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just make it clear that I was speaking. The interrupters are over there - the manners come from over there.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Make your point.

Mr. ADAMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side are going to vote against it, because we repeat that although the Leader of the House can choose the order of Government Business, yet he also has, basically, a residual power of declaring that Private Members' Business be not done. There is a difference between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition. We do not have Supply Days in here, when the Leader of the Opposition is king in everything.

Mr. Speaker, all the Leader of the House has to do, is to suspend the Standing Orders, marshal his battalion of interrupters and hecklers to make sure that embarrassing Resolutions in Private Members' Business, whether they come from the hon. member for St. Michael West, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, or whether they come from the Opposition benches, shall not be done. Let us make that quite clear. We are equal a long distance apart. I may be equal with the others over here, and he may be equal with those over there, but there is a big difference between the two. I am putting in a word for Private Members' Business now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let me interrupt the hon. member to say.....

Mr. ADAMS:

I am finished, Sir.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House resume discussion on

Item No. 1 on the Order Paper was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. A. MORRISON; and Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES-14.

NOES:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, and Mr. G. L. BOLDEN - 5;

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply to resume consideration of Item No. 1. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73, NO. 25

Resumption of a Resolution for the sum of \$40,000 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put. In moving that motion, I understand from the Leader of the House that, before further action was forestalled, he had answered questions and given a lot of information about the Computer, which I think is beyond the call of duty. I understand there is one outstanding question by the member for St. Peter, and it is the question of the age of the Computer. Well, we do not discuss computers like Sports Model Ford Cars, but we discuss them by generations. This is what we call a second generation Computer. In other words, it does not matter whether it was manufactured in 1965 or 1967, it is the same Computer. It belongs to the second generation. You may get a Computer which was manufactured in 1967 and that would be the 1401, 1402, 1403, 1405 and 1406. This may be out of the factory last month, but had more utilisation and more wear and tear on it than one that was manufactured in 1964.

The third generation Computer which IBM themselves will be bringing in is the 360 series. The other computers in the Island are not made by IBM Computer, but they are made by the Amalgamated British Company of ICL which is the Computer which was owned by DaCosta & Musson. The point about this is that it is compatible with the machinery which we have in the Data Processing Unit. Now, instead of having two rotary Converters, we have four rotary converters, and what is most important is the question of the tapes which we will need. We do not know whether we will run the other equipment as a separate unit, but I should like to assure the Committee that the first cost of the machinery is something like two to three hundred thousand dollars (U.S.). The Resolution is for \$40,000, and the salvage value of the equipment is in excess of \$40,000.

I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is meant by "the question be now put", in the context of a Money Resolution which is reintroduced by the proper Minister after it has been postponed for him to attend this sitting, because in the ordinary way of affairs he could know what was said on this side. I will be very brief; I did not speak on the Resolution. Point number one. Is the Government sure that the persons from whom it is buying a Computer have a title to sell? Point number two. I did not speak on the first occasion, but I will mention one or two things very shortly. I am glad the Prime Minister has said something about the salvage value, because it has been said in other places that this particular Computer has only a salvage value.

I would like to ask one or two very small questions. Computer technicians to look after these old-time second generation Computers - the Training Programme for the technicians ended in 1965; you cannot get a new technician to repair them. Has the Government now got, within the last eight or nine months, after the Computer technician, whom IBM sent down here, Mr. Price, was embarrassed by the Minister of Home Affairs, is the Government.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I must interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member is fond of throwing in a lot of asides and that kind of thing. Mr. Price serviced the Government 1401 series Computer next door to this building. He was granted a work permit to continue to work in Barbados, but Mr. Price discussed his chances of working in Barbados - I investigated the matter myself; mentioned it on the Floor of this House, and said that I could not even at that time make sure that the Engineer was going to stay with us - he left this Island because his chances of promotion were necessarily limited and he decided that, if he wanted to go up in the hierarchy of Mr. Watson's Company, he would have to leave Barbados. At the time when Mr. Price left Barbados, he had an existing work permit granted him by the then Minister of Labour.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I heard the Prime Minister on the occasion of the debate on computers during the last Estimates say that we had a very good Computer Engineer; you could ring him up any time of the night and he would come out if something went wrong with the Computer, and it looks as though he cannot even get a work permit. He was given a work permit for one year or two years or something like that. It was from the Prime Minister that we derive most of our information. I have derived it from two sources Mr. Price and the Prime Minister. I prefer what the Prime Minister said last year to what he is saying now, and I prefer what Price said to either of the Prime Minister's two statements. Anyhow, I am not going into that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that Mr. Price did not have a work permit? Is he saying that I did not say that he had a work permit? He is saying that the Minister of Home Affairs did not allow Mr. Price to work in Barbados, but that is not true. That is absolutely not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into that. I want to ask whether the Government is satisfied that it has the services of a technician available who is trained in the IBM Programme for servicing 1401 Computers. Barbadians were sent away to be trained, and they were trained on the 360. They would not come back here and work anyhow, because they know that there is no scope for them here. That is all I am asking.

I believe that Mr. Price originally thought he was told he would have six years, and when the first three years started to run out he was told that he had been given no such assurance. He got alarmed at what he was hearing from the Ministry of Home Affairs. It was at the time of the storm, and he decided that, rather than put himself and his family through the mental agony of wondering if or if not to get a work permit, he would pull up roots and go away. , 3.20 p.m.

The Prime Minister is incidentally correct when he says that the question of promotion within the company was also at stake; but that is not what I am after. What I am after is that there was a computer engineer and due to work permit difficulties real or imagined, there is no longer a computer engineer here; and is the Prime Minister satisfied that he has access to a technician who can handle these two aged computers that have run an election for Barbados and have run a lot of legal trouble for a firm in Grazettes and so? Is the Government satisfied that even at \$40,000, because you cannot be getting a very good machine at \$40,000, you can be sure of that, they have somebody who would at least make sure that if it comes to be salvaged he knows which bolts to undo and which screws to unscrew?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The answer is yes .

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman we are particularly glad to hear the type of reply that the Minister of Finance had to give in respect of the age of the machine and what not, but whether he measures it in terms of generation or else, what the Minister of Finance has not been able to tell us is whether the 1401 series is still in manufacture, and in what area is the 1401 machine being sold, because this is of some importance to us here in Barbados. It bears a very considerable relation to what the member for St. Thomas was just saying with regard to the servicing of this machine by the IBM engineers, and I would certainly like to hear from the Minister what provision has been made or is being made for the servicing of this machine.

I am warning this Committee that it is not the interest of the taxpayers that has caused this Resolution to come before the House at all. It is a case where the Government is trying to do the First National City Bank a good turn in return for the good turn that First National has got to do the Government in days such as these; and I am saying that the Government has not paid enough attention to the benefits, if any, to be derived from the purchasing of this machine. From what we heard the Minister say as regards the law suit and about Parliament being supreme, nobody is denying that Parliament is supreme, but what we on this side of the House seek to counsel the Government in doing is that if we find that by taking a particular step with the taxpayers' money we are merely purchasing a law suit, it is not something that the Government is obliged to engage in at this particular time. Nobody, no engineer is going to stand up and tell the Government that for the type of treatment that this 1401 has been receiving in Grazettes that the Government has any right whatsoever paying \$40,000 for it, and the Leader of the House is telling us that a saving is to be effected. Saving in what respect?

One of the most interesting, things about this whole debate is that none of the Ministers nor the Leader of the House understands anything that the Addendum tells us in respect of this machine. I have listened to the Minister of Finance and all they are really getting of the items listed (a), (b), (c) and (d) that is really worth anything are the converters. The air-conditioning plant is not worthwhile. Have somebody examine it! As regards the card printing unit and the tape drivers, these things have been listed by some Civil Servant on

the advice of somebody in the hope that members of the Opposition would believe that the Government is coming through handsomely with this deal.

I repeat that the only deal there is in this is that the Government is bailing out the First National City Bank in return for the good that First National is doing the Government at a time such as this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I would not curse and I resent on the Floor situations that we are bailing out the First National City Bank. A Bank would have to bail out somebody like the hon. member. The Government could not bail out a Bank. That is the first nonsense that I have heard; and Banks like some kind of credit worthiness. So if the Government has credit worthiness, then any Bank in the world would lend a Government money. I am not concerned about that.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the Minister of Finance has just said that any Bank in the world would lend a Government money. Ask the Minister to deny that Barclays Bank International has just refused to lend the Barbados Government money. Let him deny this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I have never known of Barclays Bank refusing to lend the Government money, especially a country which under the Barbados Labour Party had \$19,700,000 on. deposit with Barclays Bank and was getting interest at 31/2% on only \$50,000 of that money; so I do not see how a Bank which committed robbery with violence like that could refuse to lend the people of Barbados money at all. Anyhow he always has sources of information which are not vouchsafed to any member on this side. I am not going to challenge him on his Civil Service information.

In the first place, if he knows what a tape driver is, a tape driver costs \$23,000. I have a report from the Government Statistician in which he said that for \$17,000 more he would get four tape drivers instead of one, and the Government Statistician has given me a report on the amalgamation of his department as a result of this acquisition with the Data Processing Unit, and he has set out in detail the savings in cost of having even one tape driver to carry out the work which the thing such as the 447 Tabulator, the 514 reproducing punch and the 077 collater are doing at the moment. The monthly rental for those three pieces of equipment alone is \$1,600 EC. Then we go on to the coders and the cost of machine operators and rental of two key punchers at \$180 a month; that is another \$960 and so on. These are the costs and benefit analyses that have been done by the Government Statistical Office. The hon. member is saying that all we are purchasing is the converters. As a matter of fact, we can afford with the rest of the equipment to sell him the converters if he can convert some of his debates into something sensible. The Government would be glad to make a present for a pepper-corn price or rental

of 25 cents a year to the hon. member if he or the Party to which he belongs manage to get their now defunct newspaper restarted; so there are a lot of uses to which the converters can be put. 3.30 p.m.

There are a lot of uses to which the converters can be put, so do not let us go on with all this misinformation, dramatic statements about Barclays Bank. Do you think that Barclays Bank in their right senses, now that we have a Central Bank and all, could refuse to lend this Government money? All this Government would do is to use all the devices at the disposal of the Bank to put them out of the island, so that is only a word to the wise. If he has a brief for Barclays Bank or for the I.B.M. people who sold 17 machines in Trinidad when one could have done all the work, I do not intend to buy any third generations, we must get some service out of the present series. Of course the 1401 is no longer manufactured, the 1309 is no longer manufactured, but "Model A Ford" cars are not manufactured any more and a "Model A" now costs more than a Lincoln Continental. That is the answer to the question.

The question that the resolution for the sum of \$40,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon'bles. C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, F. G. SMITH, P. M. GREAVES. L. E. SANDIFORD and P. G. MORGAN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Messrs. J. B. SPRINGER, A. MORRISON and R. StC. WEEKES - 12.

NOES:

Messrs. MOTTLEY, CRAIG, HINDS and FORDE-4.

**INTERIM PAYMENTS FOR OFFICERS OF
PARLIAMENT AND EMPLOYEES OF THE
DEBATES COMMITTEE**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the next resolution is for the sum of \$7,346 relating to interim payments for the staff of Parliament. This resolution is as a result of the report of the Debates Committee, so it is consequent upon the adoption by the House of Assembly of the recommendations of the Debates Committee that all members of the staff of Parliament should be granted an interim pay increase on their salaries with effect from 1st April, 1972 on the same terms and conditions as those recently approved for public officers.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just give way, this seems to be a new resolution which we have just received. I would like to know what is before the House at the present time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, this resolution was tabled before but at that juncture only one member of the Opposition, who is now complaining about a quorum, being in his place - and I will identify him, the member for St. Joseph - we decided not to proceed with the resolution for which leave has been granted, because there was some question of the approval of the report being confused with the resolution itself. Both were circulated, and Your Honour will remember I said it was desirable that we should separate the two things, but hon. members had been given notice of the resolution and we said we would deal with it

today. If the hon. member was not in his place, well he is not exactly paid to attend the House of Assembly, and as I said before members are not paid to come to the House, they are elected to represent people and they should be in their places. The pay they get is not even an honorarium, so I am not criticising him for not being here, if he was not here that is his misfortune not ours, I do not have a problem.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Hon. Prime Minister, what was before the House last week was a report setting out the various amounts which each person should have, and a sum of not more than, I think, \$120. At that time there was no resolution before the House, and the Prime Minister said that the House could not proceed to pass something unless there was a sum of money which he as Minister of Finance would have to approve to be paid out of the Treasury, and it was then decided that the figures would be computed and brought back to the House this week, but this resolution is in truth and in fact a new resolution which is not now properly before the Committee. All that came before the Committee was a report from the Debates Committee showing the amount which should be approved.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in actual fact the report of the Debates Committee was laid and adopted, then there was a resolution which we had prepared in Parliament to approve the report. Then there is also the money resolution to be carried through in all stages. This is not a

controversial matter, we had everything done in here.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, there was no resolution before this House, and if you check the Order Paper for last Tuesday and that for today you will see that no resolution in respect of this sum has ever come before the Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

It was not on the Order •

Paper, Mr. Chairman. I had the report adopted and

I was giving notice of the resolution to approve the report, then the Prime Minister intervened and said that the resolution should have the exact sum, so that the other resolution had the exact sum and that is what we are doing here.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the only resolution which came before the House last week dealt with the payments. The Prime Minister said you could not vote on something which just gave amounts which had to be worked out.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I am stating as a fact that the two resolutions were here. Far from the Government walking out the House, they deserted their companion and walked out of the House, and I did not feel it was fair. You see, when you try to protect people, you get vile abuse and interruptions. What had

happened,

Sir, was that the two resolutions were here and were both laid, but they were being dealt with as if it was one resolution and I said we had better separate these resolutions because you cannot adopt a report and then pay money out of the adoption of the report, The resolution which we are now discussing was attached to the report and they were all here. This is a question of fact, and the Clerk and the Marshal can tell you that the resolutions were here. I was not sure that they had seen them, and I said I preferred not to proceed with it then, but we are proceeding with it today and that is the end of the matter. Whatever happened in the past does not really matter, there is no point wasting people's time with that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I think it is more a matter of procedure with which we should be dealing at this moment. My feeling is that His

Honour the Speaker ought to have been

approached with regard to the contents of this resolution so that he would have in turn given instructions that it be dealt with in Committee of Supply. That was not done. 3.40 p.m.

I am urging upon the Leader of the House to adopt the correct procedure in dealing with this matter. We are not opposing it; we do not want to do anything or to appear to be doing anything to delay the staff of the Debates Committee from getting the money. We are as anxious as the members of the Government if not moreso to see the members of the staff get what is due to them. Our view is that there should be no interim payment; the people are entitled to a salary increase for the longest time and they should have had it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, this makes no difference to me. I have never been in the House of Assembly in 20 years when any question relating to the salaries of the members of , the House and Ministers have been discussed. I come here and look after civil servants and the staff of Parliament. As far as I am concerned, there is nothing in here for me. If they do not want to give their own staff money, that is a matter for them and the staff. They will have the same kind of respect that they had for them before. Now, what the quantum of that respect is, is another matter altogether. If they are going to trifle with the people's business in Barbados by talking about not having seen the Resolution, they can go on.

Mr. Chairman, I was the person that postponed consideration of the Resolution on the first occasion, because the figure of \$7,346 was there and I said that I could not ask the House to support a Resolution which is not supported by the quantum of remuneration given to each member of the House's staff. Whatever they do, Sir, is all right with me.

Hon. C. E; TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I did not actually secure permission from the Speaker to deal with this particular Resolution, I beg to move that further consideration be postponed. It will be dealt with next week.

Mr, CHAIRMAN:

No. A money Resolution has already been passed. You will ask to report the passing of one money Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Money Resolution in Committee of Supply. (Asides) I am not asking for any leave. We will deal with it next week.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, all that is being said on this side is that, when we went into Committee of Supply earlier in the day, the Resolution moved by the Leader of the House was only to deal with one Resolution as stated on the Older Paper. All we are saying is that he will have to report progress and ask for leave to sit again, so that we could go back and deal with this Resolution. That is a simple matter. It is merely following the Rules of the House. We are not against doing this how, but we want you to report progress and ask the Speaker for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get the matter dealt with, but there is opposition on that side. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. BOLDEN rose

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

You cannot get up now.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the motion. I do not want it to go down in Hansard that the members of the Opposition are opposing the passing of a Resolution which would give the staff of Parliament the necessary increase. The Hon. Prime Minister has said that I was the only person on the Opposition bench at the time. I have to defend not only my integrity and intelligence, but I have to defend the members of the Opposition. Now this is what was circulated last week. It states To resolve the increase, and to resolve that no sum shall exceed the maximum of \$120.00 per month, etc. There is also the Addendum at the bottom.

At this stage there was an interruption in the Public Gallery.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of thing that I was talking about earlier today. [Interruption in the Public Gallery.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am ready to address the Chair when the Public Gallery is restored to Parliamentary order. Mr. Chairman, what was attached to the Resolution was an Addendum setting out the amounts which would go to each person in the posts occupied by the staff of Parliament, but there was no Resolution as such before the Honourable Committee. We are not opposing the Resolution, all we are asking is that it be

done in the correct order, rather than just trying to force it through. It has been said that members of the Opposition were not here. Nobody on this side is opposing the completion of the Resolution at this time so that the staff of Parliament should not have their money. We may be underpaid, as the Prime Minister has said, but I believe we have, sufficient integrity on this side to do our duty despite the fact that we are underpaid. Mr. Chairman, we want to see things done correctly.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN do now report (1) the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, (2) progress and (3) ask for leave to sit again 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 Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON the Money Resolution for the sum of \$40,000 was read a first, a second time, and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 A Resolution in the sum of \$7,346 was called

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with the money Resolution for the sum of \$7,346 in connection with the interim payment for the staff of Parliament. Your Honour will recall that, on the last occasion, the Report of the Debates Committee presented and adopted, and a Resolution to implement the Report was being dealt with when it was abandoned at that stage. I merely want to get this passed, and not to have a long and unnecessary debate.

I am now asking for leave to deal with this money Resolution in the sum of \$7,346 in order to implement the Report of the Debates Committee in so far as interim payments to the staff of Parliament are concerned.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted. I understand that copies of this Resolution have been circulated to all hon. members.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed in Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

3.50 p.m.

**RESOLUTION RE INTERIM PAYMENT FOR
OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT AND
EMPLOYEES OF DEBATES
COMMITTEE**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution for the sum \$7,346, as the Addendum sets out, consequen upon the adoption by the House of Assembly the recommendations of the Debates Committe that all members of staff of Parliament should be granted interim pay increases on their salaries with effect from 1st April, 1972 on the same terms and conditions as those recently approved for public officers namely (a) key scale employees categorie (1) and (2) \$30.80 to \$35.20 per week, and the interim pay increase is \$9.00 a week or 221/2 cent an hour, and (b) monthly paid employees on the first \$200 of salary or part thereof \$40, on each sucessive \$100 of salary or part thereof \$10 subject to a maximum total payment of \$120 a month, the sum of \$7,346 is being sought to effect payment of the said interim payment in respect of the period of 1st December, 1972 to 31st March, 1973 in the case of monthly paid employees, and in respect of the period beginning the first full week of December, 1972 to the 31st March, 1973 in the case of weekly paid employees. Arrears of payment in respect of the period April 1972 to November 1972 will be provided for in the 1973-74 Estimates.

I beg to move that this Resolution do no\ pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of the Opposition and as a member of the Debates Committee who I think it is fair to say hardly ever misses when in the Island any of it meetings, the only thing I would say about this i that it is a pity that it has taken so long to come before the House. I was not at all satisfied, Mr. Chairman, when upon the first occasion an attempt was made to increase the salaries of the staff of Parliament that it was frustrated by matter beyond the Debates Committee's control. Many members of the staff of Parliament have been scandalously underpaid for years. The worst example of all I am very glad to say was remedied some time ago from another vote. This is no indeed a regular member of staff although he doe appear here working as hard as anybody else in the House of Assembly every week. I am glad to say that that was remedied some time ago.

The other members of the staff of Parliament have long deserved this increase, and I an extremely happy to see this Resolution before the House. I think it only fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition thinks that there is yet some regrading to be done and some other increases which are due to some of the members of staff. At the moment it is a general increase. From the Clerk down to the lowest paid member of the staff have all been granted the agreed on scale increases, but I think in particular that the job of Clerk of Parliament requires some urgent reclassification to that of Permanent Secretary. In my six or seven years in Parliament I have observed the demands being made upon the Clerk's time and energy increasing; the Clerk of Parliament has had the opportunity and benefit of a course, he is now a more experienced person and a better trained person than he was, when he first was appointed in the position which he now holds, and I think this should be reflected in the regrading to the grade of Permanent Secretary. This would reflect more adequately the responsibility of the Post of Clerk of

Parliament.

I would myself consider that the Deputy Clerks are by no means underpaid, certainly not when compared with members of Parliament. On that I will not dwell any further. The other members of staff, Mr. Chairman, I think deserve to have their jobs properly analysed to reflect the responsibilities they carry and the years of experience which they have given to Parliament. If I could indeed pick but another member of staff beside the Clerk of Parliament as one whose job I think really needs immediate regrading, it would be that of the Deputy Marshal who entered the service of this House as a messenger many years ago, and although his progress in the service has been recognised on all sides by members of Parliament and his ready availability and assistance is known to everyone who has any dealings with the House of Assembly, yet in terms of salary it seems that he has been reduced to messenger once again. I think these are matters which I hope will be placed before the Debates Committee at an early stage.

On the matter of reporting in the House of Assembly, I think that that is so deep and difficult a matter that I would not wish to make any particular comment until the Debates Committee has had the benefit of seeing a report on the negotiations now taking place. Sufficient be it to say, Mr. Chairman, that at some stage the belief of the public that the debates of the House of Assembly should be more up to date than they are and should be more immediately available and nearer in time to the days on which they take place, must be recognised in some reorganisation of the system of reporting and printing of the debates. I myself have recently had cause to congratulate privately although not yet publicly, and I do so now, the Reporters for what I have discovered - after being in the House for all these years I have only just found it out - is the speed with which the Reporters prepare the debates. I have discovered that in nearly all cases they meet what I think is the statutory six day deadline, that they have the debates ready within six days. I think that if this is so and indeed if the improvements which I have heard suggested from time to time, for let there be no doubt in the public's mind or in the minds of hon. members not members of the Debates Committee, that we and they are aware that with only a slightly larger reportorial staff and proportionately a reportorial staff that is in fact no larger, the House of Commons yet manages to produce verbatim debates the day after they take place.....let us make it quite clear we have enough Reporters in the House of Assembly compared to the number of days on which we sit as the House of Commons; they have fifteen, we have six, but they sit more than three times as often as us and they produce debates the next day. All these are factors which will be considered by the Debates Committee and in due course I look forward to supporting its report in here with the same fervour which I can give to the support of this Interim Report. We on this side welcome the increase in salaries which the staff of the House are going to receive as a result of this Resolution.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Money Resolution for the sum of \$7,346 in Committee of Supply. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to. 4.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day. It is an abstract resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of U.S. \$3,297,000.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
BY THE GOVERNMENT OF A LOAN OF
\$3,297,000 U.S. FROM THE FIRST
NATIONAL CITY BANK TO
INTERNATIONAL SEA
FOODS LIMITED**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is for the long awaited revival of the shrimp industry in Barbados. I have before me a very compendious volume of debates which took place on 26th January, 1971 and subsequently, and I do not think any useful purpose will be served by traversing the ground which was so scurrilously traversed on that occasion. I was fortunate enough not to be present in the House when this debate took place, and it is probably a very good thing that I was not present because I could not really sit in here and see parliamentary debates at the level of scurrility that had been indulged in at that time. I am not indulging in any recriminations, I do not want to go into the history of the shrimp industry in Barbados, the shrimp industry in Barbados has been a very valuable one to this country.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, it has long been said in this House that it is a reflection on all hon. members who spoke in any debate for the debate to be described as scurrilous or debasing. That refers equally to the hon. member for St. Andrew, then the Minister of Agriculture, and to members who spoke on this side, and I would ask you to call on the Prime Minister to withdraw the remarks that relate to scurrility and debasing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would not accede to that request, I would ask the Prime Minister to so modify his remarks as not in any way to go against the spirit of good parliamentary practice.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

All I am saying is; that I reserve my right as a citizen of Barbados to criticise the conduct of members on the Floor of this House. I am not concerned with their conduct outside, but since scurrilous remarks were made in that debate, I was only in passing saying that I do not intend to go through all this, I am only here to set the shrimp industry on a sound footing again as Minister of Finance, and this is the first intervention that I have ever had in anything to do with the shrimp industry, to maintain the balance of payments loss of over \$7 million which we have incurred as a result of the closing down of the shrimp industry, and therefore if I am being asked not to refer to that debate - because I could now go into that debate and take statement by statement seriatim, but I do not think we are here to re-examine an unfortunate debate that took place in this House over a period of time during the early part of 1971 -

.....(Asides). Any opportunity you get to be scurrilous you would take because you do not know any better; I cannot really help that.

As I was saying, what we are concerned about is that for the first time we have an opportunity to do what the people always say, "put your money where your mouth is". The Government is interested in the establishment of this industry which is vital to the expansion of fisheries throughout the eastern Caribbean. The Japanese have been efficient some 17,000 miles away from their bases in Caribbean waters. The occasion when most of the shrimp fleets began to leave the Caribbean was an occasion when there was a dispute raging throughout the United Nations Organisation and the international frontiers on the fishing rights of various nations. Various excuses were given at the time for the withdrawing of fleets in Trinidad, Guyana and Barbados, but fortunately since this debate took place, although the real reasons for the withdrawal of the company which left the island were not clearly stated in the House, other countries, including the United States of America, have reached agreement with the Brazilian fishing authorities, the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, so that today 325 United States vessels are allowed to fish off the Brazilian coast, and other countries like Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, Surinam and so on have been granted licences for between 25 and 50 boats to fish.

There is a company called the Japanese Fishing Association, and I had talks in Japan with the President of the Japanese Fishing Association on the shrimp industry, and they themselves were somewhat concerned about the curtailment of their right. I thought that the best form of industry for us to have is a locally based industry, because if we have a locally based industry then the chance of a Barbadian pulling up his roots when there is some quarrel with the B.M.C. over somebody else becomes more and more remote. As I said, I am not going to go into a long examination, the Government is satisfied, my Ministry is satisfied, and I am satisfied about the security for the guarantee of the loan. The Government is not being asked to deposit money or anything else like that, but merely in accordance with the practice of the Import/Export Bank, the people who would be providing the financing for the acquisition of the vessels, in accordance with the practice of this institution the Government is being asked to show its faith and confidence in the industry by guaranteeing the loan. Furthermore, the Barbados Marketing Corporation is going to be a participant

in the operation to the extent of equity shareholding, not necessarily in management, and what is very interesting to note is that the same gentleman on whose behalf all the commotion was made in the Legislature, how unfair we had been to the gentleman and so on, that gentleman is coming back as a consultant for the Ralston Purina Company, and he will be engaged in the purchasing and the acquisition of shrimp for the Ralston Purina Company. He is not going to be employed by the Marketing Corporation, he is working for the Ralston Purina Company to investigate the purchase of the catches which they are buying, and if the hon. member wants to know the reason why he is coming back it is the reason that I have always given in the location of industries, that it does not depend on how many inducements you give a person but whether somebody else's family can find somebody to play bridge with and that kind of thing. The matter is simple and straightforward.

As far as I am concerned, despite all the remarks that were made at that time, misinformed statements and so on, the members of the Cabinet know that I had no knowledge of what was going on until questions were asked in this House. I discovered afterwards that one of the persons whom the hon. member for St. James has referred to as a friend of mine is a director of the company, but I did not know there was any crime in being a director of a company, I know it is a crime for any Barbadian to lose

\$29,700 paying wages he did not get benefit for. I have never asked the same gentleman to provide jobs for any of my relatives as the member for St. James has, I have never received any cheques from the gentleman concerned which were not supported by deposits in the bank either, so I do not know how I got into the debate at all. As Minister of Finance I am concerned about the overall economy, and as John Brown said "ask not for whom the bell tolls", when a shrimp worker is out of work members of the Legislature will be out of work the next time. 4.10 p.m.

No man is an Island, and we have to be concerned about the level of employment in this country. We have to be concerned not about somebody's daughter bringing in her husband to work in Barbados. We have to be concerned about the mothers of the Nation being used as beasts of burthen in the agricultural fields in this Island for the plantation owners who abused them over the centuries. That is what I am concerned about.

There is dignity in employment, and I am satisfied now, as Minister of Finance, coming into the matter, that this is the proper way in which to establish an industry with indigenous personnel with the Government being committed to support the industry. With expert advice, whether the person is your friend or your enemy, as long as he gives us the proper price for our shrimp that is all we have to be concerned about. I know that debates of this kind can be abused and used for personal vituperations and abuse of members on this side of the House, but I am not concerned about that. It is for you to maintain order and the decorum of the House.

I think hon. members know enough about this Resolution from the Addendum which has been circulated. As I have mentioned before, the first of the ships has to arrive. We are negotiating with the Government of Brazil. I started the negotiations myself in 1971 in the United Nations Organisation with the Brazilian Foreign Minister, and subsequently I saw the Minister of Finance. All I can say is that our Ambassador has been accredited and has been to Brazil. We have opened negotiations for the granting of licences to the Government of Barbados - that is the way we get involved - for the fishing rights to a particular number which I cannot say at the moment because the negotiations are not completed, but certainly not less favourable than the rights the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, the Government of Guyana, and the Government of Surinam now enjoy.

I think that Barbados can become a great fishing centre. We are concerned about industrialisation of aluminum pots and pans, transistors and so on. Every little bit helps. We are a maritime nation with the sea all around us. We are a nation which is not less favourably endowed than Japan, or Hong Kong, or any of the great industrial societies in the Far East, but what we have around us, Mr. Speaker, in unlimited quantities is sea water and all that therein dwells. It is factious in the twentieth century that a small, struggling, sea-faring maritime nation like Barbados should allow people like the Japanese to travel 17,000 miles or more to catch fish off our shores and send them back to Japan to be processed when we have untapped wealth right here at our disposal around us - just 400 miles away.

Before the closure of the shrimp industry two years ago, or whenever it was, Barbados shrimps were enjoying a price of 5 cents over and above shrimps from any other part of the world in the market on the eastern seaboard of the United States of America. There is no reason why our reputation should not be re-established, and it is on the level of developing the resources of a small country like this that I intend to conduct this debate. I cannot answer for the conduct or lack of conduct of anybody on one side or the other of this House, but, when members are discussing matters like this, I should like them to remember

that what we are dealing with is increasing the productivity of Barbados.

If they are against the Barbados Government guaranteeing the loan for these shrimping vessels, then they are at liberty to do so and there is no need to have what a friend of mine used to call a big melee about a simple matter like this. You are either in favour of bringing back boats under proper management and local entrepreneurship, or you are not in favour. You have to vote according to your conscience. This Resolution could be disposed of with the necessary congratulatory statements in a matter of 15 minutes.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, hearing the Hon. Prime Minister today, one could only refer to him as the Neville Chamberlain of local politics. The peacemaker, the Christ, the St. Paul, the humble, pious little fellow untouched. All day he was in this mood. Whenever he has something that he realises the Opposition is going to attack, this has always been his attitude. He is no longer the big bull; he is no longer a Frazier; he is a quiet, simple, little fellow. The people in the Gallery will say "Look our quiet Prime Minister." That is putting it in a nutshell. That is what we saw in here today.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place. I want to serve warning now on the Minister of Home Affairs that Mr. Schofield, whether he comes back here as a Consultant or a resident, should not be allowed to come into this country. I will support that by evidence from Hansard where the Minister of Agriculture made a statement on the Floor of this House. Now, this is a "ticklish" Resolution to deal with. It is to re-establish the shrimp industry. It is something that we are all anxious to see established; it is something that Senator Benard St. John fought for tooth and nail in this Chamber in order to save it. He warned the Government many months in advance about what was going on in the form of questions. The Government ignored him all the way back in 1970. He had to bring it in the form of a Resolution. The Government refused to form a quorum for the matter to be debated and so on. We had to pull the former senior member for the City out of his bed one day to come here and form a quorum so that we could have the matter debated. Those were the Government's tactics. They had 18 - 6, and that is how the people say it should be. I do not go around saying that the people are wrong. I would say that the people are now boiling in their own stew. The ladies will hear from me when the resolution for the rights of women come up.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very concerned when Government is going to guarantee a loan at a Bank for people who are going in for something in which they have no knowledge. I would not be surprised if, in a few months' time, I heard that the shrimp industry was in trouble again, and either the Japanese or the Americans had to come and bail us out. I would wish any Barbadian well who is prepared to invest his money in this project, but we have repeatedly warned the Government about the shrimp industry.

Now, what has been done at the B.M.C. to ensure or guarantee that there will be proper freezing facilities there? We heard that the fish was spoiling; that Schofield could not supply certain things. There was Bajans Seafoods. The Prime Minister said that it was a company. I asked him which company,

because there were three involved. It was Barbados Seafoods; then it was Bajan Seafoods -. a bunch of crooks were in Bajan Seafoods, and then it was Bajan Seafoods 1970 when Mr. Carlton Brathwaite had to fork out \$29,000. Bruce Procope from Trinidad was also involved. The same Schofield Industries were in Trinidad. All of your friends.

Now, you talk about a scurrilous debate and about reducing Parliament to nothing. The Prime Minister is the No. 1 contender for offensive remarks in here. It is regrettable sometimes when one sits down and reads Hansard and sees the things a Prime Minister of a country can say in here. 4.20 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, the hon. member cannot say that. The only remark I made today is that when he said "a bunch of people is", I said "are". That is all I said and he calls me a number one contender for offensive remarks. It was merely a grammatical correction. If he does not understand, I am sorry for him. It is the only thing I said. He said "is" and I said "are". I am sorry. I am trying to help him to get properly recorded in Hansard and this is the kind of thing you get.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to keep his remarks within the spirit of good parliamentary debate.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote a passage from a speech by the Minister of Agriculture on 2nd February 1971 in reply to Senator St. John.

"Sir, it is an open secret that the workers employed by Barbados Seafoods Ltd. were not treated like human beings by a man called Schofield. It is an open secret that there has been a lot of discrimination in the operation of the Company known as Barbados Seafoods Ltd.; it is an open secret that the foreign Captains were given priority over the local Captains, and in many instances they were given better wages than the local Captains. It is against this type of background that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was forced to act."

Listen again to the Minister in defence of Barbados Seafoods and Bajan Seafoods 1970:

"Here we come to a very interesting part, Mr. Speaker, of the negotiations. The representative, Mr. Schofield, of the Barbados Seafoods Company had the gall to look at the Board of the B.M.C., a Government Statutory agency, and tell them that they were not in a position to dictate any terms to him because the B.M.C. could not survive without the contract. He was Lord Dictator to a Government agency, a man who came here to kick about Barbadians, a man who came here to discriminate against Barbadians, goes to the Board of the B.M.C. to tell the Board that they could not dictate to him what he should pay to the B.M.C. for the services provided by a Government agency in dealing with shrimp, and absolutely refused to put the case of the B.M.C. to his principals, and I understand that the principals were willing to give the B.M.C. what they wanted. The B.M.C. fought their case on the increased cost as a result of devaluation....."

The Minister of Agriculture referred to him as a half-scald, redleg boy dealing with black people, he did not care about them and felt he could treat them like boys in the yard. He said "if I had the power in my hands as Minister of Home Affairs, I would ask him to leave the country immediately." This is the

person for whom the Prime Minister is asking this Parliament to support a Resolution....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I am not asking Parliament to support any Resolution for Mr. Schofield. I thought it was fair to mention that the sort of centre-piece of the argument and discussion whom the Opposition was supporting at the time has been engaged by the Ralston Purnia Company in the United States, whichever part of the States that is, Wichita or somewhere like that, I may be wrong; but I find it very interesting that the person on whose behalf he has been engaged as a consultant in the purchasing of shrimp exclusively is the Ralston Purina Company, so that we have a guaranteed market. I am not asking the House of Assembly to accept or reject Mr. Schofield or anything. I mentioned that because these things are not anything that you have to conceal, and all the debate in here has been inspired by Mr. Schofield himself, so they should be very happy now.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, the point which I am making is that the Prime Minister is asking us to support a Resolution to guarantee a loan of the taxpayers' money when we are going to have as a consultant Mr. Schofield. Mr. Schofield is coming here as a consultant and what we are saying is that Mr. Schofield should not come at all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I do not even know if Mr. Schofield is coming or going. I mentioned en passant that Mr. Schofield was engaged as a purchasing consultant by the Purina Company which has guaranteed the purchase of the shrimp, and we have no objection. I would not ask him his permission to bring Mr. Schofield here because we are not employing him, but what I wanted to clear up the hon. member on is that he said that the House is being asked to guarantee a loan of the taxpayers' money. There is no taxpayers' money in the first analysis and I hope in the last analysis involved in the Resolution. It is a guarantee of a loan for the simple reason that there is a mortgage over all the ships for the repayment of the purchase money of the ships, and the Hon. Leader of the House has assured me and reminded me that the ships are fully insured. This is not borrowing money for a market operation or for what they call turn-over money; it is not working capital that is being borrowed. What is being borrowed is money for ships which are incorporeal or corporeal hereditaments as you choose. Anyhow there are personalty and they are insurable. You can have a bill of sale over them; so there is no question of taxpayers' money involved first or last.

Mr. CRAIG:

As I understand the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, it reads "Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of the sum of \$3,297,000 in the currency of the United States of America repayable over a period of five years with interest at a rate of 2%...." As I understand it, if the industry runs into trouble and cannot repay this money, the Bank is going to be looking to the Barbados Government for the money, and that is why it is before the House; and if it has to be paid, it has to be paid by the taxpayers of this country. That is why I prefaced my remarks by saying it is a "ticklish" Resolution because we are in favour of having the shrimp industry re-established, but in the meantime we have to be very cautious from our past experience. We have had the experience here of having Barbados Seafoods; then there was some argument with the B.M.C. and Barbados Seafoods. Then Bajan Seafoods came in. Mr. Carlton Brathwaite, Mr. Bruce Procope and others were the directors. It ran into trouble and 500 people were put out of work. Of course we did not hear the Trade Union boss

say anything about the 500 people who were put out of work; at that time he was asleep. This side fought tooth and nail to save the 500 people from being put out of work.

What we are trying to ascertain from the Government is exactly what is the position with this shrimp industry. I have only seen from reports in the press who are the directors. There is Mr. Charlie Jones who is a jockey and I believe he has an interest in fishing boats, but how experienced is he as a shrimper? I do not know how experienced Captain Fergusson is as a shrimper; I know him to be a sea captain. But you have Mr. Schofield as the consultant.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I said several times that Mr. Schofield is the consultant for the people who have guaranteed the purchase of the shrimp, and the member just says - Mr. Schofield is a consultant, Mr. Schofield is a consultant. If he sings it three times like the Doxology it still means he is the consultant for Purina, so what is the point of going on with that and making it sound as if he has discovered that E = MC² or some great scientific discovery. There is a difference between foolishness and sensible debate.

Mr. ADAMS:

If the hon. member for St. James would give way, is this not altogether too sanguine an argument. It is well known that all modern manufacturing and sale processes involve those, who are involved in the selling, using the services of the buyer's consultant. Everybody knows that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

It was no point of order when the Prime Minister rose either.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member for St. James continue.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member for St. James has given way.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will both hon. members take their seats? Let the hon. member for St. James continue. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, our contention is that since the Barbados Government is involved in this exercise, and since it can be - and we hope not - the taxpayers' money involved, we have to get some more information from the Prime Minister in respect of what we are going to do. All we are seeing here is a vague resolution asking the Government to guarantee this loan. I would like to know the personnel, apart from the gentleman whom the Prime Minister seems not to like to hear his name; you just cannot bring a vague resolution like this, explain it in his way, realising the problems we have had in the past and not enough information, apart from his vague way of putting it and expect no one to say anything on the

resolution. I personally would like to hear a little more from the other side on it. What are we going to get out of it? How much money it is projected to bring in? How many people are going to be employed? We know that in the past 500 people were employed and that they were eventually turned away and the country was some \$7 million short, so all we are asking again is to find out a little more about this resolution. I would hope that the Government with its numbers would be a little more cautious in its approach to this resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that this is another blow not only to the members of the Opposition but to this House as a whole. First of all, I believe that this resolution again treats Parliament with contempt. In the first place, I heard about this new proposed company simply by chance when I was watching television some night last week and there was a Press Conference by the Minister of Trade. It is known that the Minister of Trade sits in the other Chamber, and we on this side of the House have complained before about important policies such as this being given to a Press Conference or on television without any notification to this Honourable House, and I find it rather amusing to think that after the Minister of Trade has gone on television and spoken about the new company, the shrimping and certain arrangements, then to find coming home in my House Saturday evening by special delivery a bunch of papers which included a resolution by which the Government is going to ask the House to approve the guarantee of the sum of U.S. \$3.2 million to a company.

I have said before that if you want members of Parliament to participate in policy making or what is going on in Government, that at least some statement should be given to the House so that we would know exactly what is happening. There are several things which arise out of this. The resolution on one side of the paper sets out the \$3 million and the Addendum on the other side says little more than what is said on the front page. If those of us who were in the House in 1970 and 1971 recall the several accusations and retorts that were made with the last shrimp industry which operated in Barbados, it leaves several questions to be answered which the Addendum does not answer and which I believe even backbenchers of 'Government are still wondering what is the position with this company. First of all, if you ask us to approve the resolution we do not know officially the composition of the company which is going to be involved in the shrimping industry. I hear the name of Ralston Purina Company mentioned, but if one begins to think there are several rumours which have been perpetrated in Barbados about this company and its representatives in this country, and we do not know if this company will decide it is not purchasing any more shrimps. I believe it should do Government's policy that members of Parliament should have an official document setting out the terms and conditions and whatever is involved in this particular company if Government is going to guarantee a large sum like U.S. \$3.2 million in respect of these boats.

Nobody, I believe, would oppose in such a way a method which would bring an industry into Barbados and which would cause employment for five or six hundred people who today are walking the streets looking for something to do, but it is my humble opinion that the members of Parliament are entitled to know the composition of the company and see if in the agreements certain safeguards have been written in, not only between the company and the Government itself who is guaranteeing the loan but in respect of the workers who would be involved. The hon. member for St. James spoke about the statements made by the Minister of Agriculture in 1971 when he defended the action of the Government in breaking off I arrangements with the Barbados Seafoods Company. You heard about the ill treatment of workers, I spoke about complaints which were made, that they were supposed to be training several

people to be captains of the shrimp boats at one time, but when captains were earning in the vicinity of two and three thousand dollars per trip they thought that was too much money for Barbadian captains to earn, and this was one area of discontentment.

These are things members of Parliament should be able to look into and see what these

arrangements will be. Is the company prepared to establish proper training schemes? Is the company prepared to give to Government certain undertakings that with the guaranteeing of such a loan that Government and the workers will see that certain provisions are made for them? These are the things I believe should have been done, but to ask members of Parliament to vote for this resolution and then never know what is going on in the company is not good enough. Are we entitled, after voting to guarantee this loan, to ask at any time what is happening in the company? The Prime Minister speaks about a guarantee only, it is a contingent liability to the people of Barbados. Let us assume that the boats are run in such a disorderly manner that the company cannot meet its monthly commitments, what is going to happen if you levy on the boats and sell them at any time and the value is far below that which is outstanding? Obviously the owner will turn to the guarantor for any sum which is left over, so I believe this is what Parliament is for, Parliament is the watch-dog of the people's money and these are the things I would have liked to have seen even before the resolution came to the House, but to hold a Press Conference and have a few reporters sit and ask questions and that is the end of it, and then come to Parliament and say to Parliament vote for such a resolution is tantamount to saying we have the numbers, we do what we feel like, we do not care what you or the other people think. That is my opinion of this resolution. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there are several things which I would have liked to have seen before this Resolution came here. I have been told that the last boats, which were here engaged in the shrimping industry, could not land in Barbados certain deep sea fish which might have been taken up in their nets, because there was some disagreement between the local fishermen and the trawler fishermen. In a country like this, where food prices are skyrocketing every day, is there any agreement in respect of this matter? What are the provisions in respect of this? Mr. Speaker, all of these are things which Parliament should have looked into. It seems as though we on this side are not to be told what is going on.

Mr. Speaker,. I heard the Minister of Trade mention a sum of money which is to be paid to the B.M.C. In truth and in fact, the B.M.C. at one time called for an increase in price. Are these things written into any agreement? (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will hon. members converse in lower tones, please!

Mr. BOLDEN:

You have the classic example of ISL which has just closed down. There has

always been a dispute between the expatriate workers who were brought in and paid salaries in U.S. dollars, given free transportation and a free house, etc., as against the salaries paid to local employees for doing the identical work. Do we know today if they are going to bring in expatriates? Do we know what categories they are going to bring in; what wages they are going to pay, and what are the arrangements in relation to the local Barbadian workers as against the expatriate workers? Here we are

asked bluntly to approve a Resolution and told that it should not take longer than 15 minutes to do so.

As far as I am concerned, when the Resolution is finished Parliament will be as much in the dark as to what is going on as it was before the Resolution was introduced. Had I not been looking at the television and had seen the Addendum attached to this Resolution, it would have told me nothing. One does not know anything about what is going on. All one knows is that the House will be asked to approve the agreement that the Government guarantee this sum of money which will be repaid over a specific time at a specific rate of interest. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe Parliament deserves a lot more than we have been given this afternoon, and a lot more than we have given on this piece of paper.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am like the Prime Minister in this matter of shrimps. I do not believe I have ever taken part in any big shrimp debate, except as a spectator enjoying the antics of the Minister of Agriculture on the last occasion, and I really do not hold myself out as any expert on shrimps. But like the Prime Minister I have been an observer of the fact that the shrimp business is, perhaps, of all the food manufacturing, processing and production businesses in the Western Hemisphere and, perhaps, throughout the world, one of the businesses that has been expanding fastest.

I cannot remember all the exact figures, but I think that in a matter of only a few years the price of landed shrimps in Miami is multiplied by three, and the price of landed shrimps in Yokohama and other Japanese ports is multiplied by 3.8 - some very considerable figures. There is a great expansion in the demand for shrimps, particularly in Japan, which after all is the second richest country in the world, and I believe when many of us are still in Parliament will become richer than the United States.

I also know that many South American countries, seeing all the bonanzas that are being reaped from shrimps, have made it difficult to obtain shrimps quite so easily from their coastlines. In countries such as Brazil and, I believe, Surinam, you have to negotiate a quota for the number of boats and the amount of time that they can fish. That is what I know about shrimps, and nothing that the Prime Minister has said convinces me that he knows any more. (Asides) The Prime Minister says he does not pretend to know more. That is enough. It tells you that the shrimp business is potentially a money-maker.

Now, we have a history here of a successful shrimp business. I sat down here, Mr. Speaker, and could not believe my ears when I heard the Prime Minister talk about how the loss of \$7 million a year from the shrimp business did damage to our balance of payments problems.

That is precisely what I said in my Budget Speech two years ago. [Laughter.] The hon. members are right to laugh at me, Sir. The Prime Minister introduces a Budget, and I make a Budget Speech, as far as I am concerned. I want it to be understood.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of - I do not want to interrupt.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On a point of what? On a point of interruption.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt, especially when, probably, for the first time in his Parliamentary career he may be speaking sensibly. I never, at the time when the hon. member pointed this out, said that he was wrong. I do not see the point of making that point. Anyhow, I am listening with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member says both statistically and otherwise.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. All hon. members, with the exception of the hon. member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Agriculture, recognised the economic facts of the shrimp industry and recognised how very bad it was in 1970 that the shrimp industry was destroyed. First, the economics of the business.

This is a company formed by - I gather from the newspapers, because we would never hear such a thing in here; the House of Assembly is never graced by statements relating to important policy of the Government of Barbados these days - that three young Barbadians against any of whom I have never heard anything but good said. - let that be understood in the early. This is not Carlton Brathwaite and Bruce Procope. This is young Billy Fergusson, a very decent boy and I

Believe very capable in everything that he has put his hand to; Charlie Jones, a most popular young man in Barbados, and K. Simpson. Nobody could attack their bona fides as persons interested in a business like this. I am glad they have had the opportunity to get into what, I believe, is a great potential bonanza.

Now, they have this company, a \$240,000 capital company, of which the Government has put in 20%, which is \$20,000 or whatever it is. B.M.C. has, at least, a 20% interest in this company. The first comment I would make is that, if I were a young Barbadian business man, I would beware of going into anything with B.M.C. Even the Ministry of Finance might run it better, but the Barbados Marketing Corporation has not got such a history as would give me any confidence.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I run a Budget of \$150 million. I run the largest business in Barbados and have the largest bunch of employees or idlers as you choose to look at it 15,780 people and \$150 million, and he has the temerity to say that even the Minister of Finance could run the BMC better. He should withdraw that. I have said already that I could run the BMC doing 20 minutes a day down there and make money. Not only the BMC, but any of the other businesses in Bridgetown, because that is no problem. I would like the hon. member to withdraw the remark about even the Minister of Finance could run it better, because that is really a slur on the Ministry of Finance, myself, and the whole country.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot withdraw a remark I did not make. I said even; . the Ministry of Finance and not the Minister of Finance, because the Minister of Finance could not run it any worse than it is being run.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Sir, I withdraw; I cannot win.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think when hon. members are making interruptions, they should be guided by Standing Order 28

which enjoins us to make interruptions on points of order, or points of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is the first point I should like to make, but it has a relationship to a gentleman whose name has been much bandied in here. I do not believe that he calls the names of many members of the House of Assembly, but it seems that many members of the House of Assembly call his name. I refer to Mr. Schofield. 4.50 p.m.

Now I take the B.M.C.'s interest in this matter to be a marketing interest, and this is the first point I want to deal with arising out of the cross play of debate in here. In any business where you are exporting goods, or indeed in any business where you are manufacturing goods and selling them elsewhere or selling them at a distance, you must have a marketing organisation which is going to advise you, which is going to give you guarantees for your production and with which you have to work very closely indeed in the course of carrying on your commercial affairs. The B.M.C. I take it has a 20% interest in this company because the B.M.C. is going to do perhaps I would think 20% of the marketing. I would think that the B.M.C. is going to sell that number of shrimp in Barbados out of the total production. Also the B.M.C., I imagine again, is going to continue to store the shrimps just as it stored the shrimps in the old days. Now we come to Mr. Schofield and the Government is divorcing itself entirely from any connection with Mr. Schofield.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging hon. members to understand that this cannot be so. First of all, there is a connection between International Seafoods and the old company; there must be, because the shrimps are going to be marketed under the same brand name according to the newspaper report of the Minister of Trade, as they were previously marketed. They will carry the same name previously carried for Barbados shrimp. To me it is clear that the old business of which vis-a-vis the American Mr. Schofield was dock foreman down here, because I used to do some work off the company which was Mr. Schofield's basic employer, and he was always described as the dock foreman in any correspondence, but down here I believe his position was somewhat magnified in the eyes of those who had to deal with him, I would take it has allowed its previous brand name to be continued to be used. I do not know you can use people's brand name just like that. I do not believe that I can take some "See Through" and darken it up and put it in a bottle and call it Mount Gay and sell it; so I take it that whatever denials are made in here, the new company must have some right in the trade name and the patent names which the old company had. For all I know it has money. It may be financially backing the Barbadians.

I do not believe again that it is a case like Mr. Carlton Brathwaite and Mr. Bruce Procope who only paid out the money, and I certainly do not believe that either Mr. Fergusson, Mr. Simpson or Mr. Jones has any interest in any other shrimp company which is going to compete with the company they are ostensibly promoting in Barbados, and on this I wish to congratulate the Government that it has learnt from the earlier debate no matter how scurrilous it was and has not allowed any front men who are playing "Man-O Man-O" with other interests in Trinidad and at the same time trying to destroy the shrimp industry in Barbados. I am glad that that has not happened, but getting back to the marketing arrangements, to me it is economic madness that you say Mr. Schofield is advising the marketing organisation, and yet he is not a consultant to the Barbados company. I have never yet heard of any marketing adviser who does not advise the purchasers how to package their products, how to standardise their products, what quality product is required, what amounts are required. The most important man in a business of this sort is the marketing adviser. Your technical men tell you how to catch your fish, the

marketing adviser tells you what to catch, how to box them, how to grade them and so on. And if there is one thing that is disgraceful, it is that the member who in 1970 could make statements which if the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act ever needed repealing to punish slander, it needed repealing to punish the slander levelled against Schofield by the then Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. It is disgraceful that he should not be in his seat to take back some of what was said about Schofield on that occasion. Do you believe that I could have any respect for a Minister of Home Affairs if he allowed a man of whom a responsible member of Cabinet, a man who describes himself as a senior Minister, said that he did not care about the B.M.C. because his face was half-scald and he was dealing with black people, to come back into Barbados? If that was true the Minister of Home Affairs should be called over the carpet by the Prime Minister for allowing such a man to come back here. If it was true in 1970 that Schofield did not care about the B.M.C. because he was half-scald and did not like dealing with black people, he did not care about them and felt he could treat them like boys in the yard, then Schofield should be a prohibited immigrant; and no matter what the Prime Minister might deny, I know and I am sure that hon. members in their hearts know that when you are talking about scurrilous remarks, he meant the member for St. Andrew as much as he meant anybody else.

This is what the Minister of Fisheries then said: "Mr. Schofield made it quite clear on 24th March, 1970 that he was not going to do anything without a fight after he had slammed the door in the face of the Board, hence he slammed it in the face of the Government and the people who elected us. He went further and insulted the Board as recently as the 24th March, 1970."

I am only surprised that Mr. Schofield comes back without a written apology. I think he must be well nigh a saint in the face of all these insults to turn up again in Barbados to give us advice on how to help run a shrimp industry. I think it is decent of him after all that. The only thing is that obviously he knows what remarks he can treat with contempt and what remarks he should take seriously, and I think that he has treated these particular remarks with contempt. I have never found, and I do not know him well, Mr. Schofield to be a man who much took on what you said anyhow, and if you had said that to his face he would do no more than turn away and smoke a cigarette. But anyhow here he is dealing with the marketing once more, this man who felt it was his goal, his function and his duty, according to the Minister, to kick around Barbadians and treat them as he liked.

Anyway I am satisfied that the Minister of Home Affairs knows Mr. Schofield well enough to recognise that these remarks were as untrue as they were scurrilous, and that Mr. Schofield does have some knowledge of the shrimp business and is prepared after everything that was said to come back to Barbados and work.

"It is true that Schofield did all he could to destroy the industry. It is true the pilot who sank the boat was one of Schofield's henchmen."

I would like to appear in that slander suit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would urge the hon. member to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS:

This is the Resolution. Mr. Schofield is going to be responsible for seeing that the Government does

not have to repay this loan.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, the hon. member really has amazing gifts. He has been endowed with qualities of conversion of statements from fact to imagery which even his illustrious predecessors could never possess and were never trained to possess. I have never at any time said that Mr. Schofield was coming back to be marketing adviser to the company. Mr. Schofield is going to be consultant for the purchasers. It is true that a purchaser can come and say he does not want them packed in those boxes, he wants them packed in other boxes, and he does not even have to come to Barbados to do that. As far as I am concerned I am saying that I am concerned about the re-establishment of the industry. I was not part of that debate and I do not subscribe to statements that were made if they were defamatory statements on either side, because in 21 years I have not found it necessary to do the people's business and indulge in such, and I am saying that I do not over-rule the Minister of Home Affairs, and the hon. member should not enjoin me to sack the Minister of Home Affairs if he allows anybody to come into the Island because I have never interfered with any of the Ministers of Home Affairs, not even myself when I was Minister of Home Affairs, because I discharge my duty as Minister of Home Affairs and then my duty as Chairman of the Cabinet at two different levels altogether.

I want to make it clear that Mr. Schofield is going to be paid by the purchasing company which is Ralston Purina which is a reputable company, and I mentioned that as a matter of interest, not as a matter which was vital to the re-establishment of the industry; It could be anybody, but I said it was very interesting to me that Mr. Schofield who is alleged to have treated the Marketing Corporation in such a way is the person who is willing to guarantee the purchase of all the shrimps that we produce. That is all I am saying. It is as simple as that, and I do not want to be misquoted again. 5,00 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

I know the Prime Minister has not said he is marketing adviser to us, but what I am saying is that where you have a single purchaser the marketing adviser to that purchaser is one of the most important people in your operation because he is going to tell you what he will buy. It is the same as telling you what you must catch. That is what I am saying, that Mr. Schofield's importance will be as great now as it was before. I am very glad to see the Prime Minister obviously is as much a fan of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, as other Ministers, for it was high in our Manifesto, point number one under fisheries was the re-establishment of a shrimp industry reputably and competently run. As far as I am concerned, taking it on trust - because I only know the young man so - as far as I am concerned ostensibly this company is one which starts out with the potential of being reputably and competently run, so I am not attacking it on those grounds.

Just parenthetically too, Sir, I will just tell the Prime Minister this. He has insisted that he has not ever interfered with the administration of the Ministry of Home Affairs. That will come better from the hon. member for St. Michael North Central than from the Prime Minister. Anyhow, let us get on.

What I would attack is the concept of this particular loan relating to the Government shareholding in the company, the nominal capital of the company and the marketing arrangements. This is what really I will have to say something on. The Government only has a 20% share in the equity of this company, yet it is prepared to guarantee the entire working capital which exceeds the equity by some twenty-five times. The equity is a quarter million and the working capital is over six million. To me that does not

make common sense; an argument can more plausibly be put up that we are on the one hand putting the national insurance money into the City Bank for the City Bank to lend to a company to guarantee a supply of shrimps at Miami, and we are guaranteeing City Bank that if they lose the money which they lend out we will give it to them. That argument springs out from this Addendum here which is in any case extremely inadequate.

The first point I want to make is that I would like to see the agreement between City Bank and the company; nobody has called for this yet. I read things about banking sometimes, and I will tell you straight that I do not understand what is meant by "the rate of interest would be 2% over the New York base rate adjusted for withholding tax equivalent to about 9% with a commitment fee of 1% on term loan flat". I do not understand what that means, it seems to me that somebody is going to get this 1%, but who? City Bank? Is U.S. \$300,000 going to be given to them in return for lending out our money and having its repayment guaranteed? To me that is what the 1% relates to; that is a gift of \$600,000 to City Bank. It seems to me that "adjusted for withholding tax" means that the real rate of interest is going to be about 10 1/4%, but I do not know, 10 1/4% is a lot of money. That will be \$670,000 a year on this particular loan. To me that is a very large sum of money.

If the Government is going to guarantee this the Government could as well buy the fishing boats under a co-operative system. The Government could as well set up a fisheries corporation and buy 21 fishing boats and save the \$670,000 a year and give it to the same people to run perhaps, and put them on the Board. It seems to me that over the repayment period interest is likely to be paid out of \$3 million. That is a lot of interest- It is true that the company is likely to be making very large profits, but again it seems to me that people who would agree to that fundamentally are people perhaps without the amount of capital needed or people whose business experience has not led them to understand how rapacious foreign bankers can be. I just do not see what City Bank has to lose in all this. We are being very kind to City Bank, we bought a computer from them in effect this afternoon earlier, now we are giving City Bank these very large sums of money, sums of money that Mr. Procope and Mr. Brathwaite would never have dared to ask for. They preferred to see the company go under and let the boats be levied on before they involved themselves in sums of money even one-tenth of these. This is not any small business, Mr. Speaker, if this business should fail - and let us face it, any company which depends entirely on a foreign market in the absence of a specific agreement by the foreign buyers for the whole repayment period that they will buy the entire shrimp crop, and I have not heard anybody say that such an agreement exists, in the absence of a five-year purchasing agreement, I could never myself agree to such a guarantee.

You want to re-establish the shrimp business, you want to give employment, but if there is any risk at all that this \$6 million will have to go astray you will do better to take it now, do not put the national insurance funds in City Bank, take the \$6 million and fund some operation yourself, if necessary, to give the same amount of employment. We used to see many figures some time ago about how much money the IDC needs to provide every job, I believe it was \$6 1/2 million to provide a good number of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, what about devaluation? The day before Jamaica devalued a committee was appointed with many statements about no devaluation was in prospect but these businessmen are being invited to report to the minister of Finance on what the effects of a devaluation would be. That was either one or two days before, and I do not suppose that the Secretary had a chance to summon the meeting before Jamaica had devalued. If Barbados should ever, which God forbid, find itself unable to control its

balance of payments and with the sterling avenue closed down no longer able to cover them up by capital transfers and then have to devalue I would expect the Prime Minister up to the last moment to say there is no devaluation and then the next day devalue, because that is the way things have to go. It is unfortunate. Suppose that happens, does that mean then that this \$3,297,000 becomes \$3.5 million so that the guarantee which the House of Assembly thought it had given for \$6 1/2 million becomes a guarantee for seven or \$7 1/2 million depending on the extent of the devaluation? Why U.S. currency? Why has this Addendum specifically expressed the U.S. currency? Do you mean that the fears of devaluation are so great abroad already that anybody who deals with the Barbados Government is already beginning to call for guarantees in a currency other than that of Barbados? Has confidence in our funds already fallen so low that outside commercial interests will no longer deal in long term Barbados funds? We would have reached a very sad state of society and economic development if that is already so. All of this I would like to hear from the Prime Minister. This is within his province, and he knows about these things. I would particularly ask that if he has the agreement between the First National City Bank and the Company to lay it on the Table of the House. It is the custom and the habit in here, when we are asked to approve leases, to ask that the plot and the terms of the lease be laid. 5.10 p.m.

We are asked to approve a loan between two third parties. Technically, the Barbados Marketing Corporation is not a Department of Government; it is owned by the Government and it is a statutory corporation. I dare say that the only people who can call for the particular agreement might turn out to be the Public Accounts Committee. I do not even believe that the House is entitled in the ordinary way to see these commercial transactions into which statutory corporations enter, unless the corporations choose to embody them in the Report, or the Minister chooses to bring them to the House. I would ask the Prime Minister if he has the agreement to make it a document of the House, or make members fully aware of what its terms are over and above what is stated here in the Addendum.

Where is this U.S. money payable? I am actually worried about that. Why U.S. currency? Why U.S. dollars? Does this mean that in five years' time, if we are short of foreign exchange, we will be forced to commit our foreign exchange, should the venture fail, to paying First National City Bank? Why does the First National City Bank think it is so important that it can deal with the Barbados Government at arm's length and insist on, if not a gold clause, at least a United States currency clause? These are the things which worry me. I repeat, Sir, that I would want the Prime Minister to tell me what is meant by "adjusted for withholding tax." Does that mean the real rate of interest is 10 1/4%? What does it mean by "9% adjusted for withholding tax"? Now, 12 1/2% of 10 1/4% is 9%, and that is all I can take it to mean. What exactly is involved in this 1%? Is that a payment direct to First National City Bank? Do you really mean to say that a Company with a capital of \$240,000 has entered into an undertaking to pay more than its entire capital as a commitment fee? What does that mean? All of these things are the matters which really need to be dealt with from the financial and economic point of view. Other hon. members can deal more adequately than I can and have dealt more adequately than I can with the shrimp part and the employment part of the business and so on.

Sir, this is \$6 1/2% million. This is a Resolution which might involve the taxpayers in \$6 1/2 million. I want to be sure, and I am sure all members of the House want to be sure that while we can all recognise that this is not a bucket shop run by two-faced people as the last venture was, we want to be sure that the people of Barbados are putting their guarantees behind something that will not fail. You must remember whom we have guaranteed in the past. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation \$2 1/2 million through the eddoes; the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I could not tell you how many millions have been

guaranteed, how much had to be borrowed from the Port Funds and paid out to meet its shortcomings. These are the things about which we have debates guaranteeing in here. The shrimp industry has had a lot of unsavoury publicity. I would not say scurrilous, but a lot of unsavoury things have been said about their personnel and their business methods and so on in the House of Assembly. Many of them are true. Now that for once we can get together and agree that this appears to be a reputable group, let us make sure that we and they are not fooled alike by Ralston Purina and the First National City Bank.

I myself am wedded to the idea that, if Japanese or American consumers of shrimp wish a source of settled supply, they must put money into it. I believe that Japanese interests could have been found, if the search had been carried on long and intensively enough, who would have been prepared to associate themselves with a shrimp fleet. I believe that one failure does not mean the destruction of an idea. I believe that Japanese interests might even have been found to support the very grandiose plans for a new Shrimp Harbour down at Brandons, all of which we in the Barbados Labour Party put to the electorate as a part of our plans to build a Shrimp Harbour down there and re-establish the shrimp industry, believe that all of those things are important and possible. I am not satisfied that what we have here does not amount to one or two young men and the taxpayers being taken for a ride.

I do not want to be long now, but I must deal with the Japanese a little more. We take more than |10 million in Japanese goods a year. I personally believe it is a good thing, because Japanese goods are cheaper, quality for quality, than other goods. I feel that it is a good thing to hitch your star to a rising market. I remember somebody, during the Common Market debates in the House of Commons, indeed it was Sir Robert Kirton, who is the father of the House of Commons, said everybody in England is talking about going into Europe because they have a growth rate of 6%, but why do not people talk about going to Japan because they have a growth rate of 10%? I believe that an association with the Japanese might be a very good thing, and I think they are looking for these associations. They have interests in Brazil, and they are looking in these waters for shrimp. It is they who have built up the shrimp price. I think greater efforts should have been made. If the Prime Minister says that he could not get anything out of them, I can only say that he did not try hard enough, but I was not a part of the negotiations and I do not know the background. I want to be satisfied, and I want the Prime Minister to answer those questions which I have put about the agreement; why the U.S. funds; whether the true rate of interest is not 10 1/2%; what is there involved in the 1% commitment fee, and why does the Government find it necessary to guarantee the whole loan if it only has a 20% interest in the Company eventually?

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I would not be long, because I have another engagement. The hon. Leader of the Opposition in this debate at times was serious, and I was giving him some very serious attention, but at other times he ran off. Maybe the Prime Minister will answer him on the financing of the scheme, but I think, so far as the principle is concerned, he has given one of the answers himself. He said that in his Party's Manifesto, and he must be very clear on this - if the Opposition's Manifesto says that it has confidence in the shrimp industry, then you are really opening the door to the Government to show confidence in what you, looking on the other side, say you would take a share in, You cannot ask the Japanese to show more confidence in an industry in Barbados when both parties in the House of Assembly are saying that this is an industry in which they have confidence. An investor is going to say that the people of Barbados must show confidence in their own industry first, and we should not go as far as Japan to ask Japan to put up the money.

With regard to the guarantee, the Prime Minister would have to answer that. It seems to me that, if you are satisfied that the scheme itself is a worthwhile one, you will underwrite the loan. The Government is not providing the money. The First National City Bank is providing the money, but the Government is satisfied that it can underwrite this loan. Some of the Banks, as you have seen even in the international organisation, the Inter American

Development Bank, do not finance even viably sound schemes where the feasibility has been worked out, unless such schemes are going to have the support of the Government. If the Government is satisfied that it is a sound scheme, then there is nothing wrong, in principle, with guaranteeing the loan. It is just like any one of us backing a loan for a person or a business when we are satisfied about the viability of the business but we are not putting up the money. 5.20 p.m.

What I would like to answer is the stupid remark I heard from the hon. member for St. James. The hon. member for St. James made some remark to the effect that I or the Union did not say anything about the 500 people who lost their jobs. I do not believe that when it comes to a matter like this it is necessary for me to say anything to the member for St. James because I have said already that the hon. member for St. James has said that when it comes to lying, he can match with anyone; so I do not enter into that field. The Barbados Workers' Union is not responsible for running the Government, nor do we run the Marketing Corporation. We negotiate with the Government and we negotiate with the Marketing Corporation. We have just come out of negotiations with the Government of Barbados, and when we negotiate with the Government, we negotiate in the same way as with anybody else.

I would say that speaking for the Barbados Workers' Union and speaking for myself I did not like the arrangements that were going on with the shrimp affair, and I told the Marketing Corporation so, because it seemed to me that the workers were going to be left with some hazy idea. For example, Mr. Speaker, the workers were told that the Barbados Marketing Corporation would see to it that when the Schofield group left, there would be no question of their not being employed by the new group. When we approached Mr. Schofield he said it was not any question of displacement, and at that time there was no Severance Pay Act, but he was told that he had to leave/People were going backwards and forwards. Letters were taken from Mr. Schofield and carried to the member for St. Peter. I saw these things. The workers were coming to me because they were confused, and they were going to the then senior member for Christ Church. Between the lawyers on the other side they had these people confused and they did not know what to do. Far from the Barbados Workers' Union not saying anything about it, we were the only losers because it cost us over \$1,500, because one Christmas we had to put up a week's pay for the workers down there in the hope that the matter would resolve itself, but I and the Barbados Workers' Union cannot be responsible for any deficiency by any operator whether it is Mr. Schofield or the Barbados Marketing Corporation or Barbados Seafoods.

What I would like to say is that I hope that in the step which the Government is taking in asking the nation to guarantee a loan of this nature, they will see to it that within the total operation they have proper people. When I say total operation, I mean the broad outlay. The Government has had too many misfits already in life and the B.M.C. has been plagued with misfits. It is not a question of lack of education; it is a question of lack of knowledge. Every educated man is not knowledgeable of what he is doing. We know of an occasion where a mail working with the B.M.C. ordered "some three million crates that would have filled up the whole of Brazil that has 90 million people. If you are plagued with that kind of buffoonery, you are bound to land in trouble. I do not know where he went to school and

what kind of multiplication he learned, but you ended up with so many crates at the Deep Water Harbour that you could not get the cargo stored. If you have ten boats I hope somebody does not go and order something that would suit 100 boats by taking the 10 and adding another nought. These are things the Government would have to be careful about.

Whenever you are dealing in this sort of business, everybody is looking out. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made points about the investment side of it. I am not afraid of the investment side. I would say for myself that I am very pleased to see that the Hon. Minister of Finance has agreed to this sort of thing, because the Barbados Workers' Union is sending a request to the Hon. Minister of Finance for a loan of \$4 million for housing. We do not want anymore than the extent to which the Civil Service Association has been treated. We are going to underwrite the loan for workers' housing. We are not going in for ships; we are going in for housing. I am agreeing with this because it is a good start, and if the Government feels this is a venture that it can organise, all we want is the same thing that is being done in other avenues. I am sure we would not be asking the Government for hard currency; we would be asking for just Bajan dollars, soft as anything, and the only other thing we would ask for is a 6 1/2% interest rate on the loan, because it is a social development and no profit is forthcoming. We do not pretend we are going to make money, but we are not going to give it away.

I would say that if the Opposition believes in the shrimp industry, if the Government believes in the shrimp industry, then you cannot Schofield on behalf of the workers. I have not ask the Japanese Government to show faith in asked the Government about it because it appears something that is going to put Barbadians to childish to me, but I made that statement today work. I think the Barbadians would have to show because Mr. Schofield's name was mentioned, and faith. There can be no question whatsoever that I can say this for myself, that when Mr. Schofield we have faith in it and there is a possibility of was operating in Barbados I got the impression, making the shrimp industry work, but we are from dealing with him, that he was a man who asking the Japanese to find the money. was capable of dealing with two elements at the

same time. In that sense he would run to the On the suggestion that the Barbados Government or to the B.M.C. and come back to Workers' Union did not say anything, I know the workers to tell them something, and he did that the Union is an envy to a lot of people, but not seem to understand the Barbadian mentality it does not matter. We have a job to do, but I do and therefore he had the workers down there in not think anybody could accuse the Union of not one state. The workers used to go to the hon. representing the workers in this country through member for St. Peter, at that time the hon. any suggestion that because the Government had member had a printing press, and they gave the something to do with the workers, the Union did hon. member information to print. One day I got not take its stand. Mr. Speaker, the Barbados a copy of the statement they were taking to the Workers' Union does not have to be in that hon. member to print, but I will say I do not position. The Barbados Workers' Union can take know anything about Mr. Schofield in these a stand on behalf of the workers irrespective of matters. I say that so that the records can be whether the people are Government or private made straight in so far as the workers' workers on the principle that workers must be organisation is concerned, because in a small defended. We have done so, if not there would society like this I find there is a great temptation not have been a Severance Payment Act on the not to deal with the issue involved but to put the Statute-Book of this country. We do not have issue aside and begin to deal with personalities. If any qualms of conscience about this whatsoever, it suits you, you can deal with the personalities but when it comes to business, as the Minister of in a manner you consider most appropriate if Finance has said,

there is a misconception in there is any sort of emotionalism involved. I have Barbados when it comes to finance who knows been in public life long enough to know how to about finance, and some people believe that the deal with these matters, but I am not concerned workers in the Trade Union do not know. We with Mr. Schofield, I have met the man as he have exploded that myth. We have shown them employer, but what I do hope is that with this and will continue to show them that we know, \$3 million and the agreement the Government is because we are going to be important economic entering into that it should enter into it in the elements in the total society, not for any narrow same way as some international organizations benefit of those who have the responsibility of enter into international agreements, whether it is leadership, but for the broad mass of people Captain Fergusson or anybody else, do not whom they represent. believe that the workers are going to be underwriters for anybody to operate a shrimp In this scheme, if there is anything that hindustry or any industry on the basis that they would say would be peculiar, it would be the can get the industry worked on the lowest statement made about Mr. Schofield. A worker possible wages, and all we are going to hear is had me on Sunday for half an hour - and this is that they will be employing 500 people. We are where the Prime Minister would have to take going to insist that any of these people who will note of it, and it is a wonder I do not hear the be employed, that their wages and conditions of Opposition with it - and he told me that Mr. employment are going to be good enough and are Schofield told them that the Government seized going to be consistent with this sort of thing we money from him and is holding it on behalf of are doing and we are not looking to be in the the workers. I did not even know that Mr. good graces of any of the operators who are Schofield was back here. Now I am saying it here going to operate this scheme, whether it is that if Mr. Schofield has come back to Barbados Captain Fergusson, Charlie Jones, Simmons, and is sowing that kind of dissension or Barbadians, Japanese or Egyptians, it is going to misunderstanding among the workers, somebody be the same thing so far as we are concerned, must begin to tell Mr. Schofield what is the

score. Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side are .M. glad that a shrimp industry is to be re-established It is being percolated in here that the in Barbados. We would say that it is regrettable Government has money holding belonging to Mr. that Government's participation in the matter has to be what it really is today when we did everything we thought we could possibly have done in the circumstances to have saved what was here for the benefit of between 300 and 500 workers and to the economy of this country as a whole. I heard the Minister of Finance say today that his concern is with the economy of the country. I am glad to hear him say this, but I also learnt from that statement that his interest in the economy today is perhaps what it was not in 1971, in those days when we were trying to give the Government good advice with respect to a thriving and prosperous industry that was propping the economy of this country up and helping workers who have since been left stranded.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about Mr. Schofield and what is in Hansard as regards this. I do not want to be concerned with anything that has been said today, and I do not want to be concerned with anything that has been said in the past. If Mr. Schofield is coming back as an adviser to the industry I sincerely hope that the expertise for which he is known to be able to give to the industry will be relied upon and acted upon, and what we will find I hope is that a man like the same Mr. Schofield's advice will not be kicked about for the sake of a few friends of the Government as happened on the last occasion. That was one of the things that destroyed the industry we had. I think the Government is losing a wonderful opportunity, since the Government is asking this House to give its assent to Government's underwriting or guaranteeing this \$6 million to refloat this shrimp industry. Government

has been giving its support to the co-operative movement throughout this country, and I feel the Government has it within its hands at this time to let us see and feel that the co-operative movement can be made to be worth something for all of us in Barbados, because I feel that the ownership of this company could have been widened and it should be an undertaking between the Barbados Government and the fishing co-operative, and if we need then to bring in private enterprise as outsiders they could come in in limited numbers.

Let us look at it, Sir, my constituency in St. Peter, up farther north in St. Lucy in the Half Moon Fort area there are men who have given their all, made every possible sacrifice to fishing in this country, keeping this country supplied with fish from time to time, in Silver Sands and Bridgetown - I do not have to mention all the fishing areas in Barbados - St. Philip and St. John, we have enough fishermen who can be drafted so to speak, who could be encouraged into a gigantic co-operative movement with the Government guaranteeing the financing of the company, and the same expertise that Mr. Schofield and others are going to bring to bear could be applied and let the co-operative movement get all the same management skills that are available to private enterprise in this venture, and I believe that if Government had approached it in that light it would have meant so much more. 5.40 p.m.

It would have had an appeal and an attraction to many young boys in this country. Several young people in this country would have received training in the shrimping industry. It must be remembered that with the Government's backing, there would be every possibility of the broadening of the scheme, and there we would find that Barbados could become, perhaps, one of the most thriving fishing centres of the region.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are losing an opportunity, and I do not believe it is too late for the Government to do all of this. I do not believe that the Government, not having laid on the Table of this House the agreement between the First National City Bank and the Company, would be creating any faith in anybody. Sir, we know that, however one may look at it, after all is said and done, after Government has guaranteed this loan the only assets of the Company will be the shrimp boats. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, could not the shrimp boats be owned by the co-operative movement that we have been preaching about all over this Island? What are we doing, Mr. Speaker, when we have an opportunity to do something for ourselves and our people when we let things slide like this? I am appealing to the Government even at this last moment to do something for the fishermen and the young people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, one thing must be made clear before we venture further. I believe that the Barbados Marketing Corporation needs protection, and I want to underline the word protection. Government should see to it that there are no outstanding contracts between Bajan Seafoods and Bajan Seafoods 1970 Limited that will keep the BMC so tied up that when operations start with any other company there will still be some commitments that have been hidden between the lines in the fine print. I am asking the Government to give the Barbados Marketing Corporation a clean slate to start with on this occasion. Give BMC the protection that it demands at this time. If that is done and we find at a later date that BMC has failed, then let it decide to fold up once and for all. I am willing, at this stage, to give it a chance.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, if Government is underwriting the loan, that the BMC is only taking 20% of the shares instead of 51%? This is a Socialist Government; we are out for development and so on. What

is wrong? We are saying that if the Government is underwriting the loan it should hold a commanding interest in the establishing of this business. The Government should have a controlling interest of 51% in this business. After all is said and done, Government's hopes for a success is based upon the marketing advice that will be received and put into execution by BMC; the people who market abroad wherever the shrimp is sold, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a case where shrimp is to be caught and dumped in Barbados. It is not a case where boats are going to set sail and go where they like when they like and so on. Advice has to be given by the experts in the manoeuvring of the shrimp fleet as a whole. Every operation has to be advised from the base, and we feel that something should be done in this respect.

With regard to the question of processing, we would like to know that there are no hitches whatsoever in the way of this Company when the catches are to be processed. I know that when Barbados Seafoods, the same Mr. Schofield's Company, was operating here, many a hurdle had to be overcome. They had to run about borrowing ice, and sometimes Barbados Seafoods had to supply ice and do many things that the BMC ought to have done and ought to have provided. I am asking that the Government do everything that is humanly possible to give this fleet a good send off. Do everything possible so that when the catches come to shore for processing, marketing, or whatever it is, everything will go smoothly into operation.

I am also asking about the workers. We have not yet heard from the Minister of Finance or anybody on that side of the House how many workers will be employed in this Industry. We know how much money the Government intends to underwrite for establishing this Industry. We understand that there will be a floating capital of \$240,000. How much is going to be paid up? We want to know about all of this. That is what we are interested in hearing. This is what we do not want to hear. We do not want to hear as we have heard from IDC that somebody is setting up an industry in Grazettes and he will employ X hundred people, and after he has been operating here for 19 years and so on that he has not employed one-third of the people that he said he would employ. 5.50 p.m.

If proper calculations are made and it is seen and known that with the guaranteeing of this \$6 million loan only 200 people will be employed, we want to know that 200 people will be employed. If only 100, we will be satisfied to know it is one hundred, but for Heaven's sake don't tell us 500 will be employed when after you have been in operating for two or three years you cannot get to half of five hundred. Do not mislead the House with this kind of information that we have been having throughout all the years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is any other point which I need try to raise. (Asides) What?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Ignore the asides.

Mr. HINDS:

I think it is more important for the Chair to rule these asides out of order when they are heard. However, Sir, we believe that the Minister of Finance is now ready to place before the House a copy of the loan agreement between City Bank and the company so that all these terms.....(Pause)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member finished speaking?

Mr. HINDS:

No, Mr. Speaker, there is just a brief consultation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLE Y:

I beg to second that.

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

THE LAND TAX ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is Order No. 5 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister, to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on land and for connected purposes.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Has the motion been moved and seconded?

Mr. SPEAKER:

It has not been formally moved. Would the Leader of the House formally move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the day?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I should like to suggest on behalf of the Opposition that the Government postpone consideration of this Bill. We of the Opposition constantly have to complain about the late arrival of important documents such as this which arrived in our homes at such times when it is impossible for us to do any research or consultation, or give any thought to something as serious as this is. In my particular case this was delivered on Saturday afternoon. This Bill deals with the amendment of several Bills, it is a completely new concept of taxation on land in Barbados, and the Hon. Prime Minister himself said when he delivered the Budget proposals that this was revolutionary land taxation in Barbados. In spite of that, we have been given very late notice in considering a Bill of this nature, receiving it on Saturday and being expected to deal with it on the following Tuesday. I am sure the Cabinet has had a long time to deal with this Bill.

We have said before that at the point of the introduction of the Bill it should have been possible for members of Parliament to have a copy of the Bill so that we could have some time to study the various matters which we are likely to give our contribution on in the debate to enhance the quality of legislation which is coming out of this Chamber.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised myself to learn that members of the House only received copies of the Bill last Saturday. A Bill of this nature is a very serious one. There is a measure of urgency because we have not sent out any Demand Notes for the new rates for 1972-73 and I would not like the taxpayers including myself to be confronted with the payment of two maybe moderately or greatly increased bills in one single twelve month period which is going to happen, and I will defer consideration of this matter; but I did take the precaution of circulating a memorandum on the Bill as I have done on previous occasions with Bills of an intricate nature so that members would understand the nature of the reforms which are going to be instituted. I am pressing for it to be done next week because we must get out those Demand Notes by the end of the month if possible and probably by the 15th February, because I do not want two of them coming in the new financial year. We need \$5 million right now and that is the amount of money we will raise under the new rate. It is a lot of money to pull out of the economy in four weeks. I will defer that matter so that hon. members will have a chance to read it, and deal with Order No. 8 which stands in the name of the Minister of Health.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection, Order No. 5 will be postponed.

There being no objection, Order No. 5 is postponed.

THE DENTAL RESISTRATION BILL, 1972

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when we considered this Bill to repeal the Dental Registration Bill, 1923, a Select Committee was set up to consider and report to the House of Assembly. This Select Committee met on 15th of this month and made certain recommendations which I have laid on the Table of the House today. Copies of these recommendations have been circulated I believe to each member of the House.

Arising out of the recommendations which have been submitted to this Honourable Chamber, a number of amendments have become necessary in addition to the amendments -which were made to Clause 13 of the Bill, and a copy of these amendments which have been proposed have also been circulated for the consideration of hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do not adopt the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to repeal the Dental Registration Act, 1923.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to say that I have not had a copy of the Report of the Select Committee, and I doubt whether any report is before the House. What is in my hands is a copy of the minutes of the Select Committee signed by the Clerk. That is not a Report, and I would urge on the Minister of Health not to let me make any speech upon that basis, because I believe that in fact will dispose of the motion. If there is no Report, the motion in my respectful submission is out of order and cannot stand. I would urge on the Minister of Health if he has a Report not to let me go on dwelling on this. Obviously the motion would not be pushed by him today if nobody has a Report. 6.00 p.m.

All I have is "Minutes of Select Committee on bill to repeal the Dental Registration Act" and it is signed by J. Connel, Clerk. If that is so, as a matter of order the motion is lost, but in any case to deal with the merits - the technicalities will be sufficient I think to defeat the motion -this was a Select Committee which many hon. members are aware was proposing to take a step controlling a recognised profession in this island contrary to the wishes of the professional association. One or two aspects of it were contrary to the wishes of the professional association itself, and this is a most unusual step. When the legal practitioners Bill came before the House the legal practitioners' wishes were so fully met that as one of the parliamentary draftsmen told me..... - I will come back to that, apparently the report has been found.....- but one of the parliamentary draftsmen told me that he was unfamiliar with some of the language used in the Act because it had been drafted by lawyers and he knew nothing about it. Similarly, the doctors have never so far as I know had any measure come before the House with which they were in opposition. The dentists have expressed opposition, they have submitted memoranda to various hon. members, that is, the proper dental practitioners, and so also have the mechanical dentists who are either fairly or unfairly known as the quacks have submitted memoranda.

Mr. Speaker, I have been given an unsigned copy of the report, and the difference between the two copies is that one is headed up "Minutes" and signed by Mr. Connell and the other is headed up "Report" and has Mr. Connell's name typed at the bottom, and has the word "Chairman" with nothing written over it or underneath that, but the two documents appear to be identical. I thought you used to have a report and schedule the Minutes to it, but anyhow, the professional association which is concerned with this matter has shown dissatisfaction. It is within my knowledge that that association asked Mr. Howell, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, if it would be allowed to give evidence before the Select Committee, and Mr. Howell acting, I am told, on instructions from the Minister very grandly said that enough evidence had been taken already and the Minister did not propose to hear any more. If this is true, it is a grave contempt of the House of Assembly.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

In reply to what you have just said, I would like to state quite clearly that no such instructions were issued by me to the Permanent Secretary of my Ministry, and what you have said would have to be treated as hearsay. I have made no such statement, given no such direction to the Permanent Secretary and I am a bit surprised to hear this alleged accusation made by an hon. member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That was a point of elucidation, not a reply.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I gave way. You must understand that questions of hearsay relate to the | locking up of people in prison. You do not want to lock up people in British countries because I heard somebody say that the Minister of Health said so-and-so, but bear in mind that hearsay is evidence. I am told by members of the Dental Association that their Secretary, when it was suggested to him to bring the Clerk of the House of Assembly so that he could make it known to the Select Committee that they had submissions to make to the House now - there is a difference between the House and the Government - that the Secretary took it upon himself to ring Mr. Howell and received this answer. It may or may not be true, I was not there, but I must repeat these things because they relate to a matter before the House, and I am repeating them in such a way that they can be checked and their value assessed. I am not putting them forward as truth to involve the Minister of Health, nor did I so put them forward, because I used the words "whether it is true or not". 'All of this I am reporting as hearsay and it must be checked as hearsay. I heard it said and that is what I am reporting, and believe me, Mr. Speaker, as you and the former Attorney General can tell the Minister of Health, there are numerous matters before the court in which hearsay may be the best evidence, far less inadmissible.

Anyhow, the point is this. The dentists are against some of what is in the Bill, and I for one would be glad to think - because I am not a member of the Select Committee - that the Select Committee has heard evidence from the dentists before the House is called on to deal with the control of a profession in a manner contrary to the wishes of its professional representatives. I do not think that is an unreasonable view. It is not only the registered dentists, it is also the mechanical dentists. The mechanical dentists have made submissions, admittedly in a photocopied manner, but nonetheless submissions, to members on this side of the House as well, one of them at least has made oral submissions that this will drive them out of business, the dentists on the other hand say that to allow the mechanical dentists to practise at all will be a matter of difficulty. What I would like to see is the House adopt the report of the Select Committee as an Interim Report and that the matter be returned to the Select Committee for evidence to be taken if the Committee thinks fit. There has been a lot of delay already, I do not think we should leave the dentists, the mechanical dentists, the dental technicians, the dental auxiliaries and the dental hygienists with any feeling of being hard done by. The Act already makes provision for working the Dental Council if the dentists do not co-operate. I think it would be much better to have the dentists co-operate. We have recently had an example from St. Vincent of what happens when the Government tramples arbitrarily upon the wishes and feelings of professional men.

There are other points which deserve consideration, and the ordinary rules of third reading debate will prevent my dealing with them. I think the immigration point is a very important point to be dealt with in connection with dentists, that you cannot use the ordinary means of importing dentists short-term to engage in private practice in Barbados, because dental equipment is expensive. I know I cannot talk about that in third reading and I am not going to talk about it now because in third reading you cannot talk about something that should be in the Bill, and you cannot invite the Government to make a provision which they have not made, therefore I just throw it out now as something which should be dealt with by the Select Committee, and I would really urge the Minister to go before the Select Committee and consider in the Committee whether it is not desirable to hear representatives of the responsible professional association and also any person who may wish to become one of the licensed technicians, allow them to make representations and allow the Committee to decide whether or not it will hear evidence from them. 6.10 p.m.

Sir, in urging this on the House, I would also urge that two members of the Select Committee who were, presumably, appointed by the House upon the basis that they had something to contribute, were unable to be present because of the shortness of the notice given. The hon. member for Bridgetown was, as I have said before, taking part in a murder trial, and the hon. member for Christ Church West was also engaged and wrote a letter explaining his difficulties upon that occasion. He was out of the Island attending a Court in St. Vincent. If you appoint people to a Select Committee and you want to hear from them, then give them the chance, I am suggesting, to go into the matter.

If necessary, Sir, I will move an amendment, if it is thought that an amendment is desirable. I will move that the Report of the Select Committee be noted, and the Committee given leave to sit again. (Asides) Sir, the Clerk would have to work out the form of the amendment for me. The Clerk is suggesting that the proper form would be that the Bill be recommitted to the same Select Committee. I would urge that on the Government.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, the Clerks will reduce my amendments to writing. The Clerks have informed me, and I must accept their advice, that I should move that the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee comprised of the same hon. members.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker. There are still one or two things which it would appear that the Select Committee, if the Bill is recommitted, will have to deal with. If one looks at the Report of the Select Committee at paragraph 3 there is an interpretation

"It was also decided that section 2 be amended to provide that any reference in this Act or Regulations made thereunder to a female shall also include a male person."

That in itself, I believe, is twisting around the conventional form of drafting. We already have an Interpretation Act in which when we speak of male it also refers to female. On the basis of this Report, if you are now going to alter the whole effect of the Interpretation Act, this should read in the reverse. In the Act itself all reference to a female person should be amended to read "male person". Then the Interpretation Act will come into force showing that wherever you read male you will also include female. Rather than reversing the Interpretation Act, you should correct or amend the Act to bring it in line with the Interpretation Act. There are also some amendments which have been circulated and which, I believe, could be incorporated by the Select Committee in the Act, and it should then come back to the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am opposing this matter going back to a Select Committee, for the very simple reason that Government has to govern. The Government cannot introduce a Bill to suit Dental Practitioners or Dental Technicians. The Government has consulted the Dentists in every stage of the preparation of the Bill, and the time has come when the Government must make a decision, whether it is against the

interests of the Dentists or not but is in the interests of the people for the improvement of the dental health in this community.

We are endeavouring, as a Government, to upgrade medical, dental, paramedical, pharmaceutical, and every kind of profession in this community. If we are going back to a Committee after consulting the Dentists before the Bill was drafted, sending them copies of the draft Bill, are we now going back to the Select Committee to hear the same thing we have heard from them before the drafting of the Bill? Are they going to tell the Government what bill we must bring into Parliament? We would be abdicating our responsibilities as a Government. We have consulted the professional bodies; we have consulted the advisers in the various Ministries who advise Government, and the Bill before the House is the Bill which the Government thinks will improve and advance the oral hygiene and health of the people in this country. We have to stand or fall by it. This see-sawing of legislation to suit particular pressure groups or particular interests cannot be in the interests of the health of the people of this community. As I say, the Bill will work itself out. There are people in the community who are in the Island and cannot be registered because the Bill is not before Parliament. There is nothing to register the Dental Hygienists; there is nothing to regulate or even lay down the spheres in which they must operate.

We are unfortunate in the community that we are suffering from a shortage of Dentists, and as a result of that you have your Dr. Bostick and a lot of people who are doing jobs for which they are not qualified. How long can a developed and civilised community continue with the jaw-breaking and the infection caused by people doing things for which they are unqualified to do? The time is long overdue for dealing with the question of regulating the practice of Dentists and stipulating what people with certain aspects of dental qualifications should be able to do. If we go on allowing people who are not qualified to do things for which they have no qualifications, we are certainly not contributing anything to the improvement of the dental health of the country.

For that reason, I consider that the dental health of the children and the people of this country is deteriorating every day. I must say that we are looking at the question of fluoridation of the water, and we should start a pilot scheme very soon. We will go in for the fluoridation of the water in order to improve the health of the people in this country. Let us get on with the Bill. We have already consulted them, and anything they say now cannot advance the Bill. The responsibility for the Bill is ultimately that of the Government, and we stand or fall by the Bill which we introduced in relation to the health of the people in the community.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister really sees our point. We are well aware of the fact that the upgrading of our health standard is necessary. There are two sides of the (picture. You have the Dentists saying no, and you have the mechanics saying that you should give them a break. In the first place, you do not have enough Dentists in the Island. If you want to get an appointment with a Dentists now, you will have to wait until August or September. The boys who have been doing something on the side have not been breaking anybody's jawbone lately. As soon as they realise that they will be a little trouble, they usually send them to the big boys to have X-rays and so on done. These boys are only pulling teeth from the front. If you give these fellows the opportunity to practise, then you should make sure that they have proper facilities. Some of the places in which dental work is done look worse than Dr. Bostick's place.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has to speak on whether the Report of the Select Committee should be accepted.

Mr. CRAIG:

I believe that the Government's side will accept the suggestion of my colleagues. 6.20 p.m.

Since both sides have been canvassed, it is one of those delicate situations. It is no pressure group. As far as I am concerned, I do not like dentists, period, so no dentist could come to me and ask me to give him a chance.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, as a member appointed by this House to the Select Committee, I think this affords me an opportunity to state that whilst I congratulate the Select Committee for the speed with which it wanted to work and to deal with this matter, I think that if a Select Committee is to be useful to this House, it really must be given an opportunity to do its duty. I myself only got notice of the meeting late on Saturday and I could not of course attend the meeting on Monday, but I took the opportunity to write to mention various matters that I thought had arisen during the debate and which had caused the matter to be referred to the Select Committee. I still believe that this Bill can be improved in Select Committee after hearing from the legal draftsmen in particular on aspects of the Bill, and after considering certain representations without necessarily giving up either the right to govern or bowing to a pressure group. I think that you yourself, Mr. Speaker, are very familiar with the procedure of Select Committees in other Parliaments where people ! are invited before the Select Committee to give evidence so that when the Bill comes back to the House it comes back with all of the rough parts really made smooth, and it comes back I hope with some improvements. There are points of principle on which the Government may not give way either in Select Committee or in this House, but that is no reason why they should miss an opportunity to improve the Bill. I do not for one moment believe that sending this back to Select Committee and coming back to the House in two weeks' time is going to delay in any measure the improvement of the position. I think when we spoke on the main Bill we made it quite clear that we welcomed an improvement, but I am deeply concerned that the Select Committee has not adverted in this instance to representations concerning the powers of the Disciplinary Committee and the Disciplinary Committee exercising the rules of natural justice and laying down something in the provisions about that. We would have needed a legal draftsman. Unfortunately the only adviser to the Select Committee outside of the Clerk was the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Health, and I think we should have called on the help of one or two other witnesses at the time to formulate what are non-controversial improvements which we could recommend for improving the Bill as it stands, and for this reason I am asking the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to reconsider the position.

I remember learning early that it is always a big thing to give way if a point is validly made and really it is not any point of principle or taking away the right of the Government to govern. As a matter of fact to make hasty legislation will lead to so much litigation. I can see the Disciplinary Committee under this Bill being challenged frequently in the Court on lots of issues. They have no lawyer on their body and they have not got any proper guidance, and it is for that reason that I made the point at the time.

Mr. ADAMS:

If no other hon. member wishes to speak, I would like to exercise my right of final reply on the amendment.

Sir, I am fully aware that the Government has had the benefit of representation from the dentists. To hear the hon. member for St. Michael South Central speaking on behalf of all hon. members really rather reminded me of the tail wagging the dog. I was not aware that in his many activities he has yet been Minister of Health, or acting Prime Minister or anything else, but since no hon. member has thought fit to contradict him, I will accept that he spoke on behalf of the Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, you do not have to be a Minister of

Health to speak on health matters, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that. I speak as the representative for St. Michael South Central and as a Minister, which I am entitled to do in this House at any time.

Mr. ADAMS:

I thought he was going to say as representative of the constituency in which the hospital is situated. It would make as much sense. Why doesn't he speak as representative for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? It is as true and it makes as good sense, but nonetheless there is a distinction between the Government and the House of Assembly. I have never heard the hon. member say he is a constitutional lawyer, so perhaps he would not mind if I suggest to him that he should pay some attention to that distinction.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, I have been Attorney General for five years and have advised the Government on constitutional matters. You do not have to shout that you are a constitutional lawyer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet.

Mr. ADAMS:

The fact that he is no longer Attorney General may very well be indicative of the quality of the advice he gave the Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

It is a matter of versatility, not a question of advice.

Mr. ADAMS:

He is obviously anxious to take the place of Mr. Cameron Tudor in versatility. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I must take it that the hon. member for the constituency embracing the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has spoken on behalf of the Government. The constitutional point is that there is a difference between the Government and the House of Assembly. The Government decides policy and invites the House of Assembly to carry it into effect. The Ministry of Health hears representations, and why I am urging that the Select Committee also hear representation is that the Select Committee should satisfy itself that the interpretation to be drawn from the facts put forward in those representations is a correct one. Nowhere has it been said that the Government has heard representations from the mechanical dentists whom the professional dentists describe as quacks. Not a quack has been heard on this, as no member on the other side has reported to the House. I am suggesting it, Sir. There is dissatisfaction on

both sides. The mechanical dentists are dissatisfied and the professional

dentists are dissatisfied. I am suggesting that allowing them to say their price at the Select Committee when they possibly might be under rather sharper cross-examination than anything they would have had to face in the Ministry of Health might be of advantage to the House and to the Government in the long run. There are facts which might very well be elucidated by a Careful cross-examination of all interested parties at Select Committee level than could ever be elucidated by Mr. Howell and his accolites in the Ministry of Health. A memorandum sent forward by an Association is no substitute whatsoever for a careful examination of representatives of the Association as to their real feelings.

A Select Committee of this sort and a suggestion of this sort is not a suggestion made to waste the Government's time; it is a suggestion made to enable the Government to use the proper procedure of the House of Assembly to discover information. This is the whole purpose of Committees of Parliament. The dentists can submit a memorandum, but when you examine them on it you may very well find that the facts which they use to support it are based on sand. The mechanical dentists may put forward arguments, but when you examine them and ask them questions, you may very well discover that you have either made too many or too few concessions to them. These things cannot always be discovered in writing. If oral evidence and cross-examination were not permitted, if written evidence, submissions and affidavits were all that were required, we would neither worry with the jury system or with witnesses in court. I would have thought that was a great advantage of the Government to have the opportunity to examine witnesses before the Committee when embarking Upon so momentous a step as regulating after fifty years the entire affairs of a profession. It is entirely up to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for my amendment because I believe it is the better idea and the better policy, but if the Government chooses not to obtain the best information it can under the circumstances most favourable to itself, let the Government stick to that. I cannot help it. If the Minister of Communications and Works can only see the whole situation in the terms in which he described it to the House, that indicates nothing except his lack of vision. I would urge on all hon. members to vote for the opportunity of allowing interested parties to give evidence and to be examined before the Select Committee. The Minister of Health who is only a doctor, if he does not mind my saying so, and the Civil Servants who are only Civil Servants, will then have an opportunity, as will all members of the

House, of seeing what really makes the dental profession tick in this Island. What is the point of saying there are not enough dentists; what is the point of saying that the school children's teeth need looking after, and there are persons in this Island who need registration if you are not really prepared by one of the best means known to man of discovering the truth of matters. What is the point of saying it all. 6.30 p.m.

If hon. members care to be led by the Minister of Communications and Works, let the pit into which they may fall rest at their own doors. We on this side are urging this upon the Government not for the sake of obstruction, not for the sake of scoring an Opposition point, but for the sake of making a start on giving proper dental care to the teeth of the children and adults alike in Barbados, and it is up to them if

they reject the opportunity.

The question that the amended motion to recommit the report of the Select Committee on the Dental

Registration Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Hon'bles C. E. TALMA, F. G. SMITH, P. M. GREAVES, L. E. SANDIFORD and P. G. MORGAN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Messrs. W. R. LOWE, F. L. WALCOTT, A. MORRISON and R. St.C. WEEKES - 11

Ayes: Messrs J. M. G. M. ADAMS, E. D. MOTTLEY, L. S. CRAIG, H. deB FORDE and C. L. BOLDEN - 5.

The question that the motion to accept the report of the Select Committee on the Dental Registration Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon'bles. C. E. TALMA, F. G. SMITH, P. M. GREAVES, L. E. SANDIFORD and P. G. MORGAN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Messrs. W. R. LOWE, F. L. WALCOTT, A. MORRISON and R. StC. WEEKES - 11

Noes: Messrs. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, E. D. MOTTLEY, L. S. CRAIG, H. deB. FORDE and C. L. BOLDEN - 5.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I

beg to move that the House do now go into Committee to consider the amendments consequent upon amending section 13 of the Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the correct motion should be that the Bill be recommitted. Once the Select Committee has reported that is the automatic Committee stage. It cannot go back to the Committee unless it has been recommitted. Once the report of the Select Committee has been adopted you have passed the Committee stage.

Mr. ADAMS:

With great respect, on a point of order, Standing Order 58 has not been suspended.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Bill would have to be recommitted, because you were not in the Chair and this is the stage of the third reading.

Mr. ADAMS:

With great respect to all hon. members, if it is desired that the amendment be passed there must be a recommitment of some sort, because all that you can do after a Select Committee has reported is read the Bill a third time. I have not worried with all these particulars because I have only seen the Minutes a short while ago, I got up to make my speech based upon only seeing the Minutes, but the correct report of the Select Committee would embody the amendments, that the Committee would schedule the several amendments to the Bill and then you order it to be read a third time and the amendments automatically are made. If you read Standing Order 58 you will realise that the only procedure envisaged by the rule is

an instant third reading, but I was not prepared for this point because I did not have the report, I only had the Minutes before me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Standing Order 58(4) deals with the automatic third reading of the Bill. These amendments should have been incorporated in the report of the Select Committee; alternatively the Bill should be recommitted to the whole House before the third reading so that the amendments can be agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on this matter I take it that the report has been adopted, and the report in order to be a complete report must necessarily include the amendments which have been circulated. It is one and the same thing, so to all intents and purposes the report includes all the amendments. That is my understanding, so in moving that the Bill as amended be read a third time all the amendments will have to be taken into consideration. 6.40 p.m.

It should be that the Bill, as amended, be contained in the Report, and be read a third time. That is what the motion should be.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the amendments which have been circulated, I believe, some time today, one will see that the Report of the Select Committee refers to a discussion on Clause 13. There was much discussion on Clause 13 of the Bill, after which it was decided that the said Clause be amended to provide as follows "The Minister may direct the Registrar specially to register a person who is not entitled to be registered...." You have amendments which have been circulated dealing with Clause 13 which are not incorporated. In truth and in fact, what is supposed to be a Report of the Select Committee is in truth and in fact the minutes of the Select Committee, and the Select Committee has not yet presented to this Honourable House the amendments which should go into the Bill. It was taken from the Committee of the House and sent to a Select Committee, because it was thought that the Select Committee would do all the amendments and bring the Bill back to the House in the usual procedure where it would then be read a third time, and there would be no more amendments.

As it stands now, you have got what purports to be a Report - (Asides.) No, if you look at it carefully you will see that what purports to be the Report does not incorporate what is set out in this draft. It does not say anything about the draft, and it does not set out the amendment. It cannot be a Report. A Report has to be agreed upon by the members of the Select Committee. If you have not accepted what you call a Report, you cannot now refer it to a Committee unless you recommit the Bill. You would then have to appoint your Select Committee, because it would have reported and have exhausted its authority before you can come back here. We said earlier that it should go back to the Select Committee, who would incorporate what is in here into the original Bill, come back to the House, and the Bill would then have its third reading. Having adopted what purports to be a Report - you cannot adopt this; you will have to recommit the Bill. What is the position of the Select Committee which the House appointed? It has not yet been dissolved; it has not completed its function. If you recommit, you are automatically recommitting to a Select Committee which was appointed by the House to do this job.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that in my motion I moved that this Bill with the amendments

be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House to consider the amendments as proposed. That is what the motion is, and I should like to draw your attention, Sir, to Section 46 of the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, with great respect, if any of the members of the Select Committee can tell me that these amendments were circulated and approved by them, we will vote for the third reading. The Leader of the House has said that these amendments should be part of the Report. I believe you were present, Sir. If you can assure me that these amendments came before the Select Committee and were approved, we would vote for the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Chair must never be brought into a debate.

Mr. ADAMS:

You are the Chairman of the Committee, Sir, but the Report which, I believe, you have signed does not say anything about amendments. You have not signed the amendments. Were the amendments before the Select Committee? No. What is the procedure on a Report from a Select Committee? - The third reading of the Bill. Standing Order 45 has been suspended. How are you to recommit something to a committee of the whole House, anyhow? (Asides.) I am talking about Standing Order 45 which deals with Committees of the whole House, and the procedure, and the recommittal. That Standing Order has been suspended. What are you going to recommit? Why not reappoint the same Select Committee and send it back? A Select Committee must decide whether the amendments, as drafted, meet with the approval of the Committee's direction.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It seems to me that the duties of the Select Committee have been ended. The Report having been accepted by this House, the Select Committee which has been appointed is now functus officio. If it is moved that the whole Bill be recommitted, then that would not involve the functioning of the Select Committee. In my opinion the Committee has been abandoned junctus officio on the division which was recently taken. It seems to me to be quite in order, if I might suggest, to recommit the Bill to a Committee of the whole House.

Mr. ADAMS:

In other words, Sir, the Select Committee's deliberations have been annulled, because they have reported that the Bill should be amended but have not reported the amendment and, therefore, we go back to a Committee of the whole House as if a Select Committee had never been appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That would seem to be the position.

Mr. ADAMS:

If the Government find themselves in this position, Sir, I cannot help them.

If they had voted for my Bill, they could have had the amendment dealt with in Select Committee, The majority in Select Committee could have refused to hear the evidence; we would have had the amendments, and the matter would be over by next Tuesday. As it is now, it is ten minutes to seven and

you will face a whole Committee stage on this Bill, which is to go back to the situation before a Select Committee was appointed, and that is what we tried to avoid. The Bill will now be discussed Clause by Clause. (Asides.)

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would permit me to make one point. The hon. member is so cantankerous that he would not even wait to hear what I have to say.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not querying your Ruling about the interpretation of the Standing Orders. I want to point out that quite recently - I think this is the second occasion in this second Session - we have had what purports to be the Reports of Select Committees coming before this Honourable Chamber with no agreement or concurrence of the members of the Select Committee. What we are getting is something signed by the Clerk of Committees which, technically, has no authority in this Honourable House. A Select Committee can only be composed of the elected members of the House, and when the House purports to adopt something signed by the Clerk of the Committee, technically in my opinion, the Honourable House is not , accepting the Report of the Committee. If one member disagrees with anything in the Report, then he is entitled to write a minority Report.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member is given that latitude, I will have the right to get up and make as many speeches as possible. The hon. member is making a speech, and he should not be permitted to make a .second speech.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We are trying to resolve this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT:

You cannot resolve it by allowing him to make two speeches, Mr. Speaker. He is only entitled to one speech in the House.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like consideration to be given to what purports to be the Report, so that we can put the procedure of the House correct. Should the members sign the Report which comes back to the House in order to show some sign of authority that the Committee agrees with it?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made. I think the Hon. Minister of Health has made a motion which was not seconded. It was that the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House. Am I right?

Mr; ADAMS:

The Committee is an alternative to the Committee of the whole House. If you had a Committee; you adopted its Report, I cannot see how you are going to go back. You will have to start all over again.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, you have a Select Committee's Report which you have put to the vote, which has proved to be no Report. If this Report is ultra vires, and no Report, you will have to order that the Committee sits again. That is the only way out of this impasse. 6.50 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That is what we have been asking and the hon. member gets up to criticise.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In view of the fact that there is a certain amount of irregularity in so far as this Report is concerned, in that the proposed amendments are not incorporated in the Report as such, nor does the Report at any stage refer to the amendments, it would seem to me that the work of the Select Committee has not yet been finalised. Their work is pending in that it is not satisfactory to the entire body of the House, so it seems as though this matter should revert back to the Select Committee, and the present Report of the Select Committee be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Can I have a motion?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, I think we are in difficulties here because the House has taken a vote on what was not a Report. I think that procedure has got to be corrected. The records of Parliament have got to show a correction of the last vote.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It seems to me that what we are going to do now will correct the record.

The question that the Report of the Select Committee on the Dental Registration Bill be withdrawn, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this matter now goes back to the Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed on the understanding that the matter is referred to the Select Committee and the canvassing of all the various parties interested will be accommodated.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. Private Members' Business could very well be taken for half an hour at the outset until dinner time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for St. Michael West wishes to proceed with his Resolution of concern at the behaviour of the Minister of Labour, I would advise him to speak now or hereafter hold his peace, because his Resolution will expire by the 24th. I am going to move, because I know the hon. member for St. James wishes to make a statement about Item No. 3 - this was envisaged in my speech and I know he wishes to make a statement - that Item No. 3 be the first Item under Private Members' Business, but hon. members are anxious to accommodate the hon. member for St. Michael West. We would not like him to think that because he is on the other side that the Leader of the Opposition is not going to give him every opportunity to move his vote of censure on the Minister of Labour. So if he would care I will have some consultation with him - I have some reliance he would not misrepresent me - while Item No. 3 is being discussed.

I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Item of Private Members' Business, and in so doing I do assure Your Honour that I have spoken to the Mover of the motion and I do not believe that Your Honour need leave the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would not accept those assurances, with the greatest respect. It is my own sense of duty to leave the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well the House will have to appoint an Acting Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If you can direct me to that portion of the Standing orders, I should be grateful.

Mr. ADAMS:

Anyhow I move the motion. I believe that the House can appoint an Acting Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I know that the new Standing Orders which we are about to enact would provide for an Acting Speaker, but I am not aware that there is any provision in these Standing Orders for an Acting Speaker.

Mr. ADAMS:

That is the assurance I am giving to Your Honour.

I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first order of the day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 3 be the first Item under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION RE RULING BY Mr. SPEAKER

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that there will be no embarrassment here, and I am going to immediately withdraw this Resolution if no other hon. member wishes to speak on it. I withdraw it in the light that when you go to your Chamber you will see on the Order Paper Item No. 9 under Private Members' Business, and if you were to look closely at my Resolution I believe you would give me the necessary consideration for allowing the first Resolution to go on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not hear the last sentence.

Mr. CRAIG:

If you look at Item No. 9 on the Order Paper and look at the Resolution which you did not allow on the Order Paper, you will then realise that you could probably allow me to have it tabled. You can examine it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Do not let us play with words. If the hon. member wants to withdraw the Resolution, let him withdraw.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am withdrawing it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, as seconder of the motion I have no objection to leave being granted to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection to the member's request for leave to withdraw, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted. The Resolution is therefore withdrawn.

RESOLUTION RE STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER OF LABOUR

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr, Speaker, this Resolution is now so old that a lot of the heat has gone out of the matter, but for the records I could not allow the statement that was made by the Hon. Minister to go down on the records of this country without making a reply.

Firstly, I must say that Your Honour was not in the Chair and the Hon. Minister in my opinion abused the privilege of the House by making a statement in that he departed completely from the statement that was printed and made a tirade on the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union who happens to be me to which I could not reply, and which I regard as utter cowardice, because to make a statement and then in parenthesis to attack the person when he could not make a speech was improper. I consider that this was not the best way and he should have been called to order promptly. 7.00 p.m.

I rise now to make it clear that the statements made by the Minister - I do not have the record before me because I was not prepared to deal with this today - and which it was pointed out to him were not factual, I can attest to this, that he is alleged to have been reading from minutes of a meeting, and the minutes of that meeting never came to me until two weeks after he made the statement in the House of Assembly. It is a strange thing for the Minister to be making a statement from minutes which are supposed to be proceedings of a meeting when the parties attending that meeting had never seen the minutes. I consider that this matter is now a dead issue, but what I thought the Minister would have done in making a statement like that, was to come to this

House and pledge that the Government was pledged to the policy and the philosophy of the right to organise and the right to collective bargaining, and therefore put it beyond any doubt to the public what the position was in so far as Government policy was concerned. Instead of having a Trade Union in 1973 going on the brink of disaster, going on the brink of a national crisis in order to achieve recognition from a company in this country, and then all the other things about the opening of the docks - and we heard even in here from the Minister that the efforts to get a settlement were rejected, and I made the point, and I repeat it here, at one of the meetings that where the Director of the Employers' Confederation made remarks to the Minister that I considered were insulting to the Minister, the Minister said they were not to him and therefore I say nothing more about that. My delegation considered that the behaviour of the persons was not on the best terms.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, this matter is now ended. We have been able to achieve what we were pursuing. We were pursuing the right of the workers to organise and to bargain collectively. This is a right, and I want to state here now that nothing in Barbados is going to prevent us from pursuing this right on behalf of workers at any time. We are not going to compromise one millimetre or an inch on the basic principle of the right to organise without the approval of an employee. The Government has ratified Conventions 87 and 98 and we feel that the time has come that if the

Government has ratified those two Conventions they should be enshrined in legislation to put beyond any doubt the question of asking for recognition and we would not be going cap in hand to an employer, so I feel that with the statements which have been made by the Minister which will go down in Hansard about the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, and I wrote the Minister telling him that some of the statements he made were incorrect, but he did not withdraw them. He had notice from me as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, those statements are still there, they have not been withdrawn, all I am saying is those statements in the records could not be the true impression because one of the statements in particular gave the impression that the employers and the Union had agreed to all of these things on one day, and suddenly at the end the Union decided to put the port in the situation it was. He said at the beginning before we sat down that all the issues had to be settled and that he was not going to deal with anyone in isolation, but the impression was given that we had reached agreement.

Mr. Speaker, you will know in these circumstances it would not have been a pleasant thing for me to have to deal with a matter like this, we are too busy, I was most surprised when one of the other Ministers said that the Cabinet had agreed to a statement, and one would have expected that a statement like this would have been verified. I have my own conclusions to draw as to why the statement was made, however, the outcome of the issue was not in the way some people expected, because it seemed to me that some people expected some organisation to be crushed in order to indicate that there is a feeling abroad that the Union or the General Secretary of the Union had lost the confidence of the workers. Sometimes in these issues you have to know where you stand and weigh these matters, and I feel that for that reason it was necessary for me to put the record straight. It is not my intention to pursue this matter at this stage any more, and I will ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. LOWE:

I beg to second that.

Hon. P.M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, before leave is given to withdraw the motion, I would just like to make a number of statements. In the first place, I happened to be the Minister of Labour at the time of the industrial unrest, if you may so term it, towards the end of last year, and therefore the Minister to whom the member for St. Michael West had been referring must necessarily be me. In the first place, I deny that I made any tirade against 'any member of this Chamber. It is true that I departed from the prepared text and I referred to two statements made by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union on a public platform with reference to myself. Like the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union I believe that a lot of heat has gone out of this and therefore I do not want to deal with it at length, but there was no tirade. As a matter of fact, with respect to one I said I had no intention of dealing with it, and as regards the second one I said that the former Minister of Labour had a different style from me and there was no point referring me to him. In that regard, Mr. speaker, I deny that I made any tirade against the member for St. Michael West. 7.10 p.m.

As regards stigma, immediately after making the statement, I spoke to the hon. member for St. Michael West who indicated that the statement was inaccurate in three particulars. Now, it is not correct to say that I was reading from any minutes, and that the hon. member for St. Michael West only got the minutes two weeks after I made the statement after reading from the minutes. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I did not have a copy of the minutes. My speech was prepared. I was not necessarily the intention of the Chief Labour present at the meetings held at the Office of the Officer. The fact is that at the end of the

meeting,

Chief Labour Officer. The meetings were held at my although the member for St. Michael West had direction. I directed the Chief Labour Officer to make some reference to it at the beginning of that

Convene the meetings, because during that week particular meeting to which reference was made, at there were about three different labour problems the end of the meeting reference was also made to that came up for consideration. I directed the it. Sir, this as it stands, is not incorrect, but it Chief Labour Officer to hold a meeting every day, would have been more accurate had it been stated if necessary, until all three problems were resolved. that the General Secretary of the Barbados

There were two meetings: one on Thursday and Workers Union referred again at the end of the one on Friday. Those meetings lasted for several meeting to the issue at the Port, hours. It Was the following Tuesday that I made my statement in the House. When I asked the Chief Mr. Speaker, I do not, honestly, want to go Labour Officer for a copy of the minutes of those any further into this. As regards to the point which meetings, he told me that the meetings lasted so the member for St. Michael West thought I would long that it was impossible for the officers taking have made, that is, a reiteration of Government's notes to get a record out of those meetings. principle of collective bargaining, this is so well known, Mr. Speaker, that I did not think it

I repeat that the statement made by me in necessary at that time, because it was this

this Chamber was, in fact, prepared by the Chief Government that fought hard to get these Labour Officer, who was the Chairman at the principles enshrined in the Constitution in 1956. A meeting, and he assured me on several occasions of Conference attended by the General Secretary of the accuracy of the Report. I do not want to the Barbados Workers Union, who is the member shelter behind any civil servant, and I take for St. Michael West, was also attended by myself complete responsibility for the statement I have 1956. I think that these things are so well made. It is true that I was not present at the known that repeating them would be like carrying meeting, but I am the Minister and I take complete water to the sea. Of course, that might have been responsibility for the statement made. What is the hon. member for St. Michael West's approach more, Mr. Speaker, is that the minutes, to the matter, but that is not the way I approached

subsequently, received from the Chief Labour it. My statement, as must be known, was a Officer, I believe, will in due course be challenged statement approved by the Cabinet. I assured the by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Cabinet that my statement was accurate, in the Union, because in a certain way they do support same way that the Chief Labour Officer assured me the statement made by me in this Chamber. that his statement was accurate. I had no way, at the time I made my statement, of knowing

With regard to the instance cited by the hon. whether or not my statement was accurate, except member for St. Michael West this afternoon, it is a on the assurances given me by the Chief Labour matter of interpretation. I have a copy of the Officer. Mr. Speaker, these are the facts as there statement which I made in the Chamber, and it is a are today. matter of interpretation. It states: Mr. SPEAKER If there are no objections to "Following the settlement of the Port issue hon. member's request to withdraw his motion, on the 28th September, the Union states that leave will be granted. There being no

objections, unless the Clarke & Tucker issue was settled leave, is granted, that day the strike in the Port should also be called, from 8 p.m. that day."

ADJOURNMENT

The Confederation representatives said that Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I know that they were not properly constituted to consider Private Members were dealing with certain matters, such a matter and so on I do not want to go into that matter in any great detail. It is really a matter of construction. I agree that it could have been so drafted as to remove all doubts that, in tact, the

Union did not wait until a settlement in order to spring surprises. This is a matter only of sequence, and one can certainly read into it the construction applied to it by the member for St. Michael West.

However, this is not necessarily the only I beg to move that this House do now adjourn construction, and I do not believe that this was until Tuesday, 30th January, 1973, at 12 noon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR HON. glad to find out the travelling of the Ministers,

L. E. SANDIFORD because when I put down a Parliamentary Question answer was that the

Hon. L.E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, before this vote is actually taken, I wish to make a information personal explanation. I expect to be out of the country from the evening of the 25th January until SPEAKER The question is..... the evening of the 6th February to attend a meeting of Commonwealth Ministers responsible for youth GREAVES Before you put the in Zambia, and I am asking for leave of the House I do not think I can sit and to be absent from attendance at any meeting of the House during that period. reply given here to any question raised by the hon. Mr. SPEAKER Leave is granted. member.

The question that the House do now adjourn

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I must appreciate until Tuesday, 30th January, 1973, at 12 noon was the Minister of Education's courtesy. As far as I put and resolved in the affirmative without can recall, this is the first time I have ever heard a division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting Minister ask the leave of the House to go for a accordingly. relatively short journey, Sir. We will be only too 7.22 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th January, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 Noon 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); Hon. G.G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; 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); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

Mr. W. R. LOWE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of this Honourable House for the 16th January, 1973, are before you for confirmation. If there are no objections, nor corrections, the Minutes will be confirmed. (Pause.) The Minutes are hereby confirmed.

POSTPONING OF THE LAYING OF PAPERS AND THE GIVING OF GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay certain documents and give Government Notices at a later stage of this sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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 to deal with the first Item under Government Business, which stands in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. I am asking for leave to deal with it in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question 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, 26

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Chairman, this is an Omnibus Resolution. In moving the passing of Head 1 - Governor-General - Item 15 - Furniture and Fittings, the notes are so clearly set out that it is not necessary for me to give any further explanation, However, for the benefit of hon. members, at this stage, I should like to state that the ADC at Government House has represented that the glassware at Government House has become inadequate as a result of breakages, etc., and is now comprised of odd pieces, since no replacements were ever obtained and, indeed, no glassware has been obtained for a considerable number of years now. It is very necessary that a complete table setting be now urgently provided. The following quotations were received for this hand-made cut crystal glass table ware: 48 Water Goblets 260.16

48 Sherry Glasses 235.20

48 Port Glasses 223.68

Claret Red Wine Glasses 223.80

48 Champagne Glasses 235.20

Total 1,353.12 228 pieces Batting 54.72

Freight and Insurance 290.00

Total 1,697.84,

The position is that we are just asking for a token vote in order to place the order. We are asking for a token vote of \$10.00 to enable us to place the order, and the goods should be here in another fortnight.

I beg to move that Head 1 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I really thought that the administrative costs of running this country, having a Prime Minister, numerous Ministers, Heads of Departments, Permanent Secretaries, and so on will make a very tidy sum indeed. Honestly, I thought that we might have been discussing a matter this morning of disposing of the office, or discontinuing the use of the premises now occupied by a Governor-General. It is high time that we consider this matter. However, we are asked to provide glassware by way of replacement. The reason we are asked to provide this glassware is, as the Leader of the House has said, that there have been breakages from time to time. I want to ask the Leader of the House if the glassware at the Governor-General's house is not covered-by some form of insurance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to assist the hon. member, if he will give way for a minute. The hon. member is an old member of Parliament and he knows that even if the glassware is covered by insurance the money cannot go to the Governor-General or the ADC; it has to be paid into the Treasury Department.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not so silly as to believe that Insurance claims, when satisfied, would put money into the pockets of the Governor-General. I would ask the Leader of the House to tell us how many claims have been submitted from time to time for breakages which have occurred. Do you really have an insurance coverage on the glassware at Government House? Hotels have their crockery and so on insured. (Asides.) I am hearing some heckling from one of the Ministerial Benches.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have not heard it.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it is not for you to hear it, and that is why I am drawing your attention to it. For instance, the Minister wants to know if glassware at my house is covered by insurance, as if to suggest that I should not be inquiring whether glassware at Government House is covered by insurance. I am asking about it, because taxpayers' money is involved, and I am interested in the taxpayers. If the glassware at Government House has not been covered by insurance, we are suggesting to the Government that it should be insured. 12.10 p.m.

If it has been covered in the past we would like to hear from the Minister exactly how much has been recovered from the Insurance Companies involved from time to time as a result of claims submitted in the process. That is all we are asking. The note to the Addendum tells us that they have had no replacements for a considerable number of years now. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is telling us that at Government House they had more than enough at some time or other, and a good housekeeper whoever he or she might be, might have found himself, having this quantity of glassware, to be able to stand breakages without replacement for so many years as the Resolution is telling us, and it would mean that somebody has been negligent if it is a case where we have gone without having adequate insurance coverage on the glassware at Government House, and I would pray that the Leader of the House would be in a position to tell us something about this.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire for information if it is the official policy of the Barbados Labour Party that the Head of State be abolished in the person of the Queen as represented by the Governor-General, because that is what I understood from the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, there would be no Head of State at any time under the Barbados Labour Party Government looking like the Hon. , Minister who has just sat down. He would have to be somebody looking like us.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, just in support of my colleague's speech, I am quite sure that the information which was sought from my colleague could be very appropriately answered by the Minister of Health. I am quite sure that he would share his views with some of his colleagues as to whether there should be a Head of State.

There was much amusement from members on the front bench when the hon. member asked the Government if there was insurance coverage on the crockery and glassware at Government House, but I am sure he asked this from the point of view that since Government House has so many years behind it, there obviously would be some kind of antiques there, and I do not think my colleague was referring to a glass jug or a Banks Beer glass. I think when he queried this he was looking at it from the point of view that there could be very good pieces at Government House over a period of years from the first Governor of Barbados which are still in existence, and I am sure that if they had to be bought by any antique dealer they would bring a very good price. When he made such an enquiry he made it with the view that such pieces at Government House should be covered by insurance and there are Insurance Companies who deal with this type of business.

As far as the Head of State is concerned, I think I share the view similar to that of my colleague that whether it be today or tomorrow we at some time or other in our development will surely abolish the post of Head of State and become a Republic where you have a President instead of a Governor-General. I think this is what I understood my colleague to have been putting across.

As far as Item 15 is concerned, I am quite sure that we on this side will have to support it since we realise that there are parties and all these functions for which the taxpayers must carry the heavy burden, and if you have to supply the necessary glasses for them because of breakages, we can only hope that they will buy an amount which will prevent them from having to come back for a very long time.

The question that Head 1 Governor-General - stand party was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving Head 5 - Judiciary, Item 25 - Furniture and Equipment, for the sum of \$975, in addition to the note that the combination safe at the Magistrates' Court District "A" Criminal Court has had to be dismantled because of a fault which developed in the locking mechanism, a request was made by the Attorney General for the purchase of a replacement for it. The funds under his control could

not adequately cover it, and then the Central Purchasing Department assisted by ordering the safe until the funds were made available to be reimbursed. The safe has been delivered and its duty free price which is \$975 is now requested by way of this supplementary.

I beg to move that Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that in addition to this supplementary vote for the replacement of the safe at the District "A" Magistrates' Court that at least one would have had more money being voted for the provision of proper furniture in the Magistrates' Courts of this Island. I believe that as long ago as 1963 we heard of the Government's intention to build a new Court to replace the now existing District "B" Magistrates' Court, because anybody who practises in District "A" Magistrates' Court, or practises in the Court at District "B" at Boarded Hall, the Court at District "D" in St. Thomas or the Court at District "E" at Holetown would know that the conditions are very unsuitable for Courts. In addition to this the new Court House or Court Room that was provided at Horse Hill is nothing more than the Black Hole of Calcutta to those who practise in it particularly in the evening. This is not a reflection on the Magistrates, but on the physical condition of the Court. It is virtually impossible to work properly under such conditions.

We on this side would have thought that at any rate something substantial would have come by now to replace at least the District "D" Magistrates' Court which is, I dare say, the worst of the whole lot, and that is saying a good deal.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat. 12.20 p.m.

I would go further. I think it was during the Estimates in 1970 that I made a speech in which I called on the Government to re-organise the Magisterial Districts as they then existed, with the view to centralising more of the Magistrates' Courts, because of the lack of transport facilities to the out-stations in the country. It is well known that any one who seeks to get from Seawell Airport and around that area to the District "B" Magistrates' Court first has to come to Bridgetown and then take a bus to Boarded Hall. It may well have been that the siting of these courts in the particular districts was convenient to those persons who used to attend court and also to that era, but certainly maintaining these present sites is not convenient to the litigants. Those who have to travel from St. John, unless they take a taxi, it is virtually impossible to get to St. Philip, and I would say again that with the present transportation system where everything is centred in Bridgetown I would seriously urge upon the Government to consider changing the Magisterial Districts with a view to establishing a court in Oistin's Town which could serve the Christ Church area, and perhaps a court in Speightstown which could serve from the Paynes Bay area downwards, and have the other courts sited in Bridgetown. This would lend I think to a greater flow of work being done by the Magistrates and would create less hardships upon the litigants who have to travel to the present Magistrates' Courts.

As regards the District "A" Magistrates' Court I think the time has come when even better facilities than those which at present exist should be provided for that court. I see that under the Ministry of Legal

Affairs there is a vote for furniture and equipment, but I would still like at this stage to mention the present conditions that exist in the Supreme Courts, since this comes under Judiciary, and to urge upon the Government to have a look at it and see what can be done to improve the conditions under which justice is administered in this country. I think those who practise in the courts would know that the Judges' Chambers are not really adequate for people who are called upon to administer justice in this country, and I have no doubt that if the Minister responsible, tours the Registration Office he will see that it is physically impossible for the Registry to continue under the present circumstances. There are people working there with desks jammed against each other, and I would seriously ask the Government or the Minister responsible to pay a visit and look at the physical conditions that exist in the Registration Department and to take urgent steps to alleviate the pressures under which people are called upon to work in that department.

The question that Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 6 - Ministry of Legal Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head there are three Items which need to be supplemented. These are Item 18

- Office Expenses - in the sum of \$175, Item 19

- Law Library - \$2,000 and Item 24 - Furniture and Equipment - \$9,189. The position briefly is that additional posts have been established in the legal department; the post of Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel, Senior Crown Counsel, Administrative Assistant and Secretary. As a result of the moving of the offices of the Ministry of Legal Affairs from Government Headquarters, Bay Street to Marine House, Hastings, the overcrowding in the former offices has been relieved and new allocation of office space is necessary to provide certain Items of office furniture and equipment and library equipment for use in this financial year.

At one time as many as three or four officers had to sit in one room, but we are trying to improve conditions so that they will be able to work with more ease and have greater productivity. Under the new arrangements officers of the rank of Crown Counsel and below will be working two officers to one room, and officers of the rank of Senior Crown Counsel and above will be working one officer to one room. The total sum needed to provide the necessary Items of office furniture and equipment and library equipment is \$7,834. The total sum required by supplementary provision for the purpose set out above is summarised as follows:

Item 24 - Furniture \$3,530 and Equipment

Additional office space 5,659 and library at Marine House

Item 19 - Library 2,000

Item 18 - Office Expenses 175

\$11,364

I beg to move that Head 6 - Ministry of Legal Affairs - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things I have heard members on this side of the House and in the court complain of is the fact that there was no physical separation between the offices of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Attorney General. I hope that now that the Government has acquired Marine House and that the Attorney General's office has been moved to Marine House and also that of the Director of Public Prosecutions, that with the voting of this money we will see not only in theory but in practice a physical separation between the offices of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Attorney General. 12.30 p.m.

I think it is imperative that the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions should be one that should not be subject to any sort of criticisms by any member of this House or any person when, from time to time as we know in the past, it has Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I just want been made the subject of criticism purely because, to explain one or two matters. I think the hon.

I believe, of the physical connection and the member, who has just spoken, knows my views physical lack of space and it had to be housed in about this matter. My views have always been that the same office as the Attorney-General's the Director of Public Prosecutions should be Department. I would hope to see that, with the under the Attorney-General. When we had new offices provided, the Director of Public Independence in 1966, we made a retrograde step Prosecutions and the members of his staff will have in accepting that the Attorney-General, who is a physical separation from the Attorney-General's responsible in the country as the Chief section. Constitutional Legal Adviser....there should be an Independent Republic - I should like the hon.

I note with interest that there is an additional member to realise that, if Trinidad had a similar vote of \$2,000 for the Law Library of the situation to Barbados during those riots, the Attorney- General's Department. It is strange to situation would have been chaotic. The Bahamas me to find that the Government is spending more have now gone Independent and have put the DPP money on the Law Library in the under the Attorney-General. When you had Mr. Attorney-General's Department than it is Keith Walcott as Attorney-General, he was given a spending on the Law Library for the Supreme lot of power. You had Mr. Burton and so on, but Court, which is used by all the practising Barristers when Barbados was going Independent, some as well as the Judges of the Supreme Court. It is people were saying that they cannot trust their somewhat strange to see that the Government is own Attorney-General and we have to let the spending more money on the Law Library that is British push this idea that we must have physical used exclusively by the Attorney-General's separation. I say that the DPP should be under the Department and the DPP than it is spending on the direction of the Attorney-General as is done in Law Library in Coleridge Street, which is the only the United Kingdom. If it is good enough for Law Library available to the Judges. If you do not Britain, why is it not good enough for us? Are we want to consider the members of the practising going to accept this derogation from

power, Bar, then you must consider the position of the because they are telling you that, as a colonial, you Judges, who do not have their own private Law are not capable of exercising power responsibly?

Libraries, as in the case of some practising Must we fall for that nonsense? members of the Bar. It still seems strange to me that the situation could exist that more money is England has the DPP under the spent on building up the Law Library for the Attorney-General. The Bahamas, that have just Attorney-General's Department than on the..... gone Independent, have the DPP under the Attorney-General. Trinidad has avoided having Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have said that any DPP at all, quite sensibly, because, if they had five times already. a DPP when the Attorney-General had to make political decisions during the uprising of the regiment, the whole situation would have been Mr. MOTTLEY If you do not want to hear chaotic. The Attorney-General would have had to me, you can go outside. I think it is a disgrace, Sir, sit down and twiddle his thumbs while a civil that such a criticism should be allowed to exist in servant, owing no allegiance to the country, made Barbados today, and I hope that the situation will important decisions on treason, trial and soon be remedied. In passing, I should like to urge prosecution. I say, without fear of contradiction, the Government now that the present Law Librarian that the only correct position is that the DPP attached to the Chambers of the Supreme Court should be subject to the control and authority of has resigned, that the Government should take the the Attorney-General, if you are going to have opportunity of implementing the suggestion put any meaningful situation in the legal set up in forward some years ago by the then Chief Justice, Barbados. This idea of letting the British Sir Kenneth Stoby, that someone be seconded brain-wash you - the British only did that from the Public Library to build up the Law because they are telling you that you are a young Library in Coleridge Street and the person could nation; you do not have decent and responsible serve both the Law Library there as well as the lawyers in the community and, therefore, do not Law Library in the Attorney-General's mind that the Colonial Attorney-Generals had this Department. I hope that the Government would power, you black boys cannot have it because you take this opportunity, rather than to appoint are now a young nation coming up. That is what someone, who knows absolutely nothing about the British have done to us. what is going on, to have someone seconded in order to implement the suggestion put forward by When Mr. Keith Walcott was Sir Kenneth Stoby as far back as 1964. Attorney-General - you can go and trace all of the pictures in the dinning room - all of them had the power that the DPP had in the Colonial era. In the riots in 1937 Mr. E. K. Walcott had that power, but as soon as you have Independence and you have people coming up, they are told that they do not have the integrity and honour to discharge that function. The same type of criticism made by the hon. member for the City cost the Advocate \$20,000. You have come here saying that you want physical separation of the DPP from the Attorney-General, insinuating that the DPP is not a man of character and, because he sits next door in the same building with the Attorney-General, he is going to do what the Attorney-General says.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. That is one thing I made absolutely clear when I spoke. I was making absolutely no insinuation as regards the operation of the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. It is wrong for the member for St. Michael South Central to say that I was insinuating that. I was not insinuating any such charge, but charges were made in here before. 12.40 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If the Director of Public Prosecutions is a man of integrity, he can sit in the Attorney General's lap and not be influenced by him; so what is physical separation to do with it? The moment you say that you

want him separated, raised in my mind the suspicion that you are of the point of view that he is being influenced and can be influenced by the proximity of the Attorney General. What else do you want physical separation for unless you are saying that the proximity of the Director of Public Prosecutions to the Attorney General enables the Attorney General to influence the D.P.P.? You cannot have it both ways. You are pressing for physical separation. You admit that he is a man of integrity, so if he is a man of integrity there is no need for separation because he will discharge his functions under the Constitution as he should. As soon as you want physical separation, you raise in my mind the suspicion that in the back of your mind, you feel that the Attorney General can influence the Director of Public Prosecutions and he is not the man of integrity that he is held out to be. You cannot have it both ways.

The second point I want to make is on the Law Library. The Government has every right to spend more money on the Law Library than on the library for the Judges. The Attorney General's Department has about sixteen officers and there are four Judges. When I was at the Bar I started building up my own law library, and I know that on your side there are members who have excellent law libraries, for instance, the hon. member for Christ Church West; and all barristers do not rely on the Supreme Court's Law Library to look at any law. You look up a rare volume like the Cox Reports or old English Reports that you do not have or are difficult to come by, but you are expected as a lawyer to buy your own books if you are earning your living by law. I would not be practising law here again in James Street with the struggle you fellows have; so I can afford to talk and I will not have a law library to bother about here. Look at the Attorney General's functions. I can speak because I was an Attorney General. The Government's functions are complex. The Attorney General as the chief legal adviser to the Government has got to advise on every topic under the sun. Take External Affairs - the Judges have no matters to advise on, on External Affairs, but the Attorney General has to buy books on International Relations, International Treaties, International Law and Constitutional matters.' What constitutional case had a Judge to decide on when I was Attorney General? Since Barbados became independent, the Judges have had no constitutional case to look up the law oh.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would know the reason for that, and it is that the rules were never made under the Constitution, so it is impossible to have a constitutional case.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Whatever is the reason, there is no case to which judges have had to direct their minds. The Attorney General has to advise on international financial matters, agreements with the International Monetary Fund, agreement with the World Bank and agreement with the Organisation of American States. What judge had to advise on international monetary matters? The Attorney General has to advise on one million and one matters under the sun. He does not do it all by himself because you do not keep a dog and bark too, so he has officers under him to do minor things, but the responsibility is his. It is not magical that you spend more money. If you become Attorney General, which is very unlikely, you will then realise the multiplicity of subjects on which the Attorney General has to advise the Government, because once you get the blanket from the Attorney General that this is legal or illegal or cannot be done, that is the answer.

The judges do not have to do any legal drafting. There are books on legal drafting. Everyday the Attorney General has to interpret statutes and regulations; so when you look at it and rationalise the

Attorney General, apart from the fact that he has more officers, you do not buy books by officers, but by the needs. How many judges have had to look at rate cases? I had to send to Washington for books on rate case matters in connection with the Telephone Company. Do not mind the result, but the point is that you have to read the books and know what the idea is all about because it is not an English type of method. You cannot get any English authority for it as you know; it is based on the American Public Service Commission operations. There is a multiplicity of matters on which the Attorney General has to have authority if he is going to be worth his salt, with the result that he has got to get more books than four judges trying Criminal Assizes, because once you have Arch bold and you keep up with the All England Law Reports and the Criminal Law Reveiw you are all right. Nine-tenths of the work is criminal, and the civil cases here do not tax anybody's brain. When the Government is forming a company or advising a company, you have to look up the law. That is how the Attorney General, if he is doing his job, has to operate.

The hon. member would understand that whereas there is one man holding responsibility for the entire aspect of Government advice, the judges sometimes do not have a case at all. When the Government is escheating property, you have to have books, you have to know the history; so there is no magic. Do not get up and say you are surprised because you should not be surprised because the Attorney General covers everything in his own person in contra-distinction to judges whose work entail a few wills, a few letters of administration, a little running down case and so on, and some of the judges say they do not have anything to do. Do you think the Attorney General can tell you he has nothing to do? He is working all the time. I want the hon. member not to be surprised because it can be explained away why the Government is bound to spend more money on the Law Library for the Attorney General than for the Law Library for judges. The Attorney General has got to advise on every single matter in this country, whereas the judges do not have to do it. Lawyers, as I said, keep their own libraries. I would like to know when has the hon. member spent three hours in the Law Library. You have not done it for years. You will read the books you have in your office. You have never spent three hours in the Law Library because you do not have to. You have books in your Chambers and you have legal friends who will lend you a book on what matters you have. Do you expect us to buy all the books for the Law Labrary for the moths to eat? You must spend more money on a Law library for the Attorney General, but you do not understand what the functions of an Attorney General in a country are, so much so that when you went to England you took away powers from an independent Attorney General, which powers you gave to the Colonial big high Lord High Executioners and you are still perpetuating it. You know my views on this, that in no independent country, since the Attorney General would be concerned with treason, sedition, law and order, you cannot have in an independent Republic a Director of Public Prosecutions administering this Vital aspect of the country's survival. Take Trinidad for example, I would like to see a D.P.P. having to sit down and make decisions to prosecute troops from the Regiment in Trinidad and see what would happen. It would have gone up in smoke. If the people elect you and you elect a Government, then you will take the blame. If the Attorney General is dishonest, weak, poor or partial, then the people should kick you out; but as long as you are elected to Government, you cannot run a country properly unless your Attorney General has a final say in the matters pertaining to that country's security, law and order. That is my view and I will stick to it until I die. (Mr. HINDS: They never accepted your advice.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Whom is the hon. member addressing?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I would not have expected the speech that came from the hon. member to come from one who has practised law or was Attorney General. When the hon. member can get up and say that the judges do not have anything to do, the hon. member cannot really be serious. He said that in the rate case he had to send to Washington for a volume, but the very rate case was taken before a judge in the Supreme Court. What must he do? Must he send down to the Attorney General and beg him to lend him a book? All the matters to which he referred in one way or another will eventually end up before the courts of this country. The very rate case of which he spoke ended up before the law courts of this country before the Acting Chief Justice at the time, and it has gone back before the same judge. I do not mind his argument that the judges do not have anything to do. If the judges have nothing to do, abolish the Supreme Court but do not get up in here and talk a lot of nonsense to people who do not know.

The hon. member said that no judges have any cases under the Constitution. The hon. member knows why the judges have no cases under the Constitution. Let him tell the House, whose responsibility it is to make Rules under the Constitution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

They have had no cases under the Constitution, but if you are a lawyer you know that in the absence of Rules there is a Privy Council decision telling you how to get before the Court. So do not tell me that Rules would stop somebody from going. The Rules cannot stop you; Rules cannot stop you from your fundamental rights. The courts would have to entertain it. I agree that no Rules are made, but let me tell you now that the Privy Council has said that in the absence of Rules this should be the approach to the Court; so do not tell me that this can stop you because you know this is the law. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, it is not only a question of text books for the Attorney General's Department. As the hon. member should know when he practised law - I know he says he has no intention of returning to Coleridge Street, it may be that the competition will be too stiff for him - but nonetheless, the hon. member would know that the type of book found in the law library is not so much a text book as would be found in the Attorney General's department. Is the hon. member suggesting to the members of the legal profession that they should go before the Judges and cite cases without text books? Even if members could have law reports in their own chambers, what is the position with the Judges? Are they going to sit down looking like idiots with nothing to refer to? The hon. member is talking nonsense. This year we had published a complete new edition of the law reports costing £3,000, and no law library or court should exist and attempt to dispense justice without this new edition. I will never accept this idea that more money should be spent on the Attorney General's department than on the law library, you may say that you have to buy different types of books for the Attorney General's department than for the law library, but the hon. member when he was Attorney General if he ever visited the law library would know that there was need for law reports, so the hon. member must not give the impression that the Attorney General's department is the only department of Government that does legal work. To come in here and say that the Judges do not do any work is a lot of nonsense and the hon. member should not give the public that impression.

When he talks about the Attorney General being under the Director of Public Prosecutions, that arrangement existed in Barbados before we went into Independence, and he had the responsibility at that stage for the prosecution of criminal cases before the criminal courts in this country, so this is not

something that was pushed on anybody after Independence. It was this Government which created the post of Director of Public Prosecutions and put him in the position where he was ultimately placed in the Constitution. This was a voluntary act on the part of the Government. You gave him certain functions which are separate and distinct from the functions of the Attorney General, and I say there should be a physical separation between the departments of the Attorney General and the Director of Public Prosecutions. His functions are entirely different, it is not a question of advising the principal law officers, it is a question that under the Constitution he is the person who is entrusted with the prosecution of all criminal cases in this country, and for that reason alone his functions are different from those of the Attorney General, and we on this side of the House say there should be physical separation of the departments.

The question that Head 6 - Ministry of Legal Affairs - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 18 - Training Division - was edited.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 18 there are three Items. Item 13 - Training Scheme Fund, \$69,470, Item 16 - Communications, \$250 and Item 19 - National Insurance Contributions, \$280. The notes explain the position and I do not know if hon. members want any further information, but if they wish I can produce it. One of the main reasons why the Training Scheme Fund has to be supplemented is because British technical assistance which used to be £35,000 and which was one of the chief sources of finance for some of our overseas courses has been limited this year and only £20,000 is available for new awards. As a result of what I have just stated, this government had to finance courses for which we had anticipated British technical assistance, and under this scheme there are two courses in estate management for which technical assistance will not be available after the first year.

The cost to the fund of these two courses to 31st March is \$8,450. Apart from that, four agricultural officers are being trained at the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute in Trinidad and six in the Jamaica College of Agriculture which is a new scheme, and the Government has to finance all these. The cost of this is \$19,000. Subsistence allowance has been increased from \$6.50 to \$12.00, and the Barbados Regiment will require about \$50,000 for initial training of members of the Defence Force. Training is due to commence a little later in the year, and \$10,000 will be utilised this year.

Those are some of the reasons, so that the Training Scheme Fund and the sum which we are requesting is made up as follows: Defence Force, \$10,000, course granted by the Venezuelan Government to assist Barbadians in mastering the Spanish language - and the Minister of Lands is now participating in one of these courses and will soon be addressing hon. members in Spanish rather than in English - and Barbados will have to contribute \$16,716, and the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute, \$10,308, and there is a balance of \$32,421.

As far as Item 16 is concerned, the original vote was \$200 and the balance at the end of September was only \$42.00. The rapid depletion is due to the fact that many officers who were to be trained were given very short notice, so we need \$250 to supplement this vote. Item 19 - National Insurance Contributions needs no explanation. I beg to move that Head 18 - Training Division - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that. 1.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one money Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

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 Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time, and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps this would be an opportune moment for Government Notices to be given, and I ask for leave that it be dealt with at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, Government Notices will now be given. There being no objections, Government Notices will now be given.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Barbados Tourist Board for the year 1970-71.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay -

(1) The Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December, 1972.

(2) An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended

31st December, 1972.

(3) The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1973.

(4) The Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1973 and

(5) The Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order, 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions-

(1) A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1973.

(2) A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1973.

(3) A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order, 1973.

(4) A Resolution to fix the salaries of Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teachers in Secondary Schools.

(5) A Resolution to determine the classification of unestablished and casual staff, and to fix the rates of pay of unestablished staff in the Public Service, of this Island.

(6) A Resolution to grant the sum of \$74,038 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the

Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(7) A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of a principal sum not exceeding \$2,000,000, and the interest thereon, the said principal sum to be borrowed by the Barbados Housing Authority from the Barbados Development Bank.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$81,571 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

FIRST READING OF BILL

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A LOAN OF \$3,297,000 US FROM THE FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK TO INTERNATIONAL SEA FOODS LTD.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper stands in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of \$3,297,000 U.S. from the First National City Bank to International Sea Foods Limited, for the purpose of enabling the latter company to purchase boats for use in its shrimping industry.

Your Honour will recall that, at the last Sitting, I think, the hon. member for St. Peter was speaking when further consideration of the Resolution was deferred.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I observe that....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what has the hon. member risen?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

He cannot speak before the hon. member for St. Peter. I am prepared to make a statement, if the hon. member for St. James will indicate that he will give way without prejudice to his rights. There can only be one Speaker in this House whether you are wearing purple, or white, or a fancy hat. From where do you get all of these rulings?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I suppose the hon. member wanted to rise on a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

What I was drawing to your attention, Sir, is that the Resolution.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

rose--

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet. Will the Prime Minister please sit. Are you making a point of order?

Mr. CRAIG:

I was drawing to Your Honour's attention that the Resolution, which we had before us last Tuesday, had asked the Senate to concur. On this occasion, in the amendment, the Senate is not asked to concur.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no amendment on this occasion.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, you must look at the present Resolution before the House and you will see 21 boats for use in the shrimping enterprise and that the Senate be invited to concur therein.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At present there is nothing before the House. I merely, as Leader of the House, intimated the stage we had reached and pointed out that the hon. member for St. Peter was speaking and had moved the postponement. It is in his place, normally, to continue.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker,.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

He is out of order. He never said on what he was rising.

Mr. CRAIG:

You are Prime Minister, Speaker, and everthing else.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member sit.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

He is out of order. If he does not have the capacity to understand what is going on, he should remain silent. Mr. CRAIG You big head idiot ! Mr. SPEAKER Order! Will the hon. member immediately withdraw those remarks. Mr. CRAIG I will withdraw the remarks, but I was not on my feet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Whether you were on your feet or not, I ask you to withdraw them. May I have a motion that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Rt. Horn E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Peter is entitled to speak. The Hon. member for St. peter has

indicated that he will give way without prejudice to his right to Continue the debate. 1.10 p.m.

v The reason for my intervention at this stage is that during the course of the debate I indicated that the Government was considering some to the Resolution as it then stood. I so indicated to the hon. member who was then speaking, and as a result of my intimation both to the Leader of the Opposition and to the hon. member, further consideration was postponed. It is a very simple matter. What we are proposing at this stage in the debate without prejudice to the rights of any other member speaking on the Resolution is to amend the Resolution in the light of some negotiations which have taken place during the interval when the House last met. Furthermore additional information has been supplied, which was sought by some of the members who had spoken up to the time when consideration was postponed. The gist of the matter is that as you will note in the Addendum, an agency of the Government of Barbados has made an agreement with the company in the operation to purchase at par value a further 30% of the shares which will bring the total amount.....

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, this is an alteration in this Resolution and I am asking Your Honour to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I rule that the Hon. Prime Minister is speaking preparatorily to moving this amendment.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I have not said anything about an amendment to the Resolution. I am merely pointing out that at the point of intervention last week there had been certain discussions which had been going on between the

Government and the company, but in view of the fact that the ships were ready, the matter was down for discussion on the Order Paper last week after proper notice had been given.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, if you were to look at the Resolution which is before the House today.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member would let me explain, the paper circulated is not a document of the House until a Minister or somebody else draws the Speaker's attention to it. You cannot draw the Speaker's attention to something that was circulated as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I have not made my point yet. All I am trying to draw to Your Honour's attention is that the hon.

member for St. James has given way for the Prime Minister to speak as a result of something circulated to us.

Rt. Honl E. W. BARROW:

On a point of correction, that is not true. The hon. member for St. James has not given away.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet at the same time.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It is a simple point. I think the hon. member was asking for your guidance on it. In the original Resolution it said "that the Senate be asked to concur in the Resolution". The one that was circulated today does not have that. All we are asking is for a simple ruling on that and whether it is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am now ruling that this new document which has been circulated is riot before the House because it has not been put.

Rt. H6n. E.W. BARROW:

The hon. member does not understand. This is the trouble when you try to help people. As a matter of courtesy we circulated the amendment which I intend to move to the Resolution. The Resolution is going to be amended. I was explaining the point at which the House postponed further consideration and the subject matter of the new proposals which we will be bringing, and then I will be moving the new amended Resolution. I am under no constraint to circulate a Resolution before I move it, but as a matter of courtesy to allow hon. members to see it, we circulated the Resolution. He cannot draw attention to the Resolution before I have drawn attention to it, because I am the person to move the amendment; so when I have moved the amendment and there is something in it which he would like explained or does not agree with, I will deal with that. The House has nothing before it. What it has before it is a matter of supererogation on our part which in future I will not indulge in, giving people something that they are not entitled to and then they get all confused. Their brains cannot grasp the implication of things like this.

The position now is that since the debate took place last Tuesday, negotiations have taken place. I would like to made it clear that we brought this Resolution in for discussion because it was a matter of urgency, but I personally as a member of the Cabinet always felt that there was room for negotiations for greater participation on the part of Government agencies. This was confirmed by a remark during the debate and it was during that that I drew to the attention of the hon. member then speaking that his sentiments to a certain extent coincided with what we had been trying to effect all the time and if he would move that further consideration be postponed, I would be coming back here with some amendments to the arrangements which are set out in the Addendum. You will see the difference between the arrangements which were set out in the first Addendum and the arrangements set out in this Addendum, that whereas before one agency of Government, the Barbados Marketing Corporation was participating to the extent of 20% of the shares, - 10% of which they were being given for nothing and 10% of which they paid for - that another agency of the Government, that is, the Ministry of Finance, the Barbados Development Bank has agreed with the company to purchase at par 75,000 one dollar shares or 30% of the equity of the company.

Without going into the refinements, I just want to say that 10% of those shares are cumulative preference shares which will pay a dividend of 10% whether the company makes money or not, and the other 20% will be fully participating in the way that the Barbados Marketing Corporation's shares are fully participating shares. The over-all effect on the structure and organisation of the company will be that the two Government agencies will have 40% of the voting rights in the company and 50% of the total stock issued by the company which will be all deemed to be fully paid up stock.

I have Resolutions from the Barbados Development Bank and Resolutions from the company confirming these arrangements. The arrangements between the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the company have not been in any way touched by these new arrangements because the B.M.C. continues to hold 20% of the voting stock in the company. Now while this matter was under review, I noticed that the Resolution which had been sent down was worded in an improper manner, and I asked the advice of the Attorney General on this, and what I want to draw to your attention now, Sir, is that I am now moving an amended Resolution with an amended Addendum. The new Resolution reads as follows:

Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of the sum of \$3,297,000 in the currency of the United States of America repayable over a period of 5 years with interest at a rate 2% over the New York base rate adjusted for withholding tax equivalent to about 9% with a commitment fee of 1% on term loan flat to be made by the First National City Bank to International Sea Foods Limited, a company incorporated in Barbados under the Companies Act, 1910 (Act 1910-7), for the purpose of enabling the latter company to purchase 21 vessels for use in its shrimping enterprise.

The first amendment is that the term "boats" has been deleted and the term "vessels" substituted therefor. This is strictly a question of elegance more than anything else because maritime people to which the Minister of Home Affairs agrees do not like referring to ships which are larger than moses as boats. they are known as vessels or ships. They are, strictly speaking vessels that are shrimp trawlers.

1.20 p.m.

The most important part of the amendment, that is, the substitution of one word for the other, is the first, and the second is this, that we have deleted the words "and that the Senate be invited to concur therein and, if concurred in:

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution." Also, the words at the bottom of the resolution below "Speaker." "Concurred in by the Senate this..... day of..... one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three. President." Therefore the new resolution was circulated for the benefit of hon. members so that they would not be surprised. They take an act of courtesy as a legal right. You know, when you try to do kindness to people and you give them one pork chop they want the whole hog, and they want to tell you now what you must do, but in future if they are going to behave like that I will not be circulating anything in advance, although my better instincts tell me this is the right course of action.

Perhaps I should go into an explanation about the Senate. This House is one of two Chambers of Parliament. There is This Place and there is the Other Place. The Governor-General is part of the constitutional machinery of Barbados, because Bills are not deemed to be valid until they are signed by

both the Speaker of This Place and the President of the Other Place and receive the signature of the Governor-General, but there has been from time immemorial a long fight, in all the parliamentary democracies of which we have read, over the rights of the elected representatives of the people to be the sole watch-dogs of the public purse, the sole custodians and trustees of public monies, and not only has this fight taken place in the United Kingdom in what in the Commonwealth is called the Mother of Parliaments, in some instances leading to the decapitation of the ruling monarchs, so zealously did the Parliament regard its rights over finance, but in this very island of ours there has been a long struggle between this House and the Other Place over the rights to preside over the finances of the country. This struggle culminated in the Independence Constitution of Barbados. The battle may have been won but it was not clearly enshrined in the Constitution of the island until the Barbados Independence Order of November, 1966 which came into operation on 30th November of that year both in the United Kingdom and in Barbados and which was laid in the House of Commons in England. Your Honour will remember that just over a year ago through the inadvertence of employees of the Government, whether in here or elsewhere I do not know, but automatically every time we came in here with a supplementary Resolution of the nature of the one we have just dealt with, when Your Honour presided at the passing of that Resolution, these Resolutions used to be sent up to the Other Place and frequently the Government's work was held up because of the absence of meetings in the Other Place to deal with matters of great importance regarding the expenditure of public funds. In looking at the Constitution the advice was given by the Attorney General that it was ultra vires the powers of the Senate to deal with any money Resolutions, and the authority for this is found in Sections 54 and 57 of the Constitution of this Island.

Section 54, subsection 3 stipulates that "Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet signified by a Minister, the House of Assembly shall not-

(a) proceed upon any Bill which, in the opinion of the person presiding, makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax..... etc., etc."

but most important, in subsection (4) of the same section there is an absolute prohibition on the Senate. Subsection (1) imposes a prohibition on a private member, but subsection (4) imposes an absolute restriction and prohibition on the Senate from dealing with any matter of this kind, because that section says: "The Senate shall not

(a) proceed upon any Bill, other than a Bill sent from the House of Assembly, or any amendment to a Bill which, in the opinion of the person presiding, makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing any charge on the Consolidated Fund or any other public fund or altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it or for compounding or remitting any debt due to Barbados;"

Now we come to subsection (b). You may say that this is a Resolution and not a Bill, but what does subsection (b) say? "The Senate shall not proceed upon any motion (including any amendment to a motion) the effect of which, in the opinion of the person presiding, is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid," which are the purposes for imposing any charge on the Consolidated Fund.

The interpretation of a money Bill has been given very wide meanings by several different Parliaments and Speakers, but if we go to section 57, that section fills any vacua which may have been left by section

54 because section 57 says:-

"In sections 54, 55 and 56 "Money Bill" means a public Bill which, in the opinion of the Speaker, contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely, the imposition, repeal, remission, alteration or regulation of taxation; the imposition, for the payment of debt or other financial purposes, of charges on the Consolidated Fund or any other public funds or on monies provided by Parliament or the variation or repeal of any such charges; the grant of money to the Crown or to any authority or person, or the variation or revocation of any such grant; the appropriation, receipt, custody, investment, issue or audit of accounts of public money; the raising or guarantee of any loan or the repayment thereof, or the establishment, alteration, administration or abolition of any sinking fund provided in connection with any such loan...etc, etc."

All I can say is that I have always been of this persuasion, but I have now been advised by the Attorney General that the Resolution in its original state was highly improper and was indeed a violation of the Constitution of Barbados, and I will not connive at, concur in, assent to or in any way dissemble or show any chauvinism, which were the terms used by the Statute of Frauds, in concurring in any violation of our Constitution, and that is the reason why the words have been deleted and it is in the protection of the rights of this House as the sole custodian of public funds. I should like to show members on the other side that far from not wishing a debate in the Other Place, I have been informed by the Leader of the Other Place that there will be a Resolution couched in suitable terms which will not be deemed to be an infringement of our sovereign rights in This Place which will advert to the re-establishment of the shrimp industry of Barbados at the very next Sitting of that Place. I therefore beg to move that we now resume consideration of the Resolution as amended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution as amended admits now in no uncertain terms that we the sole custodians of the public purse are providing the money with which to re-establish the shrimp industry in this country. 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, as amended, tells us that the industry is going to be a viable shrimping industry. In other words, it tells us that the Government has implicit confidence in the industry, Our request of last week, Sir, was that the Government should have a controlling interest. Why the Government, with all of its confidence in the viability of this industry, is still reluctant, in the face of the Government financing the project, to go after a controlling interest, is beyond all of us on this side of the House, and is beyond the reasoning of any creature in our community who has a right to be interested in all that is going on in the shrimping industry today.

Now, the Government is telling us that a Government agency, the B.M.C. will be having 20% of the shares. That is wonderful, Sir. The Development Bank will be having 30%. Now, 30 plus 20 equals 50 in any part of the world, but what is of very considerable concern to us is that the Minister of Finance has shown the House and the world his expertise in matters of this sort throughout the years at every

turn of the tide. How is it that he now comes to us and expects us on this side of the House to support a Resolution

of this kind, when we are told that of the 20% shares the B.M.C. will be holding, only 10% of the 20% will have voting rights?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think the hon. member has made a mistake, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member give way? .

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member will give way, Sir, I will try and explain it to him as best I can. I have stopped teaching since 1940. The B.M.C. have 20% of the shares in the Company, for which they will pay \$25,000 and the other \$25,000 will be deemed to have been fully paid up because the B.M.C. have provided the infrastructure as it were. The B.M.C. are the only entity being given what is equivalent to founders' shares in the enterprise, because the B.M.C. have the facilities. I think the hon. member appreciates that. At no time did I say that the B.M.C. would only have voting rights on 10%. I said that of the additional 30% the Development Bank decided that they would like a kind of anchor on 10% of that, that is 33 1/3% of the 30 - 10% of the shares which they are buying. It should be 10% of the total number of shares. They are buying 30% and 10% would be nonparticipating cumulative preference shares. This is what will happen. Whether the rain falls or the sun shines, the Bank, being a Bank and a cautious institution, will get 10% return on their money in the cumulative preference shares.

If the Company did not pay out money in the first, second or third year, then in the fourth year they would have to pay 40% before they paid any dividends to anybody else, because they are cumulative preference shares. But because they are cumulative preference shares, they cannot have it both ways in company formation. They are non-participating, that is, in one sense they do not have any part of the voting power of the ordinary shares, the 20% stock, that both the B.M.C. and the Bank will have. So 20+20+10 cumulative preference shares would be 50% of the total issued capital paid up by the Company.

Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to explain this in instalments, if you are not suffering from indigestion yet. At 20% dividend the cumulative preference shares non-voting will go back in. Let us say that they pay out a 25% dividend, which I see no reason they should not pay in about the third year. They will get 10% on the first 10, nothing on the second 10% dividend, but go back into participation on the 5. This was worked out at two meetings of the Bank and meetings of the Company. I merely rose to correct the hon. member on the B.M.C.'s shares. The B.M.C.'s shares are fully participating and they have full voting rights, but I thought I might explain in contradistinction what the position of the Bank would be.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, what I said just now in respect of the 10% non-voting was in respect of the Development Bank and not the B.M.C. However, what we are looking at is, why is the Government so reluctant to hold 51%? Look at it the other way. We are lending money to International Sea Foods Limited. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES That is not true.)

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, Mr, Speaker. There is a difference between a loan and a guarantee. I think that I would back a note for the hon. member, but I am not so sure whether I would do it for anybody on his immediate right; but I would back a note for the hon. member, if I had the money, say, \$100. I am guaranteeing to the Bank the repayment of the loan, but I am neither receiving nor lending him the money or vice versa, if he backs a note for me at the Bank. If I lend him the money it is a different thing altogether. You cannot say that we are lending them the money. There is a lot of difference both in law and in fact in the two transactions. In the case of a loan you pull out money, and in the case of a guarantee you are a contingent liability that if somebody else does not honour his obligations, you will. 1.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, we are guaranteeing the loan. That type of thing suits the other side, but looking at the terms under which the loan is to be repaid, what provision has been made if these people who will be using the money fail to pay? I heard somebody saying the boats. If all that was needed for us to guarantee this money, were the boats floating about, why is it that this \$6 million is not being used for the benefit of the vast numbers we have here unemployed, even fishermen? I do not want to go back on that. Is the Government satisfied that International Seafoods Ltd. is not a company that has bought shares or is involved with other companies or has indebtedness to other companies and that we are not now merely putting up \$ 6 million to help them to pay off their indebtedness towards other companies, and we may never see the shrimp industry started in Barbados? What investigations are being carried out in this respect to know the standing of International Seafoods? It is all right for us to be told, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. A is a shareholder or director or Mr. B. as the case may be, but this is a case where the taxpayers' money is going to be ultimately involved. All these directors and other people in this business are merely bringing know-how and some might even come with a lack of interest because after all it is the taxpayers' money, and we would like to know that the Government is on the right foot. In the event of the industry failing, how is the Government going to set about to repay this money? Will they have to come back to this House and seek authority for putting this money? This is something I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance. What is our position in the event that these people are unable to meet the terms of the Bank from time to time ?

If these matters can be explained to us, I am sure we would be willing to hear it, but unless the Government is going to give us some good reason why they are hedging to acquire the controlling interest that they ought to have, in the circumstances we on this side do not see how we can be expected to vote for a Resolution of this sort.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I really cannot reply to the hon. member. He has tacked to windward. The last time I even had a dialogue with the hon. member, because I was glad to hear him say that Government should participate more in this venture. There was no question of the viability of the venture, the integrity of the company which the Leader of the Opposition dealt with fully, and he said they were 100 per cent behind the venture and the establishment of the shrimp industry at a time when we only had 20%. Now we have

50% the hon. member has lost faith. What has taken place? I cannot say transpired because that means leaked out and I cannot even find out what is leaking out over there. They want to scuttle the ship now; they are scuttling the Leader of the Opposition now he is not here. There are scuttling their previous arguments. Are you saying that you are not voting for the Resolution or you are voting for it?

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Finance will agree that I made it abundantly clear last Tuesday that Government should have a controlling interest, and when the Minister of Finance conferred with me here I got the impression that he was coming back to the House today to tell us that Government would be taking 51% of the shares.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I never said that. As a matter of fact, my impression from what I heard in their sotto voce remarks is that they thought Government should have at least 40%. Now I have come back with 50%. What I rose to say is that I will disregard their private conversations because I should not have heard them; but what I am saying here today is that I at no time discussed percentage. I merely told the hon. member that we have been looking at this matter of greater participation and if he would move that further consideration be postponed, I would be coming back with a proposal. Obviously I had to consult the company and the Development Bank; so he will have to admit that I never discussed any 51%. If I may continue I will tell him now about the 51%. The point is a very simple one.

We came in here with a proposal and if we had put it to the vote it would have been carried even as it was according to what the Leader of the Opposition said. The hon. member made an intervention which was a much better intervention than the one he is making today; so it is only comparing him with himself, not with anybody else, and he cannot be vex with anything I am saying. Now what he is saying here today is that he was under the impression that we were going to come back with 51%. What I want to say is this: when you are dealing with a sensitive area like this where they castigated the B.M.C. through the Government on the floor of this House for mishandling the whole operation last time, in these peculiar circumstances if the Government was coming in here for \$6 million to buy shrimp boats, the first question they would ask and indeed would be entitled to ask is who was going to manage them and whether they were the same people they criticised and parenthetically abused. I do not want them to rise to their feet, but read the debates and you will see what I mean. Maybe there was abuse on both sides, not of members, but of people outside. I was not here and I did not take part in that debate. My name was called several times saying that I had friends who were in it. All my friends did was to lose \$30,000 and I cannot stop people from being my friends if they have money to throw away wisely or unwisely. In that kind of atmosphere I am asking the hon. member for St. Peter quite honestly if I had come in here and said that the B.M.C. was going to be given the authority to run this fleet, would he have voted for it? I personally doubt it. You can answer. I give way to the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is entirely out of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not saying that I would have voted for it or against it, but if I had come in here he would have

had to ask a lot more questions than the ones he asked today; who is going to be the manager, who is going to be the accountant, who at the B.M.C. knew about trawling, who knew about marketing? But you are dealing in a sensitive area where you are borrowing money from a Bank for what originally started out as a 100 % private undertaking, and then in discussions with the employment of the facilities and so on at the Barbados Marketing Corporation the question arises of their using the facilities which cost, let us say, \$700,000, and the B.M.C. rightly stuck out for what is described in common parlance as a piece of the action.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation at that stage was not concerned with the over-all picture of Government participation, because they are only one agency of Government, but what they were saying is that all this time that there has been a sort of interregnum, if you like to call it that, or vacuum, nothing happening in the shrimp industry, we have had to maintain this plant, and if you come in here you can press a button and process your shrimp tomorrow, and therefore we feel we are entitled to at least 10% of the equity for providing the facilities which we will rent to you at a reasonable rent, \$48,000 a year, and then we will buy another 10 %. 1.50 p.m.

The Government had not been called in at that stage. The Ministry then comes to the Government and says they are ready to start the shrimp industry and these are the terms and then the question of a guarantee comes in, because whether we are dealing with the Import/Export Bank or with any supplier of goods from the United States of America, which country has special accredited schemes available to their industries for export overseas, and they always like to know that the Government is some way involved not necessarily in equity but in some way to show the confidence of the Government in what is going on that you will have a constitutional position in which the Government is cognisant of what is going on. They do not regard it as a legality, and in so far as the treaty making power may be brought into effect as it will have to be in this instance to get a treaty with Brazil, but that the Government is letting the public know that they are willing to do all things that on their side need to be done because the Government considers it to be in the economic interest of the country.

When you look at the purchase of 21 shrimp trawlers, the money is being lent to the Company of which the Government is now a 50% shareholder, it is not being provided out of the Treasury of this Island - and I hope, and no one expects, that it will ever have to be provided out of the Treasury of this Island - the mechanics for getting the money out is a different matter altogether and that will have to be done in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

The point is that a Bank which is a locally registered Bank gets hold of funds which it can lend to a local company under the Banking Act, so right away you have this peculiar advantage. The first advantage is that the company has nowhere to go, it cannot pick up its trawlers which will be flying the Barbadian flag and take them up to Brownsville in Texas or Jacksonville, Florida or anywhere else, it is a local company the bona fides of which have been established and of which Government is now a 50% shareholder. The money is being lent by a local Bank no matter where they get the funds from, but the ships are being provided by an American boat-building company which is protected by American law on sales of this kind, and in order to qualify for some of the benefits of export aid Government guarantees have to be provided; so all around you are being helped. When the ships come down here, let us assume that we depreciate those vessels at a rate of 20% per annum, if you depreciate them on a straight line basis of 20% per annum in five years' time you have paid for the vessels and the vessels are all also yours because they have been completely depreciated and still have life in them.

Let us say now that the company went out of business after year one. After year one the vessels have been depreciated 20% but the market value of those vessels will be more than 80% of the initial value, but the replacement value of building a vessel in year two will have to be almost equal by 20% more by current price trends all over the world, and wages trends. Mr. Speaker, do I have to go on? It appears to me that I am speaking to the converted now because they asked all these questions but there is nobody here to listen to the answers, and the people on this side understand what the issue is. What I am saying is that in year One you depreciate them but the cost of rebuilding is gone and you still have boats, in year two you have paid off 40% of the money, in year three 60 % and in every year that you pay off for the vessels, you still have all the vessels, but the contingent liability has been reduced now to paying 40% on all the vessels in year three, but you still have all the vessels covered by insurance. Similarly in year four you are further depreciated, you have paid off more money, and in year five you own all of them.

What can happen now? You can have an act of God or the Queen's enemies, a hurricane, earthquake or something, all the vessels get sunk. They are covered by insurance, as has been set out in the Addendum, because the bank insists on the vessels being fully insured, and no matter what happens everybody is covered. I am not saying that it is impossible for the Government at any time under any other eventuality which human ingenuity could not now entertain or devise that Government would not have to pay some of this money, how can I say that? I am not omniscient, but I am saying that it appears to me to be almost impossible for the Government to be called upon to pay when you consider all the normal risks and hazards that are attendant or any kind of entrepreneurial activity. That is all I am saying, I am not saying anything more, and I hope that that satisfies the hon. member but I thought he was in support of the industry, I did not know now that he was against it in a week. What has happened in the last week? I would just like to add this because I thought he was on something which he has not even mentioned today, and that is, that the bank has agreed that at some time in the future when everything is level and it will not be a liability on any future shareholders to release at least 10% of its shares in the first instance to the employees of the company who have done, let us say, three or four year's service and subsequently to the public if necessary. That is all the explanation.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

On resumption

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

There being no questions, Private Members' Business will now be taken. Are there any items of Private Members' Business?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition is out of the

| Island. My colleague, the hon. member for the City, has a Bill in Select Committee stage, and the member for Christ Church West is ill, so we cannot proceed with Private Members' Business at this stage.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 standing in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance be the next Order of the Day. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on land and for connected purposes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE LAND TAX ACT, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I think that by now all the members of the House would have had ample time to study the implications of the Bill which we are now discussing. A memorandum on the Bill, because of the, apparently, intricate nature of the legislation - it is not really that complicated - has been circulated with

the Bill so that members could get a quick appreciation of the changes which are being brought about in the system of taxing land and property in Barbados.

The present system of rating in Barbados follows very closely the system in the United Kingdom in which tax was always based on the annual rental value of the particular hereditament. What I want to say is that the Government has assumed for the past few years - I cannot remember how long - four or five years, that the collection of rates and taxes, a duty which was formerly performed by the Local Government Authorities, initially by the 12 Vestries that we had in Barbados and, subsequently, after the 1958 legislation, by the three Local Government Authorities: the Northern District Council; the Southern District Council, and the City Council, the three Local Government Administrative areas under which the Island was divided as a result of the Local Government Reform following on the Sir John Maude and, subsequently, Professor Jackson's recommendations. It is all part of the history of Government in this country whether at a Local or Central Government level.

The Local Government Authorities, whether they were Vestries or not, had an almost exclusive jurisdiction over the collection of rates and taxes, because of certain functions which were carried out by the Local Government Authorities which have now come to be vested in the Central Government, but which in those days were regarded as functions particularly appropriate to Local Government. The only contention always have been that Barbados is too small a geographical area for these parochial distinctions to be perpetuated, but under that system every year the Local Authorities - I will not go back to say Vestries or Local Governments - decided how much money it would take to carry out the functions with which they were entrusted by law, or which they had taken upon themselves, or by custom and practice from time immemorial presided over. Their method of budgeting and financing was somewhat different from what is now regarded as proper fiscal policy.

They would say that we have so many people to pay; so many services to perform, and it is going to cost \$X. Then the Vestries would decide what trade tax they would levy. It was riot a progressive tax but a fixed tax. The City Council or St. Michael West, having a very wide tax base, might find it possible to impose a 10%, 11% or 12% tax on the traders within their geographical limitation. Then they would say let us see how much money is left over that they had to find, and they would then lay a general rate based on the annual rental value of all the corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments under their control and within their jurisdiction. It was a very antiquated system, but an inherited system from the United Kingdom where in some instances one was confronted, as I myself have been personally confronted, with a situation in which you would be paying 27/- for every pound in the annual rental value of the premises which you occupied. Frequently you had the anomaly that in a low-income bearing district, because of the facilities which had to be provided and the dilapidated and run-down nature of the houses and hereditaments in that area - let us take Brixton, Paddington and areas like that - you would find that the imposition was far more severe then in wealthy areas. Let us take an area like Oxford Street or the City of Westminster, and you will find that the tax rate in the City of Westminster would be immeasurably lower than in a relatively poor district, say, like Brixton and so on. This was the system which we inherited.

You would also find, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when the Island had been subdivided into three Administrative Local Government Areas that the people in the Northern District were paying something in the region of a 30%tax, because the tax base was not as wide as in the metropolitan area, and the people in the metropolitan area were paying a rate of, let us say, 12% or 14%. The first thing which was

done was to tackle the trade tax, and the trade tax was fixed, as far as I can remember, at 19% no matter where your trade or business was carried on. Then some effort was made to rationalise the rates between the three District Councils and, eventually, we settled on a rate in the vicinity of 25%, which may not necessarily have represented the arithmetic mean of the three rates which were then prevailing.

I am just giving a short historical background of the system so that members will understand what we have done in order to appreciate that we have really made almost revolutionary changes in the system of taxation which would be beneficial to everyone in the country and should not impose any unnecessarily hard burden on those who can least afford to pay. I have never been a supporter of the vestry system, and I was glad that I was able to preside over the demise of the Local Government system altogether. I was not elected to become Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the Local Government system, but if it happened during my regime I am very fortunate to have been presiding at that time. It is a system which led to iniquities; it is wide open to abuse in forms in which I do not wish to elaborate on and, generally speaking, it was an obsolescent relic of a system inherited from the Poor Law system in the United Kingdom and the administration of the Poor Law in the United Kingdom basically. This is the function that Local Authorities used to perform. The Poor Law system underwent great changes in the nineteenth century. Those changes are still not as evident in Barbados as I would like them to be. We are in the process, of course, by the development of the society for full employment, of eliminating any vestiges of the Poor Law system in this Island.

Under the new system - I will not go into the full development of rating and valuation, but what we seek to do under the new system, Sir, is to remove the criterion of the annual rental value as the basis for taxation and retort to a new and more realistic and more precise system of the site value as the basis on which the rates or taxes should be levied.

2.40 p.m.

It was called a rate because the amount of tax you paid was based on the percentage of the annual rental value of the property that you paid into the coffers of the Local Authorities.

The Memorandum has been circulated, Mr. Speaker I do not believe in long introductions; I believe in making such introductions as may be necessary to clarify issues which are not clear in the Objects and Reasons. It has never been my habit to get up and read the Objects and Reasons. I would not insult the intelligence of hon. members of the House, because I presume that before they come here they do their homework, and I am not making speeches for people outside, I am making speeches for the edification and enlightenment of members of the House. But the way in which the site value has been arrived at has been a long process of technical skill and cooperation, a long process of administrative details, and I was very glad that members of the Cabinet and the Leader of the Opposition availed themselves of the opportunity of visiting the Land Valuation Office and they have all of them been loud in their praise of what they saw up there.

Unfortunately I was out of the Island and only arrived back in time to attend last Tuesday's meeting of the House and could not attend that visit to the Land Valuation Office, and I should like to pay tribute as the members of the Cabinet have to the people who have been responsible, the Land Valuation Officer and his staff and the United Nations Development Programme experts who have been lent to us for the past few years, both in the person of Mr. Copes and Mr. Chang, people who have worked in the

background very quietly without any great fanfare of trumpets, but have done a very thorough job in the complete reassessment of everything that in Barbados relates to land or incorporeal hereditaments; and not only do I expect that this will be a very firm basis on which we are now building our new system of valuation, but also I hope that other greater administrative reforms in respect of Real Property Law will be brought about, and I am speaking particularly about the system of registration of land which I have been advocating for the past twenty years in and out of this Chamber.

The registration of land would not be possible without the work which has gone into the preparation of the tax rolls, the geo-physical work, the surveys which have been carried out and the actual map work and collating and putting down of the information in a form where it is readily accessible and available to every one who will be concerned, and I hope that very soon the next great measure of reform we will be bringing based on this work which has been carried out will be the registration of land in Barbados which will bring about savings in cost to purchasers and people who are dealing with land. I would not like to say what I could say right now about the present system of conveyancing in Barbados. I have already said what I think about the legal profession, a profession to which I have the misfortune to belong. I said "misfortune" and I would not like the Reporters to get it wrong because I think Your Honour although you happen to be a member of the same profession already knows my views on the malpractices of the legal profession in Barbados, and the way in which the litigants are put to great distress and expense through the indifference and the hanging on to old outmoded forms of conveyancing and so on in the practice of law in this Island.

That is another reason why I take very great pleasure in introducing this Bill, because I hope today will mark the beginning of the end of these abuses which have taken place in the practice of law through the ignorance of the litigants and the general public of Barbados and their reluctance to bring to light the way in which they have to wait for years to get their property transferred and even to come into their inheritances small as they might be. I have been a victim, not a perpetrator, of the system myself, but I am not speaking now as a victim, I am speaking as one of the members of the profession, a member who realises that we have had a long suffering public in Barbados. I have said that we should crown the lawyers with laurels and usher them out of the State.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Do not stray from the subject.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am on the subject, Sir, but when you realise what has been happening in conveyancing in this Island, you will realise that far from the lawyers being crowned with laurels and ushered out of the State, they should be hanged in public. It is iniquitous, it is bad. I am talking now about the way people have been frustrated in getting their rights pursued, and what I am saying is that I am very glad that we are in a position that we will be able if we pursue this matter rightly to put our house in order, and then both you and I, Mr. Speaker, will be proud to say that we belong to the legal profession. At the present moment I do not find myself constrained to admit to any such pride, and having said that I will follow your injunction and proceed with the substance of the Bill.

Now I am not going to deal with the interpretation of what a site value means. I have explained that the capital value of the land as assessed will be the basis on which the new tax will be based. I as Minister of Finance will have the responsibility of deciding how much money will be needed from this

particular revenue sector. Currently it is running at about \$3 million a year based on the old system, but a lot of the values which had been attributed to properties in Barbados - I mean corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments - were values which are now obsolete and were not really the market values of the properties with which we had to deal. It is very difficult to assess market values based on an annual rental basis, because if you take the actual rents, some rents are too high and some are too low; so it is very difficult to know in the absence of a more effective system of rent evaluation and rent control in which you have assessment tribunals based on what it cost a man to maintain a house at a reasonable return on his investment and that kind of thing; it is a system which makes it difficult to arrive at the rate which was fixed by the officers responsible for rating and evaluation under that old system. But once you can assess the capital value of the property, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, because properties are going on the market all the time, that in assessing the capital value you will have recourse to the interpretation of site value, meaning what the fee simple of the land might be expected to realise if offered for sale on such reasonable terms and conditions as a bona fide seller would require. So the only thing that you can challenge under the system is if the valuation officer says your property is worth \$100,000 and you can demonstrate that you would never have offered for sale or asked a willing purchaser who had access to other offers a price more than \$50,000 2.50 p.m.

When you say that you object to a valuation invariably you will be objecting that the price that you would ask for the land as attributed to you by the Valuation Officer and his staff is a higher price than what you would ever ask for. think most property owners, particularly in Barbados, have a very inflated idea of the value of the properties which they own, so I think that we are going to get a much more realistic approach by having the site value, and the site value as modified by any improvements which may be carried out on the land. The responsibility for the administration of the Land Tax Act, Mr. Speaker, will be charged on the Collector of Taxes, not only by sending out the Bills and so on but by enforcing the provisions of the Act, and these functions which he will exercise, will be subject to the directives of the Minister of Finance from, time to time.

In administering the Act the Collector will be required to prepare and keep in each and every year - a term borrowed from the Income Tax Act - a land tax roll, a delinquent taxpayers' roll and a taxpayers relief roll and certain particulars will have to be set out in the land tax roll which are very extensive particulars, and then the delinquent taxpayers roll will contain the names of all those persons who are in arrears, with the particulars of the arrears. Under the directive of the Minister of Finance the Collector will send out a demand notice stating what the valuation of the land is, what the site value of the land is and the rate that the Minister of Finance has instructed him to enforce, and the amount of tax which will be a calculation of the rates as against evaluation.

There are certain parcels of land which are entitled to the exemption from tax and it is not necessary for me to go into that, but any taxpayer who is aggrieved will have the right to appeal against the decision. First he will have the right to appeal against the valuation which has been enforced on his land, and he will have the right to apply for relief in respect of the amount of tax which is actually demanded. Provision is being made for discounts, and the Collector of Taxes has power to issue a distress warrant or apply to the courts. I just want to say here while we are on this subject that I could not for the life of me understand why we should have such a large amount of arrears of Local Government taxes in which I include the taxes arising out of the rates which have been imposed on the annual rental value basis. Why should we have such a large amount outstanding, because years ago I pointed out to the Ministry concerned and to the authorities that there was power under the existing legislation, power which had

been there from the time of the Vestries Act, to distrain on the delinquent property owners without encumbering the Magistrates' Courts of this island with a multitude of judgement summonses and the summonses to come and pay the taxes into the Magistrates' courts, and all the paraphernalia and the procedures which you have to go through before you can collect any money through the Magistrates' courts.

In the neighbouring country of Trinidad and Tobago, even when it was a colony, the same provision appeared in all the Local Government Legislation, and what they did in Trinidad as far as I can remember and which I believe they still do, is that they would publish a notice in the newspaper of all the delinquent taxpayers, which was deemed to be a notice of distress, and I know for a fact that the West Indian mind is such that a person does not like people to know that he owes taxes or that he has not paid his bill for Rediffusion, and these are things which they will pay because it can be brought to the notice of their neighbours in a very substantive form.

First your neighbour wakes up and he hears your Rediffusion is not on and that means that you have not paid your Rediffusion Bill, so they pay that before they pay water bills. Similarly, if they knew that on a Sunday Morning once a quarter they would read a list of delinquent taxpayers in the newspapers published by the Collector of Taxes they would pay them, and I do not see why we should have to go through all this procedure in the law courts when ample machinery was provided all these years by law for the collection of arrears of taxes which I believe would have accounted for at least 95% of the outstanding arrears, but I say that parenthetically because now under the new legislation the Collector of Taxes will have the authority to issue a warrant of distress in the same way that a landlord can under our Landlord and Tenant Act issue a warrant of distress against a delinquent tenant, and the only recourse that the tenant has is to get some kind friend to put in an interpleader action as they call it, very popular in my days of practice in the law courts, most of them spurious actions anyhow, and if we accredited any kind of validity to the numbers of interpleader actions we used to have in the law courts of Barbados, it would mean that nobody in Barbados owned their own furniture, it was always owned by somebody next door or a friend or relative.

The power to distrain I hope will be a power which will be exercised by the Collector of Taxes rather than have a recourse to the Magistrates' court's and the long delays through the normal procedure of suing for debt. Furthermore, the Collector of Taxes will have the power of sale, after taxes which are in arrears are unpaid for a period of more than three months after the expiration of 60 days from the selling out and receipt of the demand notice. Provision is also made in the Act for a Relief Board and the issuance of Relief Certificates, and I think that most of the cases of hardship which may inevitably derive - because whenever you are introducing any new system it is not possible for human ingenuity to devise all the possible variations and contingencies which may crop up - and therefore provision is made for relief so that no great hardship is suffered by people who are not in a position to pay.

In conclusion, I just want to say that the main objective is not so much to collect more money from owners of property. That may happen because we were so much out of date, but the main objective of the legislation which we are now discussing is to modernise the system of land taxation by abolishing the rating system of the 1958 Local Government Act, and to impose a tax on the basis of a site value or a modified site value in the sense of site value in addition to the value of improvements as defined in section 2 of this Act. 3.00 p.m.

There is one outstanding feature of the new tax system which, I think, I should not sit down without mentioning and it is this: because the system is based on the actual site value of the land, the introduction of this new tax is likely to speed up land development in Barbados. We have a situation now, speaking subject to correction, I am speaking purely from my memory, where we have had Town Planning permissions given for vast tracts of land in Barbados. Some of the land is what we call proper development land - land which is not useful for any other purpose but building; some of it is agricultural land which is considered marginal or sub-marginal, and in many instances, especially where plantation development is concerned, there has been a mixture of both.

Now, under the old system, as far as I can remember, there was a War Tax relief measure to encourage the growing of trees. If you had 100 acres of rab land attached to a plantation, and you had a few Mile trees or Casuarina trees on it, you were relieved from the payment of tax, but even if you did not plant the Casuarina trees, because that land agriculturally was regarded as non-productive land - the land which we find on the escarpments going all the way to the North and going East along St. Philip and in patches here and there in the plantation fields in Barbados on the edges, chiefly of escarpments and so on - this land will not bear its true incidence of tax because today that land, in the light of economic developments and the pressure of the population building up in this country, has a very high development value. Indeed, and in fact, some thousands of acres, maybe over two thousand acres of this land in this Island is now not only lying fallow, because it may be argued that it was always land that had to lie fallow because of its rocky and scrubby nature, but lying undeveloped although the price which is expected by the developer's is a very high price when they, eventually, make up their minds to sell.

We cannot afford in a small country like this where there is still some residual unemployment of 9%, where people are looking for decent housing conditions, to have any group of individuals building up what I choose to describe as land banks or land reserves to off-load on to the market at a time when it will be more favourable for themselves. We cannot be lulled into the position of somnolence, that two members of the Opposition are now relaxing in, when we are dealing with the development of land in Barbados. There is only one member alert, and that is the member for St. Peter.

We cannot allow this economy to drift into a state of stagnation, or indifference, or apathy, similar to what I now see exhibited before me. We cannot allow it. We have to look after the interests of the people of this Island and to see that developments are taking place, which will not only provide jobs for people, and keep them alert, but developments which will provide housing which is so sadly needed for this Island. There are far too many areas of land which have been immobilized from agriculture and from any productive form of development whatsoever, because of the present system. The present system, I suggest, encourages people to sit down without developing land.

Let me give you an illustration of what I have in mind, Sir. There are many people who have expensive bits of land scattered around the Island. Particularly on the East Coast there are still open areas of land which are not producing agriculturally because of their proximity to the sea air, but land which has not been developed and very little taxes are paid on the land. I do not like to be personal, Mr. Speaker. I always like to draw attention to things that I know about. I am part-owner of approximately 2 acres of land. I am a one-quarter owner, a joint-tenant or tenant in common, whichever expression you choose to use, with another member who is not in his place, and two other members of the legal profession. We are joint owners of 2 acres of land, which I am responsible for and we pay taxes on it, and I would not accept less than a \$1 a square foot for it. I do not even know what valuation is placed

upon it. Now, this is a classic illustration. We are paying \$10 a year for that land. That is the tax paid for it. That does not seem right to me, but I am not going to quarrel with the Land Valuation Officer. As a matter of fact, the only complaint I have ever had is that I rushed down one morning to deposit the \$10 in the Northern District Council office to discover that they did not have a Mail Box into which I could put the cheque before the Tax Collector changed his mind and sent up the tax. I telephoned him later and said that I came down at seven o'clock this morning to pay my \$10 in taxes, but there was nowhere at all that I could deposit that cheque in the Northern District Council office because there was not even a Letter Box in which I could have put the money. That is my only complaint. My complaint was not against the quantum of the tax.

Under this new system, if the Land Valuation Officer values the land at \$100,000, I may find myself in the unfortunate position of having to pay 1/4 of - let us say that the rate was 1%. Now, 1% of \$100,000, as far as I know, is \$1,000. Then \$1,000 would be the proper tax under the new system and, therefore, my colleagues in the House and I could not afford to keep that land undeveloped just to pay for a few goats and sheep to graze on. We would have to pay \$1,000 a year taxes. If you multiply that a few hundred times in Barbados, you will understand what has happened.

People have been discouraged from developing land because of the low valuation which was placed on land. There is no incentive to develop land in Barbados, and if this Bill does nothing else but to stimulate more building construction, it will go a long way towards relieving unemployment in the Island quite apart and distinct from the benefits which inure to the Government as the authority which has to provide the schools and the other social and other services necessary for running a country like this. 3.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is something that is long overdue in Barbados and I rise because I want to make a special plea. I would like the Prime Minister in whose charge this Bill comes to have a good look at the land valuation in all its concomitants. I am a serious believer that the development of a country depends on the maximum use you are going to make of the land resources that you have, and in this Island, land for hundreds of years was in the hands of a narrow group of people who used it mainly in the plantation system, and now that that is dwindling, land is now retained for the purposes of pure exploitation and they want the maximum price for the land, and it would look to me as if in the next ten or twenty years it would be virtually impossible for any Barbadian to build anything approximating to a decent home anywhere in Barbados, because the land price would be prohibitive.

Sometimes I hear people talk glibly about the cost of living and inflation and I hear economists talk about the inflationary trends, but I would like to say quite boldly and bluntly that the price of land has risen faster in Barbados than any other thing I know of. The Prime Minister made mention of his situation. I bought a piece of land, nothing of the size of two acres because I am not in that affluent class, and as Trade Unionists we do not deal in that area of two acres of land, but I would say that land that was sold less than six years ago at 50 cents a square foot which in my view is a high price for land

in Barbados is getting the sort of price today of \$1.50 and the land sharks are pushing it at \$2.00 if they can, and people seem to be land hungry, land thirsty or land stupid. Whatever it is, it has risen faster than anything. Nothing else you can imagine in the community has gone up as fast as land. What I would like to say to the Hon. Prime Minister is that if the price of land rises too high, it is going to stultify the development of what is essential, housing. I see there is a Resolution here, and I want to say that housing is very important. I must make a special plea that the Prime Minister must look into this serious question of land laws and taxation in relation to organisations and institutions other than the Church because the Church does not build houses for people to live in. While worship is essential and good, you must find somewhere to live after you worship. I feel the time has come. that building societies should be encouraged, and that your land laws and your building laws and your whole concept for people to own and build their houses should be so encouraged that you should study a method of giving tax relief to individuals and organisations who are prepared to spend so much capital in housing in the next 20 to 25 years so that you will increase the pace for housing construction in this community and evolve a new type of economic development.

Now I know that the international economists have put a damper on international housing, and it has come back to them now full blast. Too many of the international organisations played down housing until the Tupamaros have started grabbing people and carrying them in the bushes and holding them up. In the same countries they realise that they could as well devote some of their money into these places for housing instead of paying it out in ransom, and therefore the international banks for development which played down housing ten years ago find today that they can no longer play down housing.

I am making a special plea to the Prime Minister for my own organisation, the Barbados Workers' Union, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will not be averse to seeing something go up in St. Philip, and with 99 acres 10 perches of land we can do a lot to help people as a non-profit organisation. I would like to say that if an organisation can reach the stage of investing some of the workers' money which shows that the workers are willing to save and purchase that kind of land and keep it out of the hands of the sharks, then it would mean that it will go a long way if the Prime Minister can evolve a system where purchasers and people like this and organisations like the Barbados Worker's Union and Trade Unions could be treated like cooperatives. We would like to see that some of the taxation policy that you have for the commercial things do not apply, even the transfer tax, and if they can be relieved of these things they would be able to quicken the pace. I feel that if more of this can be done then we will have a multiplication of this kind of social development, because I do not consider that all of this development is going to be done or can easily be done by one source which is the Government. If the Government finds that it can aid and assist and quicken the pace, not by spending its own funds but by aiding and assisting other people to spend their funds, I think it will go a long way.

I am bold enough to say that I agree with the Prime Minister completely, and I have said this many years ago, that the taxation on land was an inequitable method of taxing people because the two of us could go tomorrow and invest \$10,000 and you find yourself paying a different rate of taxation, or the accretions on the investment are growing faster on the one you have got that you are not paying any taxes on. You spend \$10,000 on a piece of land and put it down and pay less taxes on it than you are going to pay on \$20,000 or the same \$10,000 in another investment, say in a house, and you find that the rate of taxation is greater on the house or any other thing than on land where the accretions are greater and growing faster. Each year you find that land that is \$1.00 a square foot is growing faster than your value in the houses, and I think that this should have been done 10 or 15 years ago. I always seem to

think that land would sell itself; the law of supply and demand would help this. The laws of supply and demand are not going to apply to land in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, because there are more people than you have land, and the ownership of the land is predominantly in the hands of a few private people who seem willing to hold on to it.

My final point is one I have made before. I made this statement before and someone said that I wanted to take over the Government, but I will make it again in the presence of the Prime Minister and this public audience, that I think it would be a good thing if the Prime Minister can enter into serious negotiations with these plantation owners about tenantry lands in this country, not to purchase them, but where people have been living on tenancies - there are laws where you cannot put people off these tenancies, but I do not mean that. 3.20 p.m.

I would like to see these tenancies taken over by the State, the Labour Welfare Fund multiplied and we carry a massive programme of rural development into these areas and have a transformation that will make people understand that this is a new dispensation, a new Government in power and that therefore we intend to throw a different light on the countryside from anything that existed 100 years ago. We should transform the old plantation concept that a tenantry is somewhere where you go through and that it starts with a little gap and disappears into the great unknown. I do not want to mention the Prime Minister's constituency, but there is a lovely one at Kendal and. I should also mention Drax Hall. I feel that we should take over these lands and let the Minister of Communications and Works understand that these roads should really be built and built properly, and have a complete physical and mental reorientation in the minds of everybody in Barbados about the use of lands, and make the people who live in this community understand that the land as such does not belong to any person by accident who happens to have title deeds, but that the land belongs to the people of Barbados who live here, people who have worked for many years for a pittance without being able to save any money. Very few plantation workers have been able to accrue any savings to buy land, the incomes that they earn cannot afford any savings and they have to depend on their children, or win a sweepstake or get a windfall before they are able to buy land. I hope the Prime Minister will give this matter serious consideration. I have confidence that with his intelligence he will see that this has to be a forward thrust and that we in Barbados can take the lead in these things. We do not have to wait until something like this is done elsewhere before we can do it. We have seen since Independence that nothing extraordinary is taking place to make people believe they have to leave this country, and I feel this Bill will mean a lot to the future of Barbados.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, this new system of land valuation and taxation whilst We must admit that it would appear to be bringing about a situation where there will be the stabilisation of land prices in certain respects, we have got to be ultra cautious that it does not at the same time affect other situations which are contingent on all of this. One cannot deny that this new Bill means increased taxation for all land owners. It means this. It means therefore a new sense of land values so to speak. It is going to mean ultimately that the question is going to arise where Government will have to move very quickly to introduce a Bill to control rents, a rent restriction Bill, because the moment that the land owner is called upon to pay more taxes, the occupier of the house on his land will have to pay more rent. We know this, the system has always been that if his taxes go up by 40% he is going to collect from the tenant 80% and even more to cover all this.

We believe that Government will at some stage be taxing in some cases both house and land, and I believe that some consideration should be given to a new interpretation of land as given in this Bill, because as I understand it, land does not in a sense only cover or must not be taken to mean and include an expanse, but certain values attaching thereto as in the case of buildings exceeding \$20,000 or something like that, and I believe the Minister of Finance will throw some light on this to let us know exactly what is a back of it all. We need as well valuation officers who can visit sites, carry out assessments and issue certificates as to site values, and to give certificates as to market value. We need people to be permanently employed in this type of work. This is something I feel Government should be looking into, because as it is at present an application will have to be made to the Chief Valuation Officer and I think only the Registrar can make this application to get this type of certificate. I think that is a bit too close for the comfort of people who would normally be requiring such certificates, and I think it is likely to create some sort of strain on the valuation department from time to time. 3.30 p.m.

We have to be very careful, Mr. Speaker. Land, as we know it, is not likely to be cultivated in the future as readily as in the past. That is common knowledge to all of us. We are going to find that cases will arise where the use of land will vary and, in some cases, too readily for our comfort. These are matters which, I think, the Commissioner of Valuations will have to pay very special attention to as we go along. All sorts of requests will be made from time to time, and the Town and Country Planning Department will have to be very careful in its exercise of discretion in certain matters relating thereto.

Now, a Bill of this nature, I believe, ought to have been given the widest possible publicity before it reached this Honourable House. I feel that it ought to have appeared in the Official Gazette on a number of occasions for the benefit of the general public. It might be said that to publish it in the daily newspaper would have been too costly an exercise, but even the memorandum which was supplied to hon. members conveyed a very considerable amount of information which the members of the public, property owners would have been glad to possess.

This is a very important Bill before us. Because of the fact that we know it is going to bring in a very considerable amount of revenue, it is not for us to just jump after it and say that we are going to give it our support. We must support it, not because it is something new, but we realise that a new approach would have to be made at some stage or other in matters relating to taxation.

Now, we still have to ask if the Valuation Department is really and truly ready to proceed. Is it in a position when we have passed this Bill, to proceed with its work? Will the Collector of Taxes be able to proceed with his work? I can say that there is still much to be done at the Valuation Department's end. I know that there are quite a number of landowners who have not been circularised with the questionnaire from the Department, and hence no return. There are instances where the property of one landowner has been joined on to others making it appear as if it were one property when it is two and sometimes three properties. In other words, the field work in some cases has been shoddy.

I know that the Act makes provision for correcting errors of omissions, but I still say that this is not good enough. If we were to look back at the length of time the Department has been engaged in all of this preparatory work, when the Minister of Finance first gave the date on which he would have liked to begin his work in this matter, he will find that the time has long expired. However, we would like to know that, whatever takes place, provision is made for the average Barbadian to be able to rent a cottage or a home along any of the seacoasts of this Island. One knows how difficult it is at the moment for any

Barbadian to be able to rent what we refer to as a Bay House or a seaside house in Christ Church, the West Coast, and so on. It is difficult, because you will find Canadians, North Americans and others paying the owners of those houses rents in U.S. and Canadian dollars more than one year in advance.
3.40 p.m.

We do not want to prevent property owners from acquiring revenue. We would prefer to stimulate more building, but what we would like to know is that every Barbadian who is in a position to pay a reasonable rent that is charged anywhere on the East Coast or anywhere else has an opportunity to go there when the occasion demands that he should.

Mr. Speaker, on this question of land use and taxation, we would like to know what is going to be the position with respect to plantations where you have vast acres of what you call rab land and the amount of tax that is going to be levied in respect of this uncultivated land some of which

would not even produce sour grass, gullies and the like. We would like to know if it is because they are presently unused and whether you are going to have vigilance officers paying periodic visits to be able to report when a particular plot of land has been changed with reference to its use so that people would not be able to evade certain taxation from time to time.

As we know, from 1st April is tax day from henceforth, but we find that land owners are going to be faced with having two sets of taxes to pay during the next few months. It is not a very pleasant thing, but I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance what consideration would be given. I know how pressed Government is for money, and it is true that there is a thirty days' grace on taxes that become due on 1st April, but I am sure that many people would by that time be looking around to pay an increased tax in respect of the year 1972. However one may look at it, I still feel that the Minister of Finance will have something to say in respect of giving people some sort of consideration when it comes to paying the first tax that becomes due on 1st April, 1973.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think I have a very small contribution to make to this debate since fortunately or unfortunately I am in the real estate business myself. As a matter of fact, at first I thought I had understood the Prime Minister to say two plantations, but he said there were two acres he had to pay taxes on. However, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation has been brought down at a rather peculiar time of the year. One feels that had the Prime Minister brought it down in the month of June in his budgetary proposals, there would have been a public outcry that he had increased taxes in Barbados. Realising this and from his experience as a politician he has decided to bring it down in the month of January so that by the time June comes you will hear that there are no increased taxes and everything is all well and good, just advance! But there is one particular point which I must draw to the Government's attention. I am in full support of much of what the hon. member for St. Michael West said in his speech about those people who buy up land in Barbados in large areas of 25 and 30 acres and then sell it to people at these fancy prices. Sometimes I shudder when I hear what people ask for a square foot of land. Maybe it will shock you too. Only a couple of days ago I was at home and some man with a Polish name rang me and said he had two acres of land for sale and asked me if I was interested in getting it off for him. I said I was quite interested because I am in this business and when I asked him what an acre it was, he told me \$21,000. I am sure that if I said this to anybody they would not believe me. I asked him if he had seen an oil bubble on the land and

told him that in that case it was not me to get in touch with, it should have been the Prime Minister or Shell or one of these people, because he could only get that price if he had found oil on it.

There is something in this whole issue in which I do not understand Government's policy. If we look around carefully we see day after day and week after week a plantation being bought to be divided up into two-acre lots, and as soon as a few acres are sold off, you hear they are no longer selling two-acre lots, they are selling by the square foot. I want to draw reference in particular to some land which I know is now advertised for sale at Graeme Hall. I was not in Parliament at the time, but I am told that Graeme Hall was acquired by Government from a Mr. Godding. I was also told that it was for the purpose of housing Civil Servants which I thought would have been a good idea, as they would have been able to pay a small sum at the end of each month knowing that at that time they had fairly small salaries. We will hear about the Permanent Secretaries this evening; these are the big men, not the small ones. This would have been a good idea for the purpose of allowing Civil Servants or even the small man to have an opportunity of buying this through the Agricultural Development Corporation; but it is now being sold to the Syrians and Jews.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What connection does this have with the Bill?

Mr. CRAIG:

I am dealing with the taxation of land and I am dealing with the same points with which the member for St. Michael West dealt if you would only let me develop my argument. I have observed that this land is now sold at \$1.80 per square foot, and the little man will never have an opportunity to go into these sophisticated areas and buy land. For many years they have to be paying for the land, and in the meantime they have to be paying a higher taxation over a period of years, thereby imposing a greater burden on the small man. 3.50 p.m.

This is a point which I want to draw to Government's attention, that before any of these plantations are cut up and sold, Government should set up some service in the Valuation Department or wherever they care to in the Civil Service for the purpose of having the land assessed before it is sold to people. After they have put in the roads then they must submit to Government a statement showing the amount they paid for the land, the cost of putting in the roads and then Government should put a ceiling figure on the land. I do not think this is too difficult for Government to do, because you find that some people buy land at \$1.00 a square foot and as soon as they are houses on it, the cost goes up to \$1.80 a square foot, and the small man is pushed further away from being able to build his own house. The land sharks are the people who make this great profit on these lands, and in particular the foreigners who come here and buy land and then sell it to the small man at a very high price.

I will appeal to Government that as soon as they find it possible they should set up some kind of service whereby they would be in a position to put a ceiling on these lands which are bought and then resold to the people of this country. I hope that that suggestion, silly as it may sound to some people, may not fall on deaf ears.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Some of the questions which were asked I really do not understand, and I must confess some deficiency in that respect. I understand from the member for St. Peter that he feared

that the new system of valuation and taxation would lead to more taxes, that is, higher taxes per unit, and hence would lead to more rent and he wants to know what the Government is going to do about rent control. I have never disguised my views on rent control, and we have had 11 years to introduce rent control if it was any part of our policy, but our policy is that rent control does not solve the problem of a shortage of housing and it lends itself, as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, to every form of trickery and outright robbery and that the tenants are the people who suffer most under rent control and houses become dilapidated if the people feel they are not getting enough rent for them.

When I was in Singapore a couple of years ago I noticed that a very large proportion of the houses in Singapore, a place roughly the size of Barbados, about 207 square miles with a population of two million people - we have not seen population density as it exists in Singapore - there were 800,000 people living in Government houses. That is 40% of the population which was housed in units constructed by the Government of the country. I do not believe in the kind of welfare state in which the Government houses, feeds, clothes, educates and even puts people to sleep at night, or exercises such a jurisdiction over the size of your family that under the guise of family planning they put a policeman to sleep in your house to see that you do not have too many children. It is the kind of state that I do not expect or hope that this country will ever come to, but there has been a long period of neglect in this country over the basic requirements for housing for the population of this country. We have had a bad land tenure system, an iniquitous land tenure system which has militated against the construction by small independent land owners of a permanent form of structure of which they will be proud.

Indeed when I started practising in this country in the law courts some 22 years ago, week after week we used to have cases of people being given one week's notice to quit land belonging to landlords, and as I think the member for St. Michael West or the former member for St. Thomas would say, you would have to put the house in a paper bag and move it on a Friday night. You had to pull down the house, and most of the movements in Barbados took place on Friday nights before the landlord came to collect the rent on Saturday morning, but frequently tenants would be evicted off land on notice as short as that because of the iniquitous land tenure system in this Island. I do not believe that the Government should house everybody, but the Government of Barbados would have to make up its mind when the Government gets money from whatever source, that the only way to redress the unsatisfactory housing conditions in this country, which are not the worst in the Caribbean - we do not have the shanty towns and slums of Jamaica and Port of Spain in this country, or the favelas in Rio de Janeiro, or the shanties in Caracas - but still the land tenure system has militated against proper housing in this Island, and we have to tackle the land tenure system. I do not believe in rent control, and the Party has not had rent control as any part of its policy because there are iniquities in a rent control system which far outweigh the immediate and physical advantages, therefore the solution to housing shortage is to build more houses, not to impose restrictions on rent. If you impose restrictions on rent you discourage development. This in a nutshell is what our philosophy is on the matter.

In so far as the plantation tenancies are concerned, the member for St. Michael West mentioned two specific plantations over which I have no problem. I must say this, that although I may have been associated with planting by my birth, that I have never been a champion of the plantocracy of this Island. As a matter of fact, they think that I am their severest critic. In so far as the plantation tenancies are concerned we do not have any problem. There is no problem over the trying to persuade the plantation owners in Barbados, and particularly the two that he mentioned - Drax Hall and I think he was referring to Kendal - because both of these Plantation owners although they are not resident in Barbados have

already given me the assurance that the day I am ready to move into Kendal and Drax Hall there will be no problem about handing over. Both of them live in the south west of England and are personal friends of mine. One of them was born on the same day I

was born. It is rather amusing that the hon. member should pick on the two plantations over which I have no problem, and this was an undertaking given to me within 12 months of assuming office in 1961, but by and large the plantation owners are not averse to this, especially since the Development and Control Bill that this Government introduced, there is no plantation owner in this Island who wants to hang on to the tenancies, but our problem is a ridiculous one. It is one of finding a Surveyor who for a reasonable fee or for any kind of fee at all will survey all these tenancies so that we can bring communities in and around the plantations in Barbados, so I would not like that to go by default. As you know, I am the severest critic of the plantocracy, and I have fought my political battles against them. 4.00 p.m.

Some people accuse me of being an offshoot of the plantocracy, which I cannot deny because I did not select my parents. Nobody woke my great, great, grandmother. They all went into St. Lucy's Parish Church, and I am the unfortunate offspring of a system of people who owned land. I cannot apologise for that, but I am, not a protector or defender of the system. I think the system is a bad system, and I have never hesitated to say so in public. I am not trying to get the best of both worlds. I say that the system is iniquitous; the land tenure system is wrong, but the planters in Barbados today, if it is only for economic and not for altruistic and Christian reasons, do not want to hold on to the plantation tenancies.

There are some 4,900 acres of plantation tenancies in this Island, and I have no doubt that tomorrow if we could get the surveyors to go in and we could set up a fund whereby at least the deposits would be available to the people who live on those plantation tenancies, we could take over every plantation tenancy in Barbados and make a decent scene of human habitation for the people who live therein. Take Drax Hall, for instance, the member for St. Michael West suggested to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works that he should go into Drax Hall and fix the roads. Drax Hall is a problem that I have studied. You have Drax Hall Jump, Drax Hall Hope and Drax Hall Woods, and the hon. member for St. George can tell you that Drax Hall is a geographic monstrosity when it comes to the dispensal of human beings and as a plantation. It is well over 1100 or 1300 acres, as far as I can remember, and the tenancies are dispersed at the extremities of the plantation over a long dusty road.

Now would it suit the Government better to take the roads to the people, or to bring the people to the roads, electricity and water? This is one of the problems which our economists and our sociologists must examine, and the kind of work a proper Housing Authority in a proper country should have been investigating. Instead of that, the Housing Authority in Barbados has been dissipating its energies for years in seeing if somebody should get a house to rent from the Farm.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You are veering.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not veering at all, Sir. I am not veering any wider than any of the members on the opposite side or on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Well, come back.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am saying, Sir, that we have talked about housing and taxation and, maybe, a member of the Government should not be criticising the Housing Authority. I am telling you what my concepts of housing should be. I am not at variance with the members on the opposite side on this. All I am saying is that, when we are looking at plantation tenancies, we have to look at the economic aspects of taking services to the people or bringing the people to the services. I do not know if this new system of taxation will in any way induce the proprietors to look at a more rational dispersal of the people who work on their plantations.

It may very well turn out that the lands which now appear to be marginal lands, and on which they may have to pay a high tax and may not be able to collect higher rents from the tenants, may make them decide, under the Land Control and Development Bill, to offer the tenants more suitable living areas closer to the public services such as water, electricity and gas which are now being provided, rather than have the Government spending money going into the back whether it is Drax Hall Woods or Drax Hall Jump. I can only say that I hope it will be Drax Hall Hope for the people of the constituency which the Chairman of Committees represents.

The member for St. Peter asked me to throw light on something. I was listening very attentively, but I really could not find out on what he wanted me to throw light. I thought I had thrown enough light on the subject to satisfy all hon. members. If he would like to consult me subsequently on the matter which disturbed him at the time, I would be very glad to answer it. I regret I was unable to hear what it was precisely that he wanted me to throw light on.

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.

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. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, can the Prime Minister give us an idea as to what is the estimated tax yield as compared with the old tax system?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, you make out of any system of taxation the amount of money you want to make. In other words, there is no automatic amount of money, since it is a new system altogether that will come into the Treasury as a result of the introduction of this Bill. Let me give you an illustration. Suppose all the property in Barbados was worth \$500 million. I am not very good at arithmetic; I have to carry along a small electronic computer when I do my addition and subtraction. Under the new system of valuation, if all the land in Barbados, the corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments, were worth \$500 million or \$1 million the amount of money you would collect depend on how much money you wanted to collect. If you wanted to collect \$10 million you would have to put on a rate that would give you \$10 million which is 2%. I choose those figures, because those figures roughly represent the value of the Island of Barbados in corporeal and incorporeal hereditaments. It is \$500 million, and 1% would yield \$5 million. Under the old system of valuation we would have collected, maybe, \$3.5 million. That would be under the old Local Government system of rating. If we wanted to collect the same amount of money as under the Local Government system of rating, again, we would have to put on .7 of 1%, which would be the rate that the Collector of Rates and Taxes would send out on his demand notes. I hope I have made myself clear. I am not formulating firmly in my mind anything about levying a rate of 1%, so that between now and the 31st March I should collect \$5 million.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I wonder if the Prime Minister would be able to tell us what is the approximate amount of arrears outstanding? 4.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Quite honestly I cannot remember. No demand notes have gone out for 1972-73, so you cannot call these arrears. To 31st March 1972, I really do not remember. It may be \$1 million, \$1.2 million or \$1.5 million. I do not know. I understand the amount is \$1.2 million. I was only hazarding a guess. I cannot keep all these things in my head all the time, I believe in going on and doing things (at the future).

I made a slight mistake. Clause 2 was passed and I have to ask that it be recommitted because there is a certain minor amendment which I would like to introduce there.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 be recommitted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2, I would like to move that in (2)(b) the words "the Relief Board" be deleted and the words "the Collector" be substituted therefor.

I think the proper motion is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part. Without going through the normal procedures which are rather circuitous, that the words proposed to be deleted stand part, I think that if you put the motion that Clause 2 as amended stand part, that would be in order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called and passed. Clause 6 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 6(2)(b) I should like to amend that clause by inserting immediately after the words "paragraph (a) of the words "notice or" So it will now read "the giving to the Collector by the owner of any land registered in accordance with provisions made pursuant to paragraph (a) of notice of any material change in the use of that land."

I beg to move that Clause 6 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 7 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to Clause 7 which I propose as well. I should like to delete all the words in section (b) which reads as follows

"the site value plus the value of improvement as defined by section 2 of the Land Valuation Act, 1969,"

and substitute therefor the words "improved value". I think it means the same thing.

I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I raised this point in the second reading and I would like to ask the Prime Minister again to look at the exemptions. The point I raised earlier is that I would like to see organisations given exemptions. I do not have the Income Tax Act before me but section (d) of this Clause says "land owned and occupied by a benevolent organisation within the meaning of section 85(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1968." I feel that if we are thinking in terms of organisations that are non-profit organisations, cooperative organisations then Trade Unions should be granted these facilities because they are not commercial organisations. Religious organisations are exempt, then there is (f) "land prescribed by the Minister by order made under section 6(2) of the Land Valuation Act, 1969." But I raise this because I feel it could stimulate development if certain institutions and organisations know that they will have this relief. I should like to know how the Government feels about those organisations I have mentioned.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

When the West Indies Sugar Producers were pressing for some clear statement from Mr. Godber who was conducting negotiations on behalf of the British Government for entry into the Economic European Community, the West Indies Sugar Producers and the Governments pressed the British Government for some clear statement to be secured from the French who were then members of the Inner Six, there was a misinterpretation. The French Minister said that he had taken the representation made by Mr. Godber on behalf of the Commonwealth countries to heart, and my interpretation of the French was that not that he had accepted it but that he had taken note that these representations had been made; and all I can promise the hon. member is that I have taken to heart in the French sense of the term the representations which he has made. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The only difference is that I am not negotiating. If I were negotiating I would not have left it that way. I want to know if the Government's policy in so far as exemption is concerned will include such organisations other than those specified. I am very serious on this. We have some old fashioned organisations about here living in the past and trying to get us back to 1898 when we are trying to get into the 21st century. These are the people who by prescription will get these things and the virile up and coming organisations that will do something will not get them, but if I was negotiating I would ask for more. It seems to me that when organisations are having to spend millions of dollars on things they want to know where they are. If the hon. member says he is taking it to heart I will accept that.

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

Clauses 9 to 22 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 23 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

In clause 23, Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment. In Clause 23(3)(b)(ii) I should like to amend the clause by inserting immediately after the word "purpose" the words "other than that", so that the clause would now read "leased, licensed or otherwise disposed of on terms whereby the land or part thereof may be used for any purpose other than that for which it was being used at the time when the application for the relief certificate was made." I beg to move that Clause 23 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 24 to 27 inclusive were called and passed. 4.30 p.m.

Clauses 28 to 47 inclusive were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed. The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to the Second Schedule. In Form A, after the words "Land Tax Act" insert "1973" for "1972". In Form B, after the words "Land Tax Act" insert "1973" for "1972". In Form C, after the words "Land Tax Act" insert "1973" for "1972". In Form D, after the words "Land Tax Act" insert "1973" for "1972".

I beg to move that the Second Schedule, as amended, be the Second Schedule to the Bill.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

The Third Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to the Third Schedule. In paragraph 2, after the words "Land Tax Act" insert "1973" for "1972".

I beg to move that the Third Schedule, as amended, be the Third Schedule to the Bill.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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 this Bill with amendments be now read the third time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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 this Bill with amendments do now pass and be cited as the Land Tax Act, 1973.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am, again, craving your indulgence and asking for leave to give notice of a Resolution which came to hand only after the luncheon interval.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the kind permission of the House, I shall grant leave to the Leader of the House to give notice of one Resolution. There being no objections, leave is granted.

RESOLUTION RE HEAD 24 - CURRENT ESTIMATES (1972-73)

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the Notes to Items 56 and 66 of the Head of Expenditure 24 in Part I - Current Estimates in the Approved Estimates 1972-73. I have already tabled the appropriate Resolution; I am seeking leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Mr SPEAKER:

Is it your pleasure that leave. be granted to deal with this Resolution? Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that the. Resolution to amend the notes to Items 56 and 66 of the Head of Expenditure 24 in Part I - Current Estimates in the Approved Estimates 1972-73 do now pass.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of a principal sum not exceeding \$2 million and the interest thereon, the said principal sum to be borrowed by the Barbados Housing Authority from the Barbados Development Bank for the purpose of meeting the obligations of the said Authority and discharging its functions under the Public Officers Housing Loans Fund Rules, 1958, the rate of interest to be paid by the Barbados Housing Authority to be 7 1/4 % per annum.

We did not ask for permission.....

Mr. CRAIG:

Am I to understand that you are doing this Resolution now?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would sit down he would understand what I am doing. I am asking for leave to deal with it, but if there is objection on the other side, we will wait until next week.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave has been sought to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side would have to object. Let us be reasonable. We received this Resolution after lunch in which the Government is asked to guarantee a loan of \$2 million. We have not even seen a report from the Housing Authority for years, and you cannot just come here and ask for \$2 million because you have eighteen seats. You cannot use your might this way. You heard the comment made by the Prime Minister not too long ago that all the Housing Authority is concerned about is how many houses they can get for their friends in the Farm and at Lodge Hill. The Prime Minister could be much more reasonable than this. I am quite sure the Leader of the House would accept our suggestion not to deal with this now. I have seen the Prime Minister directing his troops from that position; he is not so

quiet this evening, he has on his buttoned jacket.

We are appealing to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Leader of the House not to do this Resolution this evening. It is not fair to us. We have not seen a report from the Housing Authority for two or three years, and we are going to object to doing this now. We know they will throw down the bouncers and that is the end of it, but let it go on record that we on this side object. It is not fair to the taxpayers of this country.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with the operations of the Housing Authority as such, because the Housing Authority is really charged with providing houses for persons who earn \$60 a week or less. This is \$2 million for public officers housing loans; it has nothing to do with building houses for the people whom the Housing Authority Act of 1955 covers. This is really for \$2 million as a guarantee by Government for an advance of money from the National Insurance Fund for public officers' housing loans, and this is not the first time that a similar Resolution for a similar guarantee for the same purpose has come before this Chamber. I know how terribly urgent it is because I know how my office is used by public officers who want to get money that has been passed. As a matter of fact, the position is that there have been several Civil Servants who have been approved for loans but we have not got the funds. If the House gives the guarantee, the public Officer's housing loans section would be able to deal with these matters more urgently. If the House delays in giving the guarantee, then the officers will have to wait until a week later.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is it your pleasure that this Resolution be dealt with now? There is nothing before the House. Can I have a motion to this effect?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

So long as there is objection, it cannot be dealt with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the decision of the Opposition is that this should be left over and we will comply with that.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

Before adjourning I would like to mention that it is my intention to deal next Tuesday with Order No. 4 on the Order Paper which stands in my name, to adopt the Report of the Standing Orders Committee which was presented on the 12th December, 1972. I think hon. members have had ample time to look at the amended Standing Orders and recommendations of that Committee.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 6th February, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, before the motion is seconded, I would like to seek leave to be away from the House for the period 4th to 11th February, as I will be away from this country on Government Business in Dominica.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection to the Minister's request, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave is granted.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second the motion for the adjournment.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 6th February, 1973 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 4.48 p.m.