

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, 24th July, 1973

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 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. R. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mb W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Mfinister, of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. A. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., MA., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members, the Minutes of this Honourable House for the 3rd July, 1973, and the 10th July, 1973, are before you for confirmation. If there are no corrections, the Minutes will be confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. SpeaKer, it would seem that the Minutes of the 3rd July, 1973, are incomplete in that the House went up to the point where lunch was taken. We resumed after lunch when 5 Opposition Members and 1 Government Member were present. I think the hon. member for St. Andrew was present at the stage where there was no quorum, and the House was adjourned. The Minutes of the meeting of the 3rd July, 1973, do not reflect this. There may be other corrections, but as far as I can recall the Minutes are inaccurate.

Mention is made of the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Commissioners of Probates Act. As far as I can remember, the House went into Committee of Supply, and when the adjournment was taken at two o'clock it was still in Committee of Supply. There were two money Resolutions: one was dealt with, and the other one was not completed when the sitting was suspended for lunch, but it was subsequently dealt with. I remember that consideration was given to a Resolution in the sum of \$32,000 in relation to Teacher Training, and this Resolution was subsequently dealt with at the next sitting of the House. I do not see these things reflected in the Minutes of the 3rd July, 1973. It may well be that another sheet should be included in the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member would look at page 6 of the Minutes of the 3rd July.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

My Minutes of the 3rd July only deal with page 2.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Those Minutes are incomplete because I have the Minutes of the 3rd July here with 6 pages.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, the Minutes received by the members of the Opposition are similar to what I have received, and that is why I have raised these points. It means that pages have been left out in these Minutes. The Clerk has been kind enough to hand me a copy of the Minutes with 6 pages. I now see pages 3 to 6 which were missing from the Minutes sent to me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sorry about that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I accept Your Honour's apology. It is stated at page 6

"At 2.00 p.m. Mr. Deputy Speaker suspended the Sitting until 2.45 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order No. 6.

LAYING OF REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS NOS. 87 AND 89."

I do not think this is accurate, because Parliamentary Questions could not have been laid at that stage. Question Time was never reached. The Minutes go on to state:

"ON RESUMPTION AT 2.45 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair, A Quorum was not present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker directed Mr. Clerk to ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

After the expiration of 2 minutes, Mr. Deputy Speaker counted the House and only the following honourable Members were present:.....

ADJOURNMENT

There being no Quorum then present, Mr. Deputy Speaker at 2.48 p.m. adjourned the House until Tuesday, the 10th day of July, 1973 at 12 noon, without Question time put."

Mr. Speaker, at no stage was Question Time reached, and I do not think that the Minutes should have contained the words to the effect that Questions 87 and 89 were laid because that is not accurate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In respect of the Minutes of the 3rd July, 1973, the hon. member is asking to delete the words "LAYING OF REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS NOS. 87 and 89" for reasons given. If there are no objections, those words will be deleted. There being no objections, the words are hereby deleted. If there are no further amendments the Minutes of the 3rd July, 1973, as amended, are hereby confirmed.

In respect of the Minutes of the 10th July, 1973, if there are no corrections or alterations the Minutes will be confirmed. There being no corrections the Minutes are hereby confirmed.

PAPERS LAID ACCOUNTS AND STATEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am commanded to lay on the Table of this Honourable House Accounts and Statements for February, 1972, as submitted by the Accountant General.

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

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Customs (Amendment), Order, 1973. Also Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1973. 12.10 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$13,100 out of the Consolidated Fund, and to place it at the disposal of the Government to Supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to amend the note to Item 11 of Head 101 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology in Part II - Capital, of the Approved Estimates 1973-74.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following -

Resolution to grant the sum of \$202,700 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74. No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the Note to Items 7 and 29 of Head 104 - Ministry of Education Part II-Capital of the Approved Estimates 1973-74.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following -

A Bill to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922.

A Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

I intend to make a motion to deal with the last Bill in all its stages today.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Airports Act, 1970.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

A Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1967.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to amend the Airports Act, 1970, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C.E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1967, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Temporary Minister of Home Affairs, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 50, asked by the hon. member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 98, asked by the hon. member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 104, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 105, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39, asked by the hon. member for St. George North, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 110, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 47, asked by the hon. member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 102, asked by the hon. and learned for Bridgetown, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 103, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 111, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 49, asked by the hon. member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 72, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 73, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 94, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No, 97, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question, No. 101, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 107, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 88, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 90, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 92, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 108, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 109, asked by the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, is ready.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No, 93, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 96, asked by the same hon. member, is ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 99 and 100, asked by the hon. member for St. Peter, are ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 14, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is ready for tabling.

Also, Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 91, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready for tabling. 12.20 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16(4), 20(3), 22(3), 43 and 44(1) be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to seek the guidance of a ruling from the Chair as to whether it is in order to suspend a rule under a Standing Order. I see that the Leader of the House is suspending 16(4) rather than Standing Order 16, but Standing Order 71 says; "A motion may be made at any sitting of the House by any Member to suspend any of these Standing Orders; but such a motion may be made only with leave of the Speaker who must not allow the motion, if it appears to him to be an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of the rights of a minority of the Members."

Traditionally, the practice in this House has always been to suspend the entire Standing Order. During the short period of time I have been in here I have never known that a particular rule under a Standing Order was suspended, I think the entire Standing Order must be suspended and not any part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER; My ruling is that it is quite in order to suspend the whole Standing Order or any part thereof, because by its very nature, even though the clause in the Standing Order relates to the Standing Order as a whole, parts do sometimes spell out in detail very specific points, so I rule it is quite in order for parts or the whole Standing Orders to be suspended. It is true that it has never been done in the past, but it is quite in order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention particularly to Standing Order 20(3) which deals specifically with Private Members' Business, and I am at a loss to think that after having gone through all the efforts and the arguments in this Chamber to produce a comprehensive set of Standing Orders under which the business of the House can be regulated it would appear that the idea is to suspend the

very Standing Orders which put some sort of regulation into the business of the House. Standing Order 20(3) suspends the Order under which Private Members' Business should be done and it might well be that we have no Standing Orders at all, because the Government will use its numbers to facilitate Government Business and not do Private Members' Business. If they want a dictatorship let them say so, but I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is really taking things a bit too far.

I am particularly anxious about 20(3), because it means that the question of Private Members' Business can only come up when Government feels it should come up. They did this without consultation, as far as I know, with members of the Opposition, and I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that it is irregular to have particularly suspended 20(3) which deals with Private Members' Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will observe that Standing Order 16(4) has been suspended specifically to enable Private Members to have more time to deal with their business. This is done specifically to accommodate Question Time since replies to a number of questions have been kid today.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, since the Leader of the House says he is suspending Standing Order 16(4) to deal with Question Time, this Rule states at what time this should be done, so to suspend it does not say that Question Time is coming up, nothing has been said about the time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a point of argument, no point of order.

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962 which deals with the Common External Tariff, copies of which have not yet been circulated to all members, be dealt with in all stages at this sitting. Because of the voluminous amount of work we have before us we intend sitting again for a short time tomorrow in order to complete Government Business.

I am making a motion that the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962 be dealt with in all its stages at this sitting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister saying that it has not been circulated but I have a copy here in my hand of an Act, but I do not know if it is this to which the Leader of the House is referring. The Leader of the House has been kind enough on this occasion to send me by hand of the Clerk a copy of the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962 which he is seeking to deal with, but it is the fattest Act which has ever been submitted to Parliament in my memory. Can we deal with it in all its stages at one sitting? 12.30 p.m.

This is an Act which contains 315 pages. and it is to be dealt with in one day and at one sitting! I do not think the Hon. Leader of the House is serious.

Hon. C. E. TAIJMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am merely intimating that we will be suspending the sitting today in order to deal with the Customs (Amendment) Act at some stage tomorrow. The Schedule is long, but the Bill itself is short.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, this is the whole Customs law of Barbados, and it is contained in the Schedule to the Customs Act. It is 315 pages of 6-point type. It has not been printed in the ordinary type in which Acts are printed. Who can read the Act even if he stood up all night just to check through it? I now see that it is printed in smaller type than 6-point, and we will need magnifying glasses to read it. It is the smallest type I have ever seen in an Act of Parliament in Barbados. This type is very, very small indeed.

The object of this Bill is to provide for the introduction of the common external tariff and so on. Do you mean to introduce a common external tariff without notice at one sitting in the House? After all the noise we have made in here, Sir, about the Chaguaramas Treaty and bringing it before the House to have it properly debated, without giving us a chance to debate it, you are now introducing consequential

legislation that depends upon the Treaty! There is nothing in the Act, and it is only the Objects and Reasons that say what it is all about. (Asides.) Sir, I cannot hear myself talk for the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members who are not addressing the Chair must remain silent!

Mr. ADAMS:

He must learn that he can only bully the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What has that got to do with the Bill?

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, he is quarrelling with me. I would really urge upon Your Honour to consider whether the motion itself, in the case of a Bill such as this, is not an abuse of the Rules of the House. How can we possibly debate the entire common tariff with 315 pages in one day? What reason has been given for it? The Minister has not given us any reason. The Treaty was signed on the 4th July, and on the 24th July it is imperative although the House knows nothing about the background to deal with this. The Opposition could never, under any circumstances, agree to debating something of such major importance in one day, and it would be madness to think that any hon. member could do justice to a Bill with 315 pages in one day or two days.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I must join with the Leader of the Opposition in protesting the treatment that is meted out to the Opposition on this matter. I know that the member for St. Michael West would say that one should be ready to discuss this Chaguaramas Treaty, but what we said about two weeks ago when we objected to the amendment to the Customs Act was that rather than bringing in the Treaty and having it properly discussed, we found that the Government has resorted to bringing in piecemeal legislation at very short notice and not giving the Opposition a full opportunity to discuss this whole question. There is indeed a question on the Order Paper which I asked on 19th June about having an opportunity to discuss the Georgetown Accord even before the Treaty was signed, and I asked whether the Government proposed to lay the White Paper so that we could discuss the implications of the Treaty. The Government did not see fit to give us that White Paper and indeed Barbados is one of the few countries in the West Indies that treated the Opposition with such contempt. Now the Treaty has been signed and again although it is being published in the newspaper, the members of the House as yet have not been

circulated with copies of that Treaty. It has not been laid in the House and we have not been given copies so that we can study the full implications of it; but what we find is piecemeal legislation coming in and from time to time having to discuss this. 12.50 p.m.

It is all right for certain members to say that the Bill in itself is only three clauses long, but the Schedules are important. I can well remember the Prime Minister's budget statement in which he said that there were 376 items which were being affected by the budget, and I wonder whether the other items set out here in the Schedule are those which will be affected so that we will get a further increase in the cost of living in this country. This is a roundabout method of doing it; they come in here today, give notice of it and then want to discuss it tomorrow. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, we must object to this procedure.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this Bill calls for some considerable time for members to study the Schedules. I heard the hon. member for St. Michael West say that if anybody should look at the Schedule it should be the Leader of the Opposition, but we are not paying him any mind. The moment you look at the Schedule you will see it is either going to put additional charges on existing charges or it is going to lower charges on existing charges, and if any Opposition is worth its salt it must have sufficient time to get hold of a copy of the present charges, preferential and general, and compare them with what is now being sought to be introduced.

Rt. Hon. B. W. BARROW :

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really have sort of steeled myself against replying to the diatribe I have been hearing, and shouting will not impress me. The point I want to make is this, the hon. member said the Opposition would like to get hold of copies of the existing charges, but the existing Customs Act is part of the Laws of Barbados, this is nothing we keep locked up in Government Headquarters, and therefore there is no question of their getting hold of it. It should be in possession of all the lawyers of Barbados, because this has been in existence for the past seven or eight years.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat the words I said before. We must have time to get hold of the present Customs Regulations and the charges in order to compare them with what is happening now. This Bill here involves the cost of living and we have to see how it is going to affect the community at

large in order to make any contribution to a debate in this House. Even if we come back here tomorrow, are you saying that somebody must work all night tonight to come back tomorrow morning to discuss this? Has the Government been in possession of this for a long time? As far as I am concerned, there has not been any official document laid in this House dealing with the Chaguaramas Treaty or even the Georgetown Accord, and the Prime Minister promised to lay such a document in the House but this has not yet been done.

They suspended the Standing Orders, they say the Bill is only three clauses long, but then they will go outside and say that the Opposition did not even divide on it. All we are asking is that a little time be given us to make comparisons to see how many things are going to be affected by a Bill as heavy as this, heavy in more ways than one, because it is going to create a new concept in thought among the business men. They want to know what they must do, how they must shift their business and everything. The housewife will have to know whether or not she has to draw her belt one notch tighter as a result of this. Is the Government so afraid of our discovering these facts that they want to ram it down our throats? They have the numbers and they are always saying they can win by numbers.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, is that relevant to the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No, it is not.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that they are going to win by numbers. There is no doubt about that, but I am asking for enough time for us to make our contribution to the debate. History must record the stand of the Opposition, and I do not want history to record that it was pounced upon us at the last minute and we could not do anything. I want the Prime Minister and the Government to be big enough to give us a week before they discuss it. I wonder how the hon. member for St. Michael West knows what is going on when he says he does not read the fine print. I am asking Your Honour to rule in such a way to protect the interests of the minority.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I hope I have made the point that this is a motion, the effect of which is to abrogate the Standing Order, and therefore Your Honour has a discretion to disallow the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a second speech.

The question that the Bill be done in all its stages at this sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. P.M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. LOWE, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. GREAVES, Mrs. EASTMOND and Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES - 12.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. BOLDEN - 4. 1.00p.m.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND NOTES TO ITEMS 7 & 29 OF HEAD 104 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I gave notice of a Resolution to amend the Notes to Item 7 and Item 29 of Head 104 - Ministry of Education - Part II-Capital of the Approved Estimates 1973-74. The purpose of the amendment is merely to ensure that the Note more accurately reflects the purposes for which the provision has been made.

I am, therefore, moving that this Resolution be proceeded with in all its stages.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

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

AYES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P.M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. MORRISON and Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES - 13.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. BOLDEN - 4.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to enquire whether Your Honour received a letter from me about misreporting...

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is most improper. Let the hon. member sit down.

Mr. ADAMS:

Can I not ask if you have received a letter, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is most improper; I will not allow it.

Mr. ADAMS:

May I ask Your Honour if it is the practice that when a member rises, His Honour the Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no matter of privilege involved. It is a question of business transactions and the private relations which exist between the Speaker and all hon. members.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member take

his seat. The hon. member is out of order. Mr. ADAMS: On a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have not yet received any notice, and if I have the matter is still being considered.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I want to raise a point of privilege that I was misreported by the Press.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member sit down. There is no point of privilege. There is no point of privilege that legally or properly arises at this sitting.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act says that ...

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a question of privilege that I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must receive notice of it before I can deal with it at this meeting. You must give notice of it, and I must rule on it. I have not ruled on it, and the matter cannot be entertained at this meeting.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to question Your Honour's Ruling. As I understand the Standing Order, it is not a question of receiving notice, it is a question of receiving your leave. I am asking your leave at this stage, and I am attempting to give the reason why I am asking for your leave. The Standing Order does not say anything about receiving prior notice, Sir, as you get in the case of something of urgent public importance. It is a question of asking for your leave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I hereby rule...

Mr. MOTTLEY:

With all due respect to you, Sir, you must give me an opportunity to ask and then you can refuse me. In accordance with Standing Order 76(1) and (2), I am seeking leave

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must interrupt the hon. member to state that I rule that any leave which is sought must be sought in writing and not orally on the Floor of the House. Any leave which is being sought to raise a matter concerning the privileges of this House must be sought in writing and not orally.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Will you direct me to that Order, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is my ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This is for future guidance, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have ruled.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am just asking for the Standing Order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member take his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to give notice of certain Supplementary Papers.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I object to oral leave being sought at this stage. 1.10 p.m.

I am objecting to leave being granted at this stage.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will make a motion later on then,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Your Honour can rule on my objection. I object to leave being granted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We are now on Government Business and all that the Leader of the House is doing is giving notice of matters.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

With all due respect, that is not correct. On a point of order, the Leader of the House began by asking for leave to lay certain supplementaries. He cannot do this now in the order of Government Business. We have passed the stage where you give notices, and I am objecting to leave being granted and Your Honour can rule as to whether the application for leave should be in writing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We are now on Government Business and the hon. member is entitled to ask for leave to do any matter which he would like to do at this moment.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Standing Orders say that privilege takes precedent on all other business and that a member may raise a matter at any time before public business is commenced; so I am respectfully submitting that if written leave is required for privilege, written leave should be required for Government Business too because privilege is superior to Government Business according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No!

Mr. ADAMS:

Can I further ask Your Honour whether my letter amounts to an application for leave for a point of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled on the hon. member's letter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Package Tax Act, 1941;

Also I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, we have passed the part of the Orders under which...

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given permission to the Hon. Leader of the House to give notice seeing that we are still in Government Business time.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

With all due respect we must go by the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given permission. Let the hon. member sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

How can you give permission? I have objected to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member sit. We are in Government Business time and I have given permission to the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

To do what?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Mobil Oil Barbados Limited Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965.

They all stand in the name of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Oh a point of order, what is the order of business before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Is it not a point of order to deal with what is the order of business before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. The hon. member knows we are in Government Business time.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Government Business time can only deal with those items set down on the Order Paper to be dealt with under Government Business. These things have not been given notice of and therefore cannot be dealt with under Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member sit down. I have allowed them to be given notice of.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

They cannot be given with all due respect.

Mr. SPEAKER:

They have been given notice of. Let the hon. member sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Not under Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member sit down.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to repeal the Package Tax Act, 1941, be now read a first time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Your Honour has said that we are now on Government Business which means that under Standing Order No. 10 we have reached "(r) Orders of the Day." The Leader of the House is now seeking to turn back to Item (k) under Standing Order No. 10 which is "First Readings of Bills" which we have passed already. Once we have reached Government Business, we have passed the first readings of Bills because first readings of Bills is (k) and Government Orders of the Day is (r). I object and I am stating that he is out of order to move the first reading at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has asked for and received leave.

Mr. ADAMS:

To allow first readings to be made?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Yes.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, as far as I have understood...

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am leaving. I am not staying in here to put up with this any longer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member leave quietly.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The hon. member asked for leave to give notice of a Bill, not that it be read a first time; so I do not see how he can ask to give notice of a Bill and then proceed to ask that it be read a first time. That is really tampering with the rules of the House.

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. CRAIG left the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given leave. Let the hon. member proceed.

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

Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. MOTTLEY left the Chamber.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to repeal the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the Mobil Oil Barbados Limited Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965, was read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these three Bills be dealt with at this sitting of the house. Copies have been duly circulated.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 9.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in respect of Head 3 -Parliament. All of them are votes in supply of this Head, and it is a Supplementary Resolution in respect of remuneration paid to officers of the House.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.20 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1973-74 No. 11

A Resolution for the sum of 17,580 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, notice was given of this last week, and again the Addendum is explanatory. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 13

A resolution for the sum of \$34,000 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, the amount of money required is \$34,000, and it is required for the Accountant General's Office in respect of overtime \$11,000, Crown Agents charges \$7,000 and Furniture and Equipment \$16,000. This is not really furniture at all, this is entirely committed to the purchase of an accounting machine for the Accountant General's Office. A token provision was included in the Estimates but the machine was not available at that time. It is now being made available and this is to provide the funds for its purchase. I beg to move that the resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 12

A resolution for the sum of \$3,505 was called.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, this resolution deals with the sum of \$3,505 needed to purchase a stamp cancelling

machine. An error was made in the Estimates and only \$1,520 was included. The additional amount of \$3,505 is needed to meet the purchase of this new machine. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the resolution, but I am very glad to see that the Post Office at Worthing is nearing completion, because I pass there every morning going to the sea and I was wondering when it was going to finish or if another supermarket was going to be finished before that Post Office. It is a reflection on someone when a big supermarket is going up alongside a small Post Office and the supermarket is open and functioning while the Post Office is not yet completed.

What I would like to draw to the Minister's attention is that something must be done about the mailing system. A registered letter was sent to the Town and Country Planning Office and I cannot understand why after three weeks the letter was returned to us at the Barbados Workers' Union because they could not find the Town and Country Planning Office. This was after it went up to Government Headquarters. This is an amazing situation and a very peculiar one. We hope that this is not a frequent occurrence, but it is beyond me that in Barbados it would take three weeks before a registered letter can be returned to the sender after they were unable to find the Town and Country Planning Office. This is a sparkling example of gross inefficiency.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member for the information he has given, and I promise him that I will draw the matter to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, without reflecting on the hon. member, that is the kind of Civil Service answer you get from the Civil Servants. As I understand the member for St. Michael West, the letter was sent to Government Headquarters and returned, this is not a question of drawing something to the attention of the Postmaster General. I have complained time and time again about the way in which public officers perform their duties. I am not here as a solicitor or counsel for the defence for any of the public offices, I want to make my position clear and I do not know if the Parliamentary Secretary is carried away by the importance of his office that he has turned Civil Servant.

I know of a case almost as similar to the one to which the hon. member referred in which a gentleman who was a Minister of Government and who was a representative for the parish of St. John, which I now have the honour to represent, sent two letters to the Town Planning Office registered them, and the letters were sent to the Town Planning Officer or whoever is in charge. It is not the same case to which the hon. member for St. Michael West referred, but I can tell him as a matter of fact that it is a common practice in the Town Planning Office that they are so busy building houses for their friends that they do not have time to look after people's applications. The result is that they are creating unemployment in Barbados, because quite apart from the cement shortage, the building programmes and the hotel building programmes and so on are held up by the people in the Town Planning Office, and I asked them some time ago for a list of all the outstanding applications and they submitted a list of over 200 outstanding applications.

I want to say this now, because I do not have any application before the Town Planning Office, but I will tell you what happened when I had. I made a simple application. A gentleman wanted to buy the house that I formerly lived in, and after I was residing in premises provided by the Government it did not appear to me that the Government Party was in any danger of being put out of office for another 20 years, so I could not leave the house closed up for that period of time and I decided to sell the house. My office is next door to the Town Planning Office, and it took them nine months to reply to my letter. The solicitors rang me up several times and I said, I would not issue any directives, that they should do their work, and I was not going to use my position to jump the queue, I would sit down and wait to see how long they would take to deal with my application. The only reason why they processed the application at all was that another Minister heard me talking casually about it and he went down there and asked them what the Government was paying them for - I did not send him - and within two or three weeks after that they sent me a reply. 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Luther Thorne was the Minister of Education in the last Government. Mr. Luther Thorne sent two registered letters to the Town Planning Office, and you would think that Mr. Elvis Presley was the Chief Town Planner. Return to sender; address unknown; no such number; no such phone. The letters were addressed properly to the Chief Town Planner, Government Headquarters, Bay Street. I saw the letters. I repeat that a former Minister of the Opposition Party sent two registered letters to a Government Office and they did not even open them. They have no filing system. I sent in Organisation and Methods to introduce a filing system and to ask them the reason why they could not find files. For every document that comes into that office they make five different files. This means that we have to spend money providing them with file jackets. When I ask them for an explanation, they said that they did not want other Ministries to see what they were writing. If they had to send something to the Ministry of Agriculture they would make a separate copy of the application and send it to the Agricultural Department. If they were sending something to the Ministry of Communications and Works they would make out a separate file for them. If they were sending something to the Water Board they would also make a separate file and if they were sending something to the Ministry of Lands a separate file would be made.

I am struck that we are so overcome by the fact that we are Government Ministers that we forget that, basically, we are representatives of the people of Barbados and we have been putting up with a lot of tomfoolery and ignorance from the Public Service of this Island for too long, but nobody has ever paid me to be any legal representative of anybody in the Government. When I am asked for a legal opinion, I send things to the Attorney-General who gives the legal opinions. The people in Barbados do not pay me to give legal opinions. They pay the Attorney General to do that, and I refuse to give legal opinions.

The only thing that has kept me in office is that I would hate to see the people on the other side running this country. I would not like to see my children or any decent people's children living in a country that they were running. I have been exasperated and frustrated; so when the hon. member says that he will see the Postmaster General and have the matter investigated - To which Political Party does he belong? That is the kind of foolishness you hear from the Public Service. His Party is a Party with people of action. I am glad the hon. member raised this matter. I am embarrassed, but I want to confirm that it is the practice of the Town Planning Office to send back registered letters. It is no fault of the Postmaster because the Postmaster can only deliver.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution in the sum of \$3,505 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 10

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution in the sum of \$8,493 do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to secona 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 five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and 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. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the five Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION RE APPROVED ESTIMATES 1973-74.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Item No. 2 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister is to move the passing of a Resolution to amend the Note to Item 8 of Head 11 - Pensions, in Part I - Current, of the Approved Estimates, 1973-74. As the Addendum sets out the amendment seeks to remove doubt as to whether those persons whose pensions computation include the pensionable interim payment are also eligible for the cost of living allowance payable from 1st April, 1973. They are not eligible for both.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BAWDENS, ST. ANDREW

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item stands in the name of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bawdens, St. Andrew, for the purpose of highway improvement and soil conservation. 1.40 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVIS:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the acquisition of 1 acre, 1 rood, 39.4 perches of land in the parish of St. Andrew for the purpose of soil conservation works as well as for highway improvement. The reason for this Resolution is for the Government to have a good and marketable title to the property when acquired. There is no difficulty as to price of the property and the requisite notices in the newspaper and in the Official Gazette have been made.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

THE PUBLIC LOAN (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the day is No. 4 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Loan Act, 1961.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, under the Public Loan Act of 1961 (1961-59) the House sought to extend the authority for borrowing from \$30 million to \$50 million. The amending legislation was enacted on 3rd November, 1971, by the Public Loan (Amendment) Act, 1971 (1971-40).

Now under that Act the amount to carry out the Development Plan 1968-72 was provided. The amount of Capital Expenditure for the past twelve years shows that there is an annual increase in Government activity in the Capital programme when compared with previous years. In 1968-69 the amount of Capital Expenditure was \$8.8 million; in 1969-70 it was \$11 million and in 1970-71 it was \$15 million. In the years 1971-72 and 1972-73 the amount was over \$21 million. The Capital Expenditure for this current financial year, Mr. Speaker, is estimated at \$44.1 million, and this has already been approved by the House.

I propose to finance this sum by using unexpended C.D.&W. balances of \$340,000, a Canadian External Loan of \$1.2 million, a Caribbean Development Bank Loan of \$1.1 million, an Inter-American Bank Loan of \$2.7 million making a total of \$5 million. These are the sources from which I am assured that money will be forthcoming. This Bill leaves a deficit of \$38 million. Now of the authorised amount of \$50 million we have already raised \$48,100,000 and the outstanding amount is inadequate.

Under the Bill which is now before us therefore, I am seeking to raise the limit that we can borrow from the issue of local debentures from \$50 million to \$100 million. The law requires that this should be done by a Bill and not by a Resolution.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses i and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

THE SPECIAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 5 is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Special Loans Act, 1968.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, we are seeking in this Special Loans Act to increase the amount which can be borrowed from \$20 million to \$50 million.

The Special Loans Act of 1968 authorised the Government to raise a sum of \$20 million from any bank, corporation, company or other institution, and so far we have raised from two banks the amount of \$18,743,103. It is necessary in order to carry out the provisions of the Government programme that we should be authorised to raise more and particularly in respect of the Coast Guard Service for which we

have ordered the ships, commercial export order coming from the United Kingdom and we need a loan of 70% of the cost of the project. The amount of this loan alone is \$1.5 million which will therefore exceed our authorised borrowing. There are only two short clauses.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIR-MAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 1. 50 p.m.

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

THE ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend section 43A of the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941 (Act 1941-16) as inserted by the Estate and Succession Duties (Amendment) Act, 1961 (Act 1961-37) in order to permit the acceptance by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue of bonds issued by the Barbados Development Bank established by the Barbados Development Bank Act, 1963 (Act 1963-48) in payment of estate or succession duty where those bonds form part of the assets of an estate liable to such duty.

This is just to facilitate the payment of estate and succession duties, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, under Clause 2 I would like to see a principle like this extended. I think the time has come when the Government should give some consideration to these matters in the areas where no profit is being operated by certain institutions and organisations. I think Barbados is at the stage now that greater encouragement should be given to non-profit organisations, building societies and the like so that for succession and income tax purposes you can exempt them. I am sure the Government is not going to lose any money, it will make money if these organisations are exempted. I am speaking selfishly now because I think that the Trade Union should be treated in a similar way because it is a non-profit organisation.

The question that clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (MEMBERSHIP OF BARBADOS) ACT, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, when Barbados became independent in 1966 we immediately made application for membership of the United Nations Organisation and we were unanimously accepted. Shortly thereafter we became full members of the World Health Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, the International Labour Organisation and one or two other ancillary or associated bodies of the United Nations which have been rendering assistance to Barbados even in our

pre-independence status, and we deem it advisable that we should continue in association with them. We then became members in our own right and we therefore had seats in the Councils of these organisations which have been of benefit from time to time to the country as a whole.

I think it was in 1968 that we joined the Organisation of American States, and I would like to go on record as saying that Barbados is the only country in the Caribbean that has stated in 1961 or at any other time in any programme put to the people that we would join the Organisation of American States, and we set out our reasons. Two other countries have joined the OAS, one is the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the other is the Government of Jamaica. What is significant in that case is that although Jamaica applied for membership prior to the Barbados application, the Jamaica Government did not state its intention to do so but put out a feeler to some member countries of the Organisation of American States to see whether their application would have been accepted. The application was not processed, let me put it like that. This Government declared its intention in 1961 to join the Organisation, we did not become independent until 1966, but we said that as soon as we become independent we would do so. 2,00 p.m.

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago hastily put in an application for membership as soon as Barbados became independent and so preceded us into the Organisation by a matter of months, but in truth and in fact they were 6 1/2 years behind the Government of Barbados in their declaration of intention to join the Organisation. Now the Government of Barbados, always having an intention to establish its own Central Bank and to manage its monetary system, made it abundantly clear that it considered membership of the International Monetary Fund vital to the management of our own affairs. The Barbados Government has been for the past four or five years a full member of the International Monetary Fund.

It is very unusual for a country to be a member of what is known as the I.M.F. and not be a member of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which is known as the World Bank. These are supposed to be sister organisations, but they have two separate functions because the Bank is what it says. The Bank raises loans and lends out the money for development, and the International Monetary Fund is concerned with the stability of world currencies. It is a subtle difference between them, but for the past three years we have been holding joint meetings of the Bank and the Fund, although they used to be separate meetings before; so today it is almost a distinction with very little difference because the speeches on World Monetary Reform are made at the Joint Meetings at which the Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and the Governments may be present and frequently the Governors of the Bank are the same persons and identity as the Governors of the Fund. It is very difficult to know on whose behalf, or in respect of which institution a Governor may be speaking from time to time because there is a confusion of identity.

What is significant is that we have stated our reasons for not applying to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for membership, and our reasons are very simple. According to the Rules of that Institution which had been in force up to last year's meeting, the meeting in September, 1972, Barbados did not qualify because of our per capita income for assistance from the special loans or soft loans from the Bank. We were not considered a below-the-line country in so far as the poverty-line countries are concerned, and in so far as the ordinary market operations in the hard loan side of the Bank were concerned. The Bank does not like to deal with projects of the size of the projects which we in our wisdom go in for in Barbados.

We did not have any high-dam schemes or any big project which could absorb \$100 million (US), and so we did not qualify because our projects were not big enough on the one hand, and on the other hand we did not qualify for the special assistance programmes for soft loans because we were considered to be too rich. As I have said before to this House, I did not see the sense of paying a subscription to an institution which takes four years, anyhow to process applications when clearly the activities of that institution were circumscribed by the terms of reference under which it was established and under which it operated.

The quota that we refer to is really your subscription. It is something like \$13 million (US), and it is similar to the quota which we have to pay to the International Monetary Fund. It is based on a certain formula under which we come out fortunately pretty low down in the quantum of contributions or quotas which have to be subscribed to the two Institutions. You may then well ask, Mr. Speaker, if you had not been following the events of the past year: What new thing has happened to bring the Government to Parliament with a Resolution, with a Motion and a Bill to make Barbados a member of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development? A very simple thing has happened.

In September, 1972, Mr. McNamara, who was President of the international Bank, at the Joint Meeting of Governors of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund declared a new policy in so far as the Bank was concerned. I should like to commend Mr. McNamara's speech to members of this House as being a most illuminating and encouraging statement of the position of the lesser developed countries and calling upon the Bank to take new initiatives in regard to their pattern of loan-making to the developing countries and far from ignoring infrastructural projects such as housing, water, light and applying criteria of minimum size and per capita incomes, to take a realistic view of the problems which were confronting the developing nations. This new change of direction has been accepted by all the members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Indeed, I would say that the President of the Bank issued a directive to steer the ship on this new course.

I, personally, had discussions with Mr. McNamara. They had been prodding me year after year for some indication that Barbados would join the Bank. I have been telling them bluntly that I did not see

any point in paying a subscription to an institution from which you could not derive any tangible benefits. I have been giving that as my reason. Last year I had discussions with the Chairman of the International Monetary Fund and also with Mr. McNamara who had been at one time Secretary of the U.S. Government. I complimented Mr. McNamara on his speech, and I told him privately that he was now beginning to talk my language. I gave him an assurance at that meeting last year that I would put the matter before the Government of Barbados, indicating and underlining the new direction in which the policy of the Bank would take. The result of that is that the Cabinet of Barbados make a firm decision on the 21st December, 1972, that is, within three months of the meeting. 2.10 p.m.

On the 12th January I submitted an application from the Government of Barbados for membership of the Bank, and authorised our representative in Washington, the Ambassador to the United States of America to open negotiations on the terms on which Barbados would join. A draft Bill was submitted as a matter of courtesy, but the Bank has had no objections to the draft Bill, and shortly after, on 27th April, 1973, the Board of Governors of the Bank, that is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, passed Resolution N6. 283 approving the terms and conditions of Barbados' membership of the Bank. I am saying this for the record and for the general information of members of the House and the general public. We have not wasted any time once we were convinced that the Bank could do Barbados a good.

The Resolution No. 283, Mr. Speaker, calls upon the Government of Barbados to subscribe to 111 shares of the capital stock of the Bank at par value of \$100,000 per share based on the value of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944, and the current price of these shares is \$13,390,469.13. That was our subscription. Of that amount 10% or \$1,339,047 has to be paid before acceptance of membership in this fashion:- One percent or \$US 133,905 deposited in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and 9% or \$1,205,142 in United States dollars would be the equivalent of local currency to be deposited in an account which the Bank would open with its designated depository in Bridgetown, Barbados, providing that of the 9% portion of the Barbados subscription, one percent or \$12,051 is to be deposited in cash and the rest which is 99% may be substituted at our request by non-interest-bearing non-negotiable demand notes or promissory notes.

After the Bill has been passed arrangements will be made for the payment of the subscription and we will notify the Bank of the Government's intention to pay the 99% of the local currency subscription in non-interest-bearing non-negotiable promissory notes. After we have enacted the legislation, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados will then complete the memorandum of law indicating adherence to the provisions of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank, we will also complete the Instrument of Acceptance and deposit it with the Government of the United States of America, and finally we will sign the original copy of the Articles of Agreement held in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Up to now all we have done is to negotiate the terms and conditions under which we will be accepted as a member of the Bank.

I should just like to add that despite the fact that we are not strictly from the juridical and point a full member of the Bank, by the time I attend the meeting of the International Monetary Fund as a Governor of that fund in Nairobi around the end of September, all of these formalities shall have been completed. Despite the fact that formalities have not been completed and the legislation has not been enacted, I am very pleased to say that- the Bank is already working on projects for loans for Barbados and is in active consultation with one or two Ministries who have actually sent experts down here, so that there will be no delay between our formal acceptance and membership and the implementation of loan projects for Barbados. This demonstrates that my hesitancy was justified and my new enthusiasm for membership is also vindicated.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear the Hon. Prime Minister, but I cannot agree with him that his hesitancy has been justified. I think his hesitancy has been too long. In international affairs you cannot sit outside these days and believe you are going to gain anything by it. You will be wallowing in the little waters of small fishes all the days of your life. The time has come when people in small territories have more to get involved in international affairs than people in big territories, because people in big territories can take care of themselves in any case and they have more surpluses than the small communities.

The Hon. Prime Minister made a statement that Mr. McNamara is speaking his language. I would say that the Prime Minister today is speaking my language. About four years ago we sent a note to the Prime Minister about the International Monetary Fund and we said in that note that we considered that the International Monetary Fund was an institution for developing countries to use and we should make the Monetary Fund people understand that it must reflect the wishes of the developing countries. Sometimes it is good when a person comes out of one Government because there is then not that narrowness with the powers that be, and this is the case of Mr. McNamara who was a Defence Secretary in the United States Government. He has made speeches that are different from what are the old fashioned economics. That is why I challenge the old fashioned economic experts who did not see development in the form of people. They would not agree to housing, but now we find that Dr. Mena and the IADB agree to housing.

I have just come back from a meeting in Vienna where we have passed a Resolution, and the International Trade Union Movement will be having consultative status in Nairobi, and we hope that not the Group of Twenty who are controlling the monetary situation of the world, not the multi-national companies who shift money from one part of the world and make the bank rates move up and down - and you only have to leave Barbados to realise how much it costs you, because the exchange rate makes the money with which you leave here look like a smile before you get back - but small areas like Barbados and the members of the Caribbean and the people in Latin America and what they call the Regional Committee of 77 will be forced to come together and bring pressure to bear because they have a case to put up. 2.20 p.m.

In the Schedule to this Bill it is stated that one of the purposes of the Bank is to promote the long-range balanced growth of inter-national trade and the maintenance of equilibrium in balances of payments by encouraging international investment for the development of the productive resources of members, thereby assisting in raising productivity, the standard of living and conditions of labour in their territories. This is very important so far as I am concerned, because sometimes international institutions do not pay any real attention to the conditions of life of the people or conditions of labour, and I am one of those people who believe that these international institutions can be made to work for the benefit of the people in smaller territories. I am not afraid of international institutions, I am all for them. I am now back from an international meeting, and I feel I can go into the bigger people and talk to them. I do not have these fears, because I realise that you cannot stay on the periphery of things and believe you are going to control the centre, you have to get into the centre if you really want to make any contribution. When you return from conferences people always ask you if you had a good time first, and then they ask what it means to Barbados.

I would like to say to the Prime Minister that he must tell the people of Barbados not only what Barbados is going to get out of it, the people must realise that you can make a contribution not only with money but with thinking as well, and when these thoughts are well expressed by people from the smaller areas these international bodies then have to sit up and take notice, because they will then realise that they cannot push us around. This makes them change their outlook. Mr. McNamara's views could not have changed if he were living in the United States of America all his life, he is a changed man now because the opportunity was given to him by the IBRD to meet men from all parts of the world whom he never expected to meet, and the kind of contribution they had to make to international affairs made him change. As a result of this he has made some of the most brilliant statements any man can make, and in my view he has made some statements that would put some of the politicians and Ministers in some of the developing countries to shame, because when you hear him make a speech you want to know if he is a socialist as compared with what I have been hearing some of our own people saying in these parts where we are struggling, so it only shows that we do not have to believe that we cannot make a contribution when we go to these institutions. My only fear about it is that the Prime Minister has shown the capacity and aggressiveness for these things, but I would like to see it more intensified because you do not want to send people to be ornaments or just to hold seats, this is an area where the aggressiveness coming from smaller countries can make a lot of difference, if not Barbados would gain nothing in the

whole context of the IMF or the World Bank if the person you sent cannot make proper contributions.

I would like to tell the Prime Minister also that these international institutions will give aid and assistance to organisations other than Governments provided the Governments agree, but if the Ministers agree that only Ministers of Government can make these decisions or attend these conferences to seek aid for the country, they will wait until 2099 before such aid is forthcoming. Sometimes the Ministers feel that if some other organisation puts up a request to some of these institutions that it will get more credit and praise, but we want to accelerate the pace at which people can be helped. If an organisation is willing to help with hotel training because it has the facilities to do so, this organisation should be allowed to undertake this training, but if you say it must be done only by you you can wait to see how long it takes. I hope the Government will be able to stimulate more interest to get aid for some things in Barbados like the extension of the Deep Water Harbour and other areas which qualify for international assistance. Make the civil servants get up and work and understand what is going on in the world, not merely sitting down in Barbados drinking whistley at cocktail parties, because they should be able to prepare the necessary papers for attendance at international meetings and if they are not aware of what is going on, how can they?

I am very pleased to see this Bill before us, because the Prime Minister has always been a little hectic on international affairs. These are not things you win elections with, the Prime Minister cannot go to the people in St. John and tell them about the International Bank or the Common Market, because they would not know what he is talking about, they would think he is referring to Cheapside or Fairchild Street, but I am very pleased to hear what the hon. member said. He goes with the best wishes of the labour movement to Nairobi, and I hope he will be able to continue in the way he has been going before, I hope he can get some of these multi-national companies to stop creating a lot of confusion all over the world and invest some money to help the smaller countries. 2.30 p.m.

I hope that the experts and all the members up there will make it happier for everybody in the world to have more equilibrium in the International Monetary System of the world.

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

REVENUE IN AID (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER Order No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this House will remember that on the 14th May, 1973, when I delivered my Budgetary Statement and, Financial Proposals that I intimated at that time that the additional duty levied under the 1941 war-time Revenue In Aid Act would be removed from certain items of which I gave some indication at the time. The items are set out in the Schedule, so that in my budgetary proposals there were some lowering-of the incidence of taxation as well as some increases in the incidence of taxation.

The instant Bill, therefore, seeks to implement the proposals which I made at that time and to remove the additional excess surtax, or whatever you may call it, from the items which had been set out in the

Schedule to the Act.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I realise that there is no quorum and I ask that the bell be rung.

Hon. C. E. TALMA entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is now a quorum. When you rose there was no quorum. Thank you very much.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed. 2.40 p.m

THE CONSULAR CONVENTIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons set out that this Bill would amend the Consular Conventions Act, 1952 (1952-15) to transfer inter alia the power to grant an exequatur or other similar authorisation to consular officers from the Governor-General to the Minister responsible for External Affairs.

This matter has been under review for some time and the Bill is to regularise the matter.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 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, and 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.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 10 is the instant Order of the Day, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a consequential amendment to the Customs . Act, 1962, after the Bill which

we have just passed, which would authorise the Minister responsible for External Affairs to make Orders which were formerly made by the Governor-General. It is a natural corollary to the Bill which has just been passed.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that

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

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

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) (No. 2)

ACT, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, of which notice was given earlier today and of which the Leader of the House gave an indication would be dealt with in all its stages today, be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to revert to any discussions which took place in this Chamber earlier, but as early as my Budget Statement last year, that is, in 1972, I indicated to the House that Barbados along with its independent partners in the Commonwealth Caribbean would be moving towards a common external tariff as the next step in the process of Caribbean integration. We have had five years of the free trade area in which there were no tariffs between the constituent member countries of the Caribbean Free Trade Area or more popularly known as CARIFTA. We also gave indication that we would be seeking the harmonisation of fiscal incentives, and then in October last year in Chaguaramas the Governments firmly decided that the common external tariff would be introduced by 1st August, 1973, so that we have to all intents and purposes what is more popularly known as a common market, because a common market has two features. In a common market there are no tariff barriers between member countries, and these are eliminated either in one fell swoop or for certain members in certain stages, and that process is still taking place in the European Economic Community today. But the point is that you establish the principle of the free trade area subject to those reservations which may be embodied in the document setting it up. 2.50 p.m

After your Free Trade Area has been functioning satisfactorily for some time you then move to the next stage of the Common External Tariff so that you put up a barrier which surrounds the market of 4.7 million people against the outside world, so that no one external exporting country can infiltrate the industrial and commercial structure of the people who are within the piling of this protection. There is no mystery about a common external tariff, the problem was that in the past year or eighteen months the officials and customs experts have been seeking to recommend a tariff which would not impose too onerous a burden on the inhabitants of the area and at the same time give some kind of incentive and protection, to the industries which we are now trying to foster.

The Common External Tariff is not the highest tariff which exists in the region, in some respects it is the lowest. In some respects there is no tariff at all, but the no tariff or zero tariff aspect is common to all

the countries within the area, so it does not really matter. The point is there are no discrepancies between one country and the other, so when we speak about a Common External Tariff we will not immediately assume that the Common External Tariff will mean an increase in the level of the import duties which are imposed on goods which are shipped into the Commonwealth Caribbean countries which are members of the Community and which have subscribed to the Agreement. As I said before, in many instances it has meant that Barbados has eliminated duties altogether because that is what we have commonly agreed to, that on certain items there will be no duty at all, and if one goes through the list of the items which is not difficult because you only have to go through the right hand column to see what tariffs are imposed, but you will see the word "nil" all the way through, and most of these commodities are commodities which are vital for the development or manufacturing sector within the region, because it is not the policy of the Governments to impose high tariffs on the raw materials for industry which will make us in competition with the people with whom we have to deal and in those markets in which we are seeking a larger share. •

On luxury items there has been an increase, and this is to discourage the people in the region from going into behaviour patterns which indicate, as I said before, that they have champagne tastes and mauby pockets, and therefore if you must drink champagne we want to make it expensive to drink champagne. I never could afford it, and if I could afford it I do not like it because it makes me feel ML. I do not think any West Indian with rum all around us should be wasting time drinking anybody else's product. I would not mind if everybody in Barbados stopped drinking champagne and drank a little more rum, if they feel they must drink, but they should stop drinking altogether and the health of the community will improve.

There is another aspect which I wish to draw to your attention. We have implemented the Common External Tariff and it will come into effect on 1st August, 1973, which is seven days away. Someone may ask why it was: not introduced before. In the first instance, we only agreed on the external tariff, the officials were working oversight up to the morning of the 4th July, 1973, which was 20 days ago. Even on the Agreement which I have promised to lay establishing the Caribbean Community, although the Jamaica House had discussed it - for what reason I do not know ;-. they introduced amendments to the Agreement which the other Governments had not even seen, so I could not introduce something which was not commonly agreed to. They do not have to see it at all, they can read it in the newspapers, but I have promised to lay it. The treaty making power is the prerogative of the Government. You cannot come in here when you have delicate negotiations going on and bring it into -the market-place for foreign governments who are friendly disposed to you to be abused by ill-informed and ill-mannered people, because the whole community of nations would break down. We know West Indians very well, and this would mean that nobody would want to speak to you at all.

I hate to refer to this because this is a bad example of what should go on, but when you had the war in Vietnam, when the Viet Cong were in Paris discussing with Mr. Kissenger the terms of the treaty Mr. Kissenger did not fly back to Washington every five minutes to ask what he could discuss with Le Duc

Tho, you do not do that, the treaty making power is the prerogative of the Government, and when the Government has done all its negotiation the Government then informs the people and if the people do not like what the Government does they will say that it is outside the scope of the mandate they gave you at elections. The people who are objecting to our conducting negotiations to integrate the Caribbean are the people who said they did not want any independence except in a federation with the same people we have set up an Agreement with. There is no question of if you can have a common external tariff, because in the kind of federation I believe they were talking about the common market was all one country, so I do not understand the insincerity and the hypocrisy that we hear coming from the other side that we did not have the courtesy to tell them, Every time we go to a meeting we come and tell them what we have done, but the details of this Common External Tariff is a matter for people who are experts, not even like me, like Mr. Green who was our representative on the committee, to understand what it is all about. If you ask some of them what SITC means they would say they never heard about it, they would not know it is the Standard International Trade Classification, four out of six of them do not understand it. That is considered a waste of time, because Customs legislation is not something that you read, because that would be like going to Mr. Lewis at the Turf Club and telling him you are not going to buy a ticket until you know all the numbers. 3.00 p.m

It is as foolish as that. You want to see all the numbers and all the figures because you do not know if a few have been left out. You want to make sure that all the tickets are in the box when Mr. Lewis pulls out the balls on television. That is a waste of time because it is a question of figures.

Last year I indicated that I was introducing the Common External Tariff and I picked out certain items. This year I think there are 346 or 379 items, and I picked out all the items which would cause significant increases and told the House that it was a move towards the Common External Tariff re-incorporated into the Schedule of the Bill that we now have before us. Apart from those items, most of the items now are for reductions. The next stage which we will witness is, probably, an elimination of preferential duties because Britain is committed to the elimination of Commonwealth preference, and the sooner we do that the better for us, too. I am not advocating that now because we have not yet come to that stage. I would like to make a prophecy here that Britain may not be in the Common Market very long, the way things are looking now. Anyhow, I am not the voice of prophecy. I want to be the Minister of Finance, and I am concerned with the business which affects us today. All I am saying, Sir, is that members need have no fear.

We have discussed matters. The officials from my Ministry have been to the Chamber of Commerce and to businessmen and discussed the new definition which all the members of GATT, that is, the BTA and the Brussels definition have replaced the Standard International Trade Classification, and we will be basing our tariff on the Brussels Definition of Value whereby commissions and all of that kind of foolishness that we have in our legislation will be eliminated as well.

The Act has three Clauses. The first Clause says it is the Customs (Amendment) Act, 1973 The second Clause says that the Schedule to the Customs Act is amended. I submit that the real important amendments were done on the 31st May, which members had in their possession from that time, and that it shall come into operation from the 1st August, 1973, because that is what we agreed to on the 4th of July of this year at Chaguaramas.

The whole of the Schedule contains figures in which the businessmen, from day to day, and the Customs Officers will be involved. I assure hon. members that I have already extracted - I needed to extract because we had a \$20 million deficit - every single item which would tend to affect the cost of living adversely. I had the courage to come and tell the House so. I cannot print money, and I brought in the 300 odd items, and in the Schedule which we now have before us those amendments are incorporated so that we would not have to rely on the Revenue In Aid Act after this Bill is passed.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

M. Speaker; you will remember that I said I have some views on this matter. I regard this to be a very important change that is taking place - a change for the good I hope. It is not a local Bill which deals with another phase of our existence which is moving from a total Customs area into a Common Tariff area. Like the Prime Minister, I am not afraid of the Treaty arrangement. Even though I am a member of the public, I would expect to hear what the Ministers are discussing. As the hon. member says it is just as though you are going to purchase anything and you want to find out about it. If you want to buy a Bible you cannot expect to read through it before you buy it. Nobody reads everything in a Bible unless he wants to be a serious Bible student. You take it for granted that all of the Chapters are there.

I am sorry that the Opposition walked out. I feel that this is such a general matter that we would be dealing with general issues and matters of principle. For example, I feel that the Caribbean Area must be clear in their minds that if you have a Common External Tariff you must know what benefits you are going to get. It means that you are going to look forward to the movement of people in the same way as you can talk in terms of the movement of goods. The movement of goods presupposes that you are talking about people. If you are moving goods from one area to another, then it will be the sort of examination that the politicians will be involved in, and they will have to think in terms of what trade

relations and employment turn out are going to be.

I am not on the narrow basis of the Jamaicans or the Guyanese who are having a little bit of war. The Hon. Prime Minister says that Britain may not be in the European Economic Community for too long. That is his prophecy, but it is difficult to prophesy in these matters because at home you do not know what is taking place abroad. I am a bit hesitant myself because Jamaica believes in federation. I feel that the Jamaicans are far away; they are not close to people, and they have to make sure that these people are ready to take part in certain things.

In this first step we have spent a lot of money in the Caribbean area. We have sent people to Conferences and so on. I feel that if the time has come that we are going to talk in terms of a Common Market, we will have to look at the question of the movement of people, what consideration has been given to this matter, and when we will have a phasing out.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a believer in tariffs as such. I believe it is a convenient arrangement for some countries because they have been doing it for many years in order to raise revenue. You cannot remove suddenly from underneath people's feet their method of raising revenue because you do not have anything to substitute for it later. For that reason I feel that the tariff system is a necessary thing to have. It has become convenient, but it is a cumbersome thing.

I believe that in years to come you are going to find that the expenses in maintaining the Customs and Customs Officers as well as the things that go with them will be very expensive. If we have a cost analysis we will find that we are not gaining anything in the light of what is taking place in the Caribbean Area. Very soon that will have to go, and the external tariff, depending on what you are dealing in, will be a microscopic amount. If you examine things in Barbados you will find that it is very important because we are still getting a considerable amount of money in this way. It is another way of taxing the people because they pay for the clothes they wear and the food they eat. 3.10 p.m.

I came back to Barbados and read that the Prime Minister in opening one of these factories made a statement about the quality of the goods. That is one of the things that will arise. There is a tendency to buy our local stuff, but some of these new manufacturers make garments that if you buy a pair of long pants and you launder them, they become Bermuda Shorts, or if you launder a shirt it becomes a waistcoat like the midriffs that the ladies wear because it can no longer come below your waist. This is something that the garment people must be prepared for; they must be prepared for standards, and if we can transmit this like in bigger countries where people have grown accustomed to these standards, it means that we are on the right track. There can be no question that your own community should learn to

provide people with the basic materials.

I look around Barbados, Mr. Speaker, and I laugh when I see that 99% or 100% of whatever he is wearing cannot come from Barbados. The least we can do then is to manufacture some or make up some of it. I do not have any worry about that. Where I think the next worry is going to come for Barbados - and I am not speaking in a narrow sense now, I am speaking on this area as a whole - is whether the leaders of the area are prepared to face the next inevitable problem, that is, the free movement of people. It has happened in Europe. They have agreed to an European Economic Community and they have agreed to the movement of goods, and they have now agreed that as from a certain date they are going to phase out things and people will move freely. The next thing is when we are going to do this in the West Indies. Are the leaders and the communities prepared for it? We are used to people saying that you are from Barbados and you cannot come to St. Lucia. That to my mind is the crucial area, and this is what I have been watching. As soon as one country gets a little above the other in the balance of payments position, the other countries begin to say that as a result of the things we are buying from you, you are better off than we are, and consequently this starts, not a trade war, but some stupid idea of breaking this thing up. We just saw a little bit of it occurring in one or two of these territories, and we hope that this sad situation will not take place.

I feel that a Caribbean community is an excellent idea; it is inevitable. It is the only way we can stand up to the pressures of the outside world. Europe has come together with 200 million people. They talk now between the East and the West in Europe. That is going to produce a different situation from what it used to be, and I do not see how we in the Caribbean area are going to resist this. Far from being on our own in the Caribbean, it looks to me as though we should look for relationship with the Latin American area in order that the 200 million people south of us can really join together and we can form a bigger trading bloc or have a better understanding.

I feel that if the members of the Opposition really intended to make a contribution to the community in which they live and want to see progress, it should be their duty to remain and discuss this matter because so far as the details are concerned, some of these items will go up, but this is inevitable in any common tariff in which you are striving towards equalisation. Some things will also go down, but I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is the sort of thing that people are not looking forward to.

What I would like to be able to live long enough to see is that it is not necessary to have tariffs at all and that our economy can be so adjusted that tariffs become a memory just as in Europe, and they are not relying now on taxing people for buying things within Europe. You travel within Europe now without any Customs Officer worrying you and going through your luggage, and in Europe now you find a minimum of Customs Officers at these places. People must be doing other jobs because they have reduced the number of Customs Officers and it is no longer the region it used to be. If we reach that

stage I feel that the Caribbean would save a lot of money, but it is a matter for a working party to give study to these things.

I support the concept of Caribbean unity as the Prime Minister said. I am surprised that hon. members on the other side show opposition to this when five years ago the gravamen of their objection to Barbados becoming independent was that Barbados should not become independent but should have joined into independence with the other territories of the Caribbean. As he rightly said, if we had done so there would be no question of a common external tariff because that would be redundant. There would be one common area like a unitary state. There is no common tariff between Louisiana and Alabama; there is no passport. Today we are doing it in a different form, a form which we can regard as more palatable, because we are still maintaining our identities which people like to have, that politicians have to live with people and with reality, that they are opposed to it, and what is more, they are not only opposed to it but at the juncture of dealing with it this is the point at which they have broken off. I think this is regrettable and I would not like to say behind their backs what I would like to say. I sometimes wonder what is the point of the Legislature paying to any Opposition Leader these trappings that we copy from England where you give the Leader of the Opposition more than anybody else and he is working less than the others.

I am not performing the task of the Opposition, but I have a task to perform and you get these people sitting down and wanting to be carried on conferences. I am telling the Prime Minister now that I am going to be one of the biggest voices of opposition in his own party the next time I come in here and hear that they are carrying the Opposition somewhere as a matter of policy. I will be opposed to it. If the people have placed them in the Opposition and placed you to rule and govern, you must govern and not have this soft-soaping business. We have too many soft soaping politicians, and you want to soft soap the fellow on the other side, but all I know happens with soft soap is that before you can get it on your face it runs out in your fingers and you will never be able to wash your face or your skin properly. You have granted the Leader of the Opposition more money and have put him in an office because it was done to Mr. Wilson in England, a man leaving Liverpool and coming down to London. There are six people over there. You cannot play a cricket match with six people. Very few matches can be played with six; but they create more problems and walk out of the House and if something happened you will hear the difference. If we were going to select people for a conference in Nairobi nobody would walk out; they would sit down and you could insult them and tell them everything, they would stay because they would want to go to Nairobi.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member come back to the Bill in question.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am dealing with the idea of the Opposition walking out.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think you have exhausted the point. The point is well taken.

Mr. WALCOTT:

But there is a matter of emphasis.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not repetition. 3.20 p.m

Mr. WALCOTT:

It is a matter of emphasis, not repetition. I am emphasising the point that I am opposed to the idea in Parliament of according certain things to the members of the Opposition when they do not appreciate them—This is the second time they have walked out, and this is a classic example that they could not justify the kind of treatment that the Government has tried to accord the Leader of the Opposition. This kind of frivolity I do not agree with, and we are paying the Leader of the Opposition the kind of salary he is getting and he himself is not accepting the responsibility in Parliament in accordance and in consonance with the position he holds in Parliament. I am going to oppose it any time I come in here and hear that the Opposition is accorded this position, because they have disqualified themselves, and if they continue to be accorded this treatment by the Government, I think the Government should concede to them and let them run the Government.

I support the Bill because it is something that is necessary as long as the others are willing to join with you. It is like a marriage, you do not marry a woman who does not want to marry you because you will be putting yourself in nothing but trouble and worry, but I think it is an inevitable step we all must take.

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

The clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule to the Bill was called and passed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, at this stage it will be convenient to suspend the sitting for half an hour. I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for half an hour.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

On resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. E. W:

BARROW Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to repeal the Package Tax Act, 1941 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

THE PACKAGE TAX (REPEAL) ACT, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember that during the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals on 31st May this year I intimated that the Package Tax Act of 1941 would be repealed. This Act was imposed as a war time measure in order to raise additional revenue, but now that we have the Common External Tariff the continuation of this Act would commit the Government of Barbados to imposing a higher rate of import duties than those prescribed in the Common External Tariff, and it is for this reason therefore of repugnancy that the Act would have to be repealed.

It is a very short Bill, and I do not think any parliamentarian will regret its passing, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. JR. B. CADDIE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C.E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE REVENUE IN AID (REPEAL) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to repeal the Revenue in Aid Act, 1941 be the next Order of the Day.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.05 p.m

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to repeal the Revenue in Aid Act 1941. As far as I can remember, Sir, the Objects and Reasons are much the same as those in the Package Tax Act, 1941, which had been repealed

as being repugnant to the principle of the Common External Tariff and would tend to increase the tariffs which will be charged in Barbados over and above those charged in the other territories. This, again, is a war-time measure in order to raise additional funds.

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

Hon. R. St.C WEEKES:

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. R. StC, WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1-3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and 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. R. StC. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

MOBIL OIL BARBADOS LIMITED REFINERY

(LEVY ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTS)

(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next item is the Bill to amend the Mobil Oil Barbados Limited Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965 which stands in the name of the Minister of Finance and Planning.

I beg to move that this be the next Order of the Day.

Hon R. St.C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Mobil Oil Barbados Limited Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965 (1965-8) in order to fix the duties to be charged thereunder independently of the customs laws. This is another Bill which is consequential on the Act.

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

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

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. R. StC. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 - 6 inclusive were called and passed. 4.15 p.m.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

On the (separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTES TO

ITEMS 7 AND 29 OF HEAD 104 -

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of which I gave notice earlier today and for which a Resolution was passed to be taken at this sitting.

I therefore beg to move that the notes to Items 7 and 29 of Head 104 - Ministry of Education, Part II - Capital of the 1973-74 Estimates be amended by deleting the existing notes and substituting the following:

"Item 7: To provide for the construction of the new buildings for the Community College and for renovations at the Eirie. Includes provision for office accommodation, support services and furniture and equipment."

Quite briefly, Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment is being moved in order that the note will more accurately reflect the purposes for which the funds have already been provided. This is no requirement for any new funds, but first of all, in order to carry out the developmental projects at the Community College at Eirie, it is necessary to provide a project office for the execution of the extensions and developments at the Eirie in accordance with the agreement entered into with the Inter-American Development Bank which has already been approved by this Honourable Chamber.

In addition we have a generous grant from the United Kingdom Government for the provision of equipment for the division of technology. However additional equipment is required and the amendment to the note will enable expenditure from this particular item for the additional items of equipment. Then there are other matters connected with the project office, the furniture and equipment and support offices

which are required and the amendment to the note which will provide an opportunity for expending from the existing vote the sums required to meet the several items that I have just referred to.

As far as the amendment to Item 29 is concerned, this relates to the development of the facilities at Government Hill, the studio for which an agreement has been made with the Barbados Telephone Company to purchase the buildings there for studios for the Educational Television project, and the amendment to the note will enable certain staff members to be paid from this particular item as well.

I beg to move that this Resolution 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.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION RE WORK PERMITS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11 asked by the hon. member for Bridgetown who is not in his place.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders, I would like to table the reply, the hon. member not being in his place.

QUESTION RE FLOOD VICTIMS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 50 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I understand that the member was granted leave from the House. In that case the answer can be held over, but the reply is ready. I will table the Reply but I am willing to reply orally in view of the absence of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I suggest that the answer be withheld so that the reply can be given orally.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I understand that the hon. member did not ask for leave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is so. The hon. member did not ask for leave.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I therefore beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE REEFS IN BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 95 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE BARBADOS FIRE SERVICE

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 98 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE ROYAL BARBADOS POLICE FORCE

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 104 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE POLICE STATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 105 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE MOTOR INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 39 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. George North.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE GEORGETOWN ACCORD

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 110 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE CASUALTY OF QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 102 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Dr. the Hon. R.-B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE TECHNICIANS AT QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 103 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE BURNING OF REFUSE

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 111 stands in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply.

QUESTION RE PINE HILL DAIRY

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 47 stands in the name of .the hon. member for St. Peter.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 49 asked by the hon. member for St. Peter.

Hon. C, E, TALMA The hon. member not in his place and I will ask that the Reply be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 72, 73 and 97 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; The hon. member is not in his place and I will ask that those Replies be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No, 94 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology: 1. Can the Minister state whether or not the current swine fever epidemic has affected pigs throughout the parish of St. Lucy? 2. Or can the Minister state whether this fever has been confined to a particular area in the parish? 3. If the answer

to Question 2 is in the affirmative, will the Minister state which area this is and the possible reason for the outbreak in this area? 4. Can the Minister state any sound reasons why the slaughtering of pigs has been prohibited throughout St. Lucy and will the Minister say what are the possibilities for lifting the ban on slaughtering pigs in the areas in St. Lucy which are not affected by the fever?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows

1. Yes. The swine fever epidemic had affected pigs throughout the parish of St. Lucy.
2. Does not apply.
3. The basic reason for the outbreak in some parts of St. Lucy was the use of uncooked swill.
4. The slaughtering of pigs in St. Lucy, as in all other parts of the island, was prohibited to combat the spread of the disease. This prohibition has now been removed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 101 and 107 asked by the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not in his seat and the Replies will be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 14 asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member is not in his place and I beg to table the reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 88, 90 and 92 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member who asked the questions is not in his place and the replies will be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 93 and 96 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not in his seat and I am asking that these replies be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 99 and 100 asked by the hon. member for St. Peter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Peter is not present and I am laying on the Table of this House the replies to those questions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 108 and 109 asked by the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not in his seat and the replies will be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 91 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not in his seat and I ask that the reply be tabled.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two other questions to which it will be proper for replies to be tabled. These are Nos. 87 and 89. 4.35 p.m..

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two other Questions Nos. 87 and 89. Parliamentary Question No. 87 asked by the hon. member for Christ Church West is temporarily deferred. Parliamentary Question No. 89 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph re the Government's policy in relation to cigarette . smoking, (Asides.) The point was that at the earlier confirmation of the Minutes of the 3rd July, 1973, at the beginning of the session, objection was taken to the laying of replies to Parliamentary Questions 87 and 89 because Question Time had not been reached; therefore, the sentence in the Minutes "LAYING OF REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS NOS. 87 and 89" was deleted. If they were laid on the 3rd July they were not properly laid. It is possible that the Replies are already in at the Clerk's Table.

Dr. the Hon. R, B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who asked this question is not in his place, and I seek permission to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 89 on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted. Has the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 89 be laid?

Hon. C. EL TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not in his place, and I ask permission to lay the reply to Question No. 89 on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING GOVERNMENT TO MAKE A SURVEY PLAN OF LAND AT
RIVER BAY**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 standing in my name be the instant Order of the Day. Mr. Speaker, last week....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like you to complete your motion. You began by moving a motion; you did not complete the motion, and it has not been seconded. (Asides) I have just been informed that this motion was being debated at the last sitting, and the hon. member is entitled to continue.

Mr. GREAVES:

As I was saying Mr. Speaker, last week we had a long wrangle over whether or not this motion should be debated. It is a pity that members of the Opposition are not in their seats because as far as they were concerned this was considered to be an extremely small matter, and they did not consider that it should be treated as an important matter. I think that any Parliamentary representative of a constituency has to view matters which pertain to his constituency as matters of importance for his constituency and, indeed, for himself.

There is a little background' to this Resolution which I would like to make this Honourable Chamber aware of. It started somewhere in April when notices began appearing in the daily newspaper to the effect that River Bay is private property and anybody who trespass on River Bay would be prosecuted by the owners. 4.45 p.m.

This kind of advertisement had a reaction on my constituents and indeed on myself because it seemed to us that it was grossly unfair and indeed down right dishonest for any person to say that River Bay was private property. I think that those of us who know River Bay would realise that the area around River Bay surrounding the sea is an area which was acquired by Government I think as recently as 1970, and when we investigated where this piece of land which the owners tried to say was private property was in relation to River Bay, we discovered that it was some 400 yards away from what is conventionally known and accepted as River Bay. It was nowhere near the beach. The general impression which was given by the advertisement which appeared in the newspaper was that people would be prosecuted if they attempted to trespass on River Bay.

Now I think that we in this country must try to get away from this kind of dishonest approach particularly when it comes to trying to give the public a wrong impression about ownership of land, and I was upset, Mr. Speaker, when I learned who were the owners of the property. This was something which was a tremendous shock to me because I could not understand how people for such a long time could masquerade under the kind of banner under which they were masquerading before and then to come and give people the impression that they were with them only suddenly to put a notice in the newspaper to prevent them from coming on their property and to suggest that they would be prosecuted if they trespassed on the property. I think this kind of dishonesty is something which we must wipe out from our public life. We must try to instil in people that the small man, indeed people who do not have an opportunity to own property near the beach should have an opportunity to have access to the beach. It is not that this property is in any way preventing the people from getting to the beach.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the whole idea behind the notice was an attempt to bring pressure to bear on the Government to acquire this property for one reason or another, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I had reason to object to certain pressures sought to be brought to bear on me in order to get me as it were - to use the phrase which was used - to pull a string in order to get this matter straightened out, and that I would be taken care of. I do not know if I would be taken care of in the grave or what have you. I disapprove of this kind of approach because I think that we have got in our public life to be absolutely certain that we are above any kind of taint. We have got to have a purity in our approach to matters which pertain to the public and which in effect, affect the public, and this is something which is of particular importance and concern to me where you are going to have people who are going to be making this kind of open approach to you with a view to getting you to push matters through Parliament in order to assist people in escaping from paying taxes and getting the Government to take over land like this.

Now I want to make my position absolutely clear in this matter. As far as I am concerned I am for the development of River Bay. I think the records of this House would indicate that when the Estimates were being debated, under the item dealing with the development of parks and beaches I raised the question of the development of River Bay. This was followed up by a question which was asked here of the Minister who was responsible for lands about the development of River Bay Sir, it is not to say that I am not interested in the development of River Bay, but what I am thoroughly against is the attempt which was being made to mislead the public into the ownership of River Bay.

Some time ago it was said that the Government would be instituting measures to have the area developed. It is our sincere hope that the long awaited beach facility will be erected at River Bay, because if you go to River Bay you will realise that it is an area which has considerable potential for development, and I think that the sooner the beach facility is developed the better it will be not only for the people of St. Lucy even though this is my primary concern, but indeed for other people from other parts of the Island who use the area for bathing and for excursions from time to time.

Now I happened to visit the area one morning when the Parks and Beaches Commission went on a tour of River Bay and I was again surprised to learn from the owners of the lands which are adjacent to the property which the Government owns at River Bay... I said I was surprised which is a little mild, I was shocked by the attitude which they displayed to the setting up of a facility in the area which we own. They said to me that they would prefer to have the facility put under the hill because if it is put just above their bay house this is going to bring down the value of their property and their investment would not be worth the amount of money it is worth as present.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with me that this kind of attitude is one which must be deplored. There are a lot of people who seem to think that they have arrived when once they own a beach cottage or a piece of land near to the sea, and they do not want to see people who are from more humble circumstances coming around and using the facilities, even to get to the beach if it means passing over their property, and if we are going to have a situation where a facility is going to be built at River Bay, then this is the kind of attitude which is being displayed by these people who are not expatriates. This is the attitude which is being displayed by people who are supposed to be like us, who are supposed to be interested in seeing that what we have in this country, the natural resources, are for the people and should be developed for the people of Barbados. This is an attitude which we must deplore. I feel that it is a problem which we face and we should try to instil in people that no matter what they own, in the final analysis whether it is a piece of land near the beach or whatever, that we should be in a situation where we should be trying to help each other and where we should try to encourage people and let them realise that the resources which we have in this country are for us and should be developed for our good. 4.55 p.m.

The resolution calls on the Government to make a survey of the River Bay area so that a proper plan can be made for the most effective utilisation of the land in the area. My understanding is that the Government acquired about 21/2 acres of land sometime in 1970, and we should now have a very close look at the area to see how the area can be developed for the good of the nation, and indeed for the good of the people who live in the parish of St. Lucy.

One of the things I would like to see done when this survey is carried out - because it is not only a survey which is designed to find out how much land the Government owns, we all know this - but I am talking about a survey which is going to look in a broad way at the kind of development which is best suited for the utilisation of the land which we have there. If it means that some additional land has got to be acquired, then I would like to implore the Government to do this as soon as possible, and I would like to say here now that from my knowledge of the area the acquisition of any piece of land or any additional land in that area will not have anything to do with the land which the owners put a notice in the newspaper about, because that is so far away from the River Bay area that we are talking of that the acquisition of that would not come into consideration at all, because it is cut off by some other person's property which comes between there, so I want to make this absolutely clear.

If we are going to look at the kind of development which is going to take place, and if you are going to acquire some additional land, I would suggest that this be done as soon as possible. I would also like to suggest that in the overall planning for the development which we are talking about in this area the Government should examine the possibility of constructing a bridge over the gully which, as it were, separates the Cove Wood area from the Pie Corner area. I do not think it is a major operation, I think it is something which will facilitate movement to and from the big districts in the parish of St. Lucy, because as a matter of fact the children from the Cove Wood area have to go to school at St. Clements in Pie Corner, and any time the rain falls they have to walk about two or three miles in a roundabout way to get to school, and I am sure the Minister of Lands had this problem when he went to school there. I do not believe that I am appealing to deaf ears or knocking my head against a brick wall when I make this appeal because at least I am sure that the Minister of Lands will realise the problems I am talking about. The Minister of Health has served in St. Lucy for a number of years, and I am sure he would have encountered this problem as well, so he will also be able to appreciate this.

There are two aspects of this to which I said we should direct our attention, one relates to the fact that we have got to have a broad survey and a new look at the area with a view to seeing how best the area can be developed. I do not think that anybody can say that it is not an area which has potential which can be developed, not only for the people of St. Lucy but indeed for people who come from other parishes on excursions. River Bay is a very popular excursion spot, and when people go down there they also like to bathe because it also has some good areas for bathing, but this brings to light the whole question of changing room facilities and showers. At the moment people bathe under the pipe which is next door,

and I do not believe it is in our national interest to have people bathing under the pipe. I think this is something we should be getting away from. I think it is a whole question of national pride. (Asides). Mr. Speaker, I would like you to ask the hon. member on my left not to distract me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not aware that the hon. member is being distracted.

Mr. GREAVES:

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the interest of national pride the establishment of a beach facility at River Bay is something which we should give urgent consideration to, I know that the Minister in a reply which he gave here earlier in the Session, about two or three months ago, did indicate that this is something which was receiving attention, but I would like to get it beyond the point of receiving attention and let us have some action on it.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, relates to the question which I raised about the building of a , bridge, which I see as part of the total development of the area, and in this development this would indeed make it easier for communications between some of the larger areas and make it easier for people to get from one area to the other.

Mr. Speaker, I would just in winding up refer again to the utter disgust which I felt with the owners of the land at River Bay. I would say not only one, but both of the owners of this land approached me and asked me to get the Government to purchase this piece of land from them and told me I would get a piece of change. I do not understand this kind of thing, and I take very serious objection to this, I know that already one of the owners is saying that I have put the people of St. Lucy against him, and as far as I am concerned I think that my campaign for re-election has started. I would like to serve notice that I will be able to handle any attempt at underhand dealings in my future election campaigns. All I want to say is that I am going to have as my philosophy in politics that I am not going to bow to these kinds of offers, because I would like to think that I am the kind of person who would be able to stare anybody in the face and let him know where to get off. I would do this when I feel like it because they do not hold any secrets for me, and this is really my position on this matter.

I just want to say that the resolution emanated from this notice which appeared in the Advocate-News and my constituents felt that it was something which I had to raise because they could not understand how all these areas we knew around River Bay were publicly owned and suddenly a notice appeared in the paper saying that River Bay is private property. 5.05 p.m

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some law against this kind of dishonest approach to the whole question of saying what is private property and what is public property because in the final analysis this is something which is going to affect each and everyone of us. We should be very careful that we set out clearly what areas are public areas. I feel that we have to make it absolutely clear to people who own lands in and around the sea coast of Barbados that the people in Barbados must have clear access to the sea. We must also make it absolutely clear that any attempt to prevent people from getting to the beach will be dealt with with the force of law. Maybe this is something that the Legal Department should direct their attention to, and it is the whole question of the attempt which some people make to mislead the members of the public.

I hope that the Minister and, indeed, the Government - I am appealing to my colleagues on the front bench - will deal with this matter as early as possible, and in the very near future we will see the kind of development in the River Bay area that we would like to see. I should like to say that we in St. Lucy are not averse to being involved in any Development Plan which might be introduced because, I am sure, we could put forward some suggestions. We do not want anything fantastic. We are not going to ask the Government to spend \$1 million down there, but I think that we would like to be involved in some kind of planning and suggesting how best the area should be utilised.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I would not expect the Ministers to second the motion even if they agreed with it, and I think it would be my duty to second this Resolution. The only thing I should like to add to what the hon. member for St. Lucy has said is that I do not confine the facilities to merely bathing, because I would say that it is one of the best areas that I believe you will find in this whole Island. It is one of the few peninsulas that we have remaining, and in a small place like Barbados it is always nice to be able to enjoy life on a peninsula. I think we should do everything to preserve some of our heritage. I agree with him that the Government should do everything possible to preserve the northernmost tip. St. Lucy is such a healthy place in which to live that when I go there I often wonder how people could die down there. It gives me much pleasure in seconding this Resolution, and I feel sure that it will receive the treatment it deserves from the Government.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, as an erstwhile sojourner in the parish of St. Lucy, I should like to compliment the representative of the constituency of St. Lucy in bringing this matter to the attention of this Honourable Chamber. I should like to point out that when that notice was displayed in the daily newspaper, it

aroused a lot of concern among the people of Barbados and not only in St. Lucy, but throughout the country. There are many people who journey from other parts of the Island to St. Lucy on many occasions throughout the year on picnics.

I should also like to point out that, in my opinion, this is part of the general, problem confronting Barbadian people who seek to make proper use of the beaches surrounding this country. Over and over again we have had incidents where people have been prevented or harassed when they set out to enjoy the pleasures of beaches which we are told are the property of the people of Barbados and not the property of a private individual or a group of individuals. We accept that this may be a point in law, but in practice a lot of constraints and a lot of obstacles are being put in the way of the citizens of this country who want to enjoy the beaches. I do not have to dwell on any specific incident, but members of the Cabinet are well aware of some of these instances because on some occasions they have been drawn forcibly to the attention of the Cabinet.

As regards the development of River Bay in St. Lucy, for a very long time there have been proposals being aired and talked about doing something for the parish of St. Lucy. There was a time when this parish had to be considered as one of the neglected areas of the Island. A lot has happened which, if the people were of a different attitude, might have changed their allegiance to the present Party in power. However, one would rush to point out that the present Government is keen on paying due attention to the legitimate aims and desires of the people of St. Lucy for proper development in that area. I hope I am not letting out any secrets when I say that Government has proposals for the acquisition of certain lands in that area to assist in the development of the area. I believe that when one looks in terms of the development of the northern area in Barbados, then the development of River Bay should be given due consideration.

There may be a lot of disputes as to how this development can take place and in what manner it should be brought about, but all of us are agreed that something should be done to prepare the River Bay area for the people of Barbados and to ensure that ready and easy access to the facilities, in whatever form they may take, is always there. I think we cannot sit by in Barbados any longer and see that the people of this country are now finding the reverse of what took place when they were given their freedom in 1834. At that time they had to take to the beach lands because good agricultural land was not available and the only land which the free slaves could find was land adjoining the beach and which people did not attach any great importance to. Today we are seeing the reverse of that trend. The citizens of this country are now being pushed back into the interior either with their own connivance or due to their ignorance, and being deprived of the use of many of the beaches of this country. Any Government which is concerned with the full and proper development of the people of this country must take measures to ensure that some of the facilities available on beaches for the ready access of the people of this country.

It is very easy to talk about what the law says, but there is a tremendous difference between the law and the application of the law. We have to point out that it would be a very serious problem straining the resources of each Minister if Ministers had to go around the country trying to ensure that the laws of this country are being properly enforced. While the Ministers in the Cabinet can pass laws for the benefit of the people, a lot more has to be done to ensure that these laws are enforced as the Government would like and the people of this country would like.

I feel that while we will point out that the beaches are free to each and every one in Barbados, we still have to bear in mind and take cognisance of the fact that too many people of this country are being prevented by obstacles far too numerous to mention here from enjoying the beach facilities of this country. In an area such as St. Lucy and River Bay, I think it would be very disheartening if we sat back and allow such an area to go along a course which would make it difficult for the people not only of St. Lucy, but also for the people of Barbados as a whole to go and enjoy themselves in that area. 5.15 p.m.

I can give no assurances to the hon. member, but I feel that such a Resolution which seeks to develop River Bay not only for the people of St. Lucy but also for the people of Barbados is a good one, and whether or not it is going to be implemented I would have to point out will depend upon the availability of funds. I believe that given the necessary funds something will be done with the support of the people of St. Lucy and of the people of Barbados generally to develop the facilities at River Bay for the benefit both of the people of St. Lucy and of Barbados as well as foreigners who want to come into the country and enjoy such facilities with the people of Barbados.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when the debate on this Resolution began, but I think I was able to get the gist of it as I entered, and I think I am in a position to make some kind of reply and contribution to this debate. I myself did not anticipate the debate taking place on this Resolution today and therefore I do not have my files available, but from recollection the Government in recent years purchased about three acres of land at River Bay in St. Lucy for the purpose that the land should remain open for the enjoyment and pleasure of the people of Barbados.

I am not surprised that a Resolution of this kind should have been brought so soon after notices appeared in the daily press in this country, because as has been observed by more than one member, that notice did cause some concern. I believe it caused more than concern to the people of St. Lucy because knowing the area better than persons from other parishes, they were able to see that their enjoyment of River Bay should not have been interfered with. I spent perhaps more time than any other member present this afternoon in that area, and what is more that to some extent used to be my regular route to and from the primary school I attended to which reference has been made earlier. Now I want to state here that the three acres of land which the Government acquired in St. Lucy was not a rushed acquisition. As a matter of fact, it took several years before the Government was able to finalise the

purchase of this property and the actual area that the Government would buy. Several visits were paid to the River Bay area. On one such visit I had the pleasure of accompanying the Prime Minister to see the area we should acquire, and I myself paid other visits to the area officially and unofficially to take a look at the area that we wanted. The area that we acquired extends right up on the cliff on the north peninsula to which the hon. member for St. Michael West has made reference; so not only does the Government own land on the beach, which is west of the bay and probably running about 60 or 70 yards west of the bay, but it loops around and traverses the creek and goes right on top that peninsula. Perhaps we did make an error in acquisition in that we did not acquire the shaded area at River Bay. There are some casuarina trees which provide very good shelter, and I think that that should have been acquired by Government at that time. We however acquired the area for the purpose of providing a facility for the use of the people of St. Lucy and the people of Barbados generally.

I said earlier that the notice probably caused more consternation outside of St. Lucy than inside St. Lucy, and I know that following the appearance of the notice and even the tabling of this Resolution I had the honour to speak at a Branch Meeting of the St. Lucy Branch of the Democratic Labour Party, and that meeting was held in an adjoining area of River Bay in the Hope Road, and I was able to explain to them the extent of the Government's ownership in the area and our plans for the area. I think that some months ago I answered a Parliamentary Question on River Bay here. The fact is that the Government intends to put in beach facilities like the ones they have put at Bath in St. John, at Silver Sands in Christ Church and other areas. I cannot say that it will be done in the present financial year because this was not contemplated at the time the Estimates were done. If I remember correctly, we felt that a beach facility at Bats Rock in St. Michael would probably take priority over River Bay because of its very frequent use. (A VOICE) I hear an appeal being made for Brandons.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is the policy of the Parks and Beaches Commission wherever the beaches are popularly used to erect facilities. It is not that the Parks and Beaches Commission or the Ministry goes around choosing areas where to put up such facilities. The people of Barbados choose these areas for themselves, and wherever these beaches are frequently used, then you will find that the Parks and Beaches Commission within the limits of its financial resources will be going behind people wherever they congregate to enjoy themselves on the beach and put in these facilities. This is the case with River Bay and I cannot say exactly when it will be done. I know it is on the priority list and runs second to Bats Rock, and it is my feeling that in the not too distant future we will see a beach facility established at River Bay in St. Lucy, because St. Lucy is a very popular excursion area in Barbados. We want to keep it as an open area for the enjoyment of the people of Barbados.

I remember some years ago when I was Minister of Home Affairs I had responsibility then as now for lands and as such for these many things, and we had down here a conservationist whose name escapes me at the moment, but River Bay was one of the areas to which I accompanied this conservationist and he did put in a comprehensive report and River Bay did get some attention along with several areas for preservation for the enjoyment of the people of Barbados, and I can assure you that this remains the

policy of the Government.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

, Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th August, 1973 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.25 p.m.