

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1975.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o' clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C. B. E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister Without Portfolio); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; (Chairman of Committees); Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes for Tuesday the 18th November, 1975 have been circulated and are before you. There being no amendments I deem these Minutes to be confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

(1) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$241,382 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,380,556 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1975-76, Part II - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following:

The Resolution to grant the sum of \$364,166 from the consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1975-76, Part II - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

The Resolution to grant the sum of \$95,145 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement of the Estimates, 1975-76, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve of

the lease to Aircraft Services International Ltd. of a parcel of land situate at Seawell in the parish of Christ Church.

Also I give notice of the following Bills:

- (1) A Bill to amend the Parks and Beaches Commission Act,
- (2) A Bill to amend the Companies Act,
- (3) A Bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, and
- (4) A Bill to repeal the Shops Act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1975.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1975 was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Parks and Beaches Commission Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Companies Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to repeal the Shops Act was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the

Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1975-76 No. 18

The Resolution for the sum of \$17,600 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution which is before this Hon. Chamber sets out in the Addendum the purpose for this sum of money. I think I should just let the Hon. House know that the Hotel School has now moved from its old place of abode to Marine House, and in due course also before the Hon. House today is a Resolution to pay for the completion of the alterations which were necessary to make this transfer possible and comfortable.

As the Hon. House will know, I assumed duties as Minister of Education on 15th September, 1975 and only last week I paid a visit to that institution to see the progress that has been made in its settling in to the new location. I am also looking at the structure, staff-wise, at that institution from the Principal down to make sure that this institution serves the purpose for which it has been established.

12.20 p.m.

I am also looking at an aspect of the whole structure that disappoints me, and I am trying to see if I can make any progress in this regard to see whether the Hotel industry itself, since the Government is expending money for training persons for future employment in this industry, itself, should not make some input, financially or otherwise, in the functioning of this Institution.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, this sum of money is to replace the existing post of Senior Instructor and two posts of Trainee Instructor. As the Addendum says, the Hotel School is being reorganised and, in the process, temporary posts of Principal, Deputy Principal, and two posts of Instructor are required to replace those posts of Senior Instructor and two posts of Trainee Instructor. This Institution is very vital to this Community. I think it is accepted that the

economy of this country, to a large extent, depends on the progress of the Hotel industry and, therefore, the Government having embarked on this enterprise — it is falling under the Ministry of Education — you will see that it has to be constantly looked at in terms of the development of the industry itself, the needs of the industry, and at what levels, in order to make sure that the money being spent is spent in the best direction.

I do not think there is very much more for me to say at this point of time except to say that I, as the Minister responsible for the Hotel School, will see to it that at every stage the best staff is obtained to meet the needs of the trainees and the needs of the Institution, and I shall pursue with great diligence that aspect of it which I mentioned earlier. I feel that very often the Government establishes Institutions to benefit private enterprise — I think the member for St. Michael West will see with me and share these difficulties which we all experience, he in his organisation and we in the Government — and that although it is a Government Institution it is not going to benefit the Government, but it is going to train our man-power to meet the needs in the private sector. The private sector is very often unwilling, financially or otherwise, to contribute to something which can only be in the best interest of their investment and in their enterprises. That is an aspect I shall pursue with great diligence.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection against the purpose of the Resolution, but I will comment on the dying words of the Minister who has introduced this Resolution. I am of the view that, in Barbados, there is a tendency to do too much for the employers in industry in the form of training the industry itself when the industry is not prepared to match what is being done in the form that it should be done. I am not going to draw any examples now, but at another time I will do so. The Hotel industry is a private industry and it is not run by the Government. The Government, sometimes, have been bulldozed into believing that the Hotel industry is Government's industry. The Hotel industry is run by private people; private people control it, and they determine the kind of tourist industry that we should have.

I visit hotels. I have said this before, and I will repeat it. I am not going to be a party to a system which in itself underwrites, very predominately, the kind of tourism that would indicate it is a white community that you are

living in solely, and when it comes to the outlook for black people there is a little playing down of these issues. I am not saying this from any racist point of view, but from my own analysis of what I see. Even in the context of the Barbadian society there is an idea, in common colloquial terms, that a tourist is somebody white. To this extent the Government is spending money, not on the promotion of the tourist industry, but on the training of personnel for private industry.

I remember two years ago there was a strike in the tourist industry in the hotels. The hotels wanted to treat the same people that you have trained as they liked. There is some concept that you train a man or woman to do a job, but you leave him or her to accept whatever the industry feels it is going to pay the worker. That is wrong, and we are going to run into problems. I observe that this Resolution is being introduced by the Minister of Education. This is not an educational matter *per se*. This is an industrial relations matter and it comes under Labour. I would have preferred to see the Minister of Labour introducing this Resolution. What we find is that Trade Schools should have been more advanced in this Island. We, in the Trade Union Movement, do not understand why a Trade School has not yet been installed in the Polytechnic or some other place where you can have people trained for various trades. We want to see a Trade School where boys and girls can be trained as artisans, carpenters, masons, etc., in a short time, relatively speaking, to enter into the various trades in this Island so that we will have more skills available in the community.

I am worried about the tourist industry because I feel it is badly organised. I do not consider the borrowing of money at short-time notice and at high rates of interest on it for training people to be a good thing, if you have to pay back the loan in ten or fifteen years, and after the people have been trained you do not want to pay them decent wages for working in the industry.

They now have a Research Centre here, and I am pleased to see that research is being made into these things. I am also very pleased to see what is being done because Barbados has sunshine, sea bathing, and some of the natural ingredients for tourism.

12.30 p.m.

Barbados has some of the natural ingredients for tourism, and now that you are training people in the industry, I feel this is likely to provide more qualified persons who are able to stand up when the time comes and represent themselves

for what would be regarded as a fair and equitable distribution of the industry. As I said at the beginning, I do not have any objections to training in the hotel industry, but I would like to see the hotel industry provide wider training as in agriculture where you are shifting from the old primitive method of the fork and hoe to more mechanical instruments. This is not to say that the industry alone should do it, but the only person who can make the industry provide these things is the Government.

One of the things about industrial training is that you should make the employers of Barbados understand that they alone do not pay the cost. The taxpayers' money we are spending is part of the workers' money that is providing training for themselves, but they are not going to get the direct benefit in the same manner as the employers would be getting from the industry, and it is time that the industry should be made to understand this. There is too much belly-aching and crying that people are not fit for the jobs they enter. You cannot have an educational system which teaches people to read and write and the normal things you get in your conventional system that is going to fit every individual for every occupation there is in Barbados when he or she leaves school. There must be some in-training which must be provided or assisted by the Government. We have said already that we feel the Government should give incentives to employers who provide training whether in the form of income tax relief or in some other form, so that they will assist in this area. This is done directly in Barbados by the Telephone Company, Cable and Wireless and some other sectors where they employ people. It must be borne in mind that training for hotel work, catering and restaurant will serve you within these areas, but it is not necessarily the training that is going to serve you outside those areas in every respect. For that reason I do not see why the hotel and catering industry should not be called upon to make a contribution, and a levy should be imposed on these people for industrial training within the sector in which they are going to deal. This is nothing new, and it is time we face this issue and call upon persons so that you distribute the cost of this training and so too that more training is wide-spread because if you carry out a proper evaluation of industry and you call for a levy within certain sectors, you are spreading the cost and making it easier for more people to be trained.

Now I do not subscribe to the view, Mr. Chairman, that because you train a person and the person is not immediately employed, then the training is lost. That is not true. For that

same reason you can use that argument about education. You do not educate a person only for a job, otherwise some of the rich people would not educate their children because some are not looking for jobs. Education must mean something to the individual as a way of life, how he is going to live, what he is going to do, whether he is going to live like an animal, and because he can get something to eat he has no further interest. The job which a person is going to have is not going to be the final answer because the worker is an individual and a personality which transcends the particular job that he or she has to do, but the importance about training is that it is going to uplift and upgrade the very population itself, and this concept about snobbery that is associated with work would be removed if people are trained. Hotel workers are trained in Europe, but nobody in this House can enter communities in Europe and disrespect a hotel worker on the basis that he is a hotel worker. In Geneva you can find waitresses who speak three and four languages as a commonplace thing. If that were so here we would say that they should be at University as professors, but they did not start with three or four languages. It is not difficult to find in a city like Geneva a hotel worker who speaks three or four languages, but he is going to be paid properly for the job; a maid is going to be paid properly and there is no indignity in being a maid as if being a maid is something *infra dig* because she can speak three or four languages. The idea is that it promotes trade in that country, and as such they are looked upon as important elements within the society. I hope that if we get hotel training the Union does not have to call a strike in order to get justice done to the people who work in the industry. We hope that the Minister of Tourism would not have to tour around with the Union when a strike is on to see how the strike is conducted, and that the employers themselves would realise that they have to pay the people who work for them decent wages.

Mr. Chairman, the employers in Barbados are very diffident about subscribing money or making provision for industrial training. In a general way some of them are backward while some are forward-looking. The majority of employers in Barbados have a primitive concept about industrial training and look for immediate results. Education and training have never been immediate. They have always been a long and tedious process, and therefore it must be the objective and policy of the Government to train people.

As I said before, it is a pity that a department is dealing with this matter which is

not the department's speciality. I am satisfied that industrial training is not part of the basis for education as such, not that the Education Department would not have to come in. It would have to come in in that they would provide ideas about curriculum, teaching methods and what not, but it is basically industrial training with which we are dealing and it is lacking that in training people for industry the Department that should really be dealing with it, which is labour, is not in any way associated to know what are the needs of industry and how many people you need to train without the emotional appeal that because tourism represents something important in our economy therefore we are going to train as many boys and girls as we can find, whereas you could have trained other people in other areas. It is no point training 10,000 people for the hotel industry whereas you do not have enough for other trades. It would be better to make a better assessment and analysis of the situation and this should come from the Department of Labour.

12.40 p.m.

I have nothing against the Ministry of Education proceeding with this but to my way of thinking this is a matter which strikes me as being a matter for the Ministry of Labour. I support the Resolution because I am in favour of industrial training.

The Question that the Resolution for the sum of \$17,600 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76
No. 19

The Resolution for the sum of \$44,188.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: This is a Resolution connected to the same institution as the one on which I spoke. The Addendum to the Resolution clearly sets out the need and the purposes for which this money will be spent.

I hope the member for St. Michael West will appreciate that there will be a time when I could more adequately explain to him my policy and the purposes and reasons for the existing situation. When that time comes I do hope that I will be in the Ministry long enough, or much longer, to be able to give him satisfactory answers to the problems which he has posed in this discussion.

I do not think, Sir, there is need for any lengthy explanation but I would like to invite members of the Opposition to pay a visit to the Hotel School where the meals are served

reasonably cheaply. They do break even, and I think it would be an encouragement to the institution if they could see members of the Opposition attending and seeing what we are trying to do in the interest of our young people and in the interest of the country.

So I would like to extend an invitation to the Opposition to pay a visit to the institution itself, as they have to vote money from time to time for its existence and functioning; and I think it would be a good thing to see for yourselves how the institution is structured and how it is intended to function.

I now beg to move that this Resolution do pass.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the Minister has thrown out an invitation to members of the Opposition to visit the Hotel School and see what is being done; but while it is true that we must congratulate our people in trying to take up some of the posts in an industry which is locally based, what I would like to see the Minister of Education do is to speak to the Minister of Tourism and find out why is it that all the lucrative posts in tourism are kept for non-nationals. That is the first thing I would like to hear him explain when he comes back to this Chamber.

I heard the member for St. Michael West speak just now about the hotels in Geneva, etc., where you can find hotel workers speaking as many as three languages, but I am sure he will agree with me that those people are enjoying the fruits of their country; while in Barbados where we have people who are able to speak two and three languages — people who are Barbadians — they are denied the right to lucrative posts in tourism in this country, and there is a burning example today of the German tourists that are coming to Barbados. I do not want to call the names of the Travel Agencies involved in this now, but I am sorry the Minister of Tourism is not in his seat.

They are bringing German guides into Barbados, and I have asked a question of one in particular and I am waiting to see what answer is going to come out of that; but when those people come here they are paid in U.S. currency, they are given subsistence allowance and when they go down the Islands they get special rates etc., and the local Barbadians who are able to speak German fluently are denied the salary and

the subsistence which are being paid in the hotel industry.

I am waiting to see what will come out of the question I have asked, because I am going to tell this House in no uncertain terms the names of the persons to whom I am referring. I would hope that the Minister of Education would make it one of the priorities to find out why in the hotel industry where Barbadians are qualified for the lucrative posts they are either not given the posts, or they are paid in Barbadian currency which amounts to half or even less than half of the salaries paid to non-nationals enjoying the benefits of Barbadian tourism.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to draw to the Minister's attention that — I am not too clear and I am going to be snooky about the name — but names happen to be changed just as the name of the Tourist Board has been changed to the Board of Tourism. The Hotel School gives a particular connotation, as if training in this field must relate to hotels.

It would have been a good thing if we emphasised hotels and catering. There is a lot of training that goes on in Barbados outside of the hotels, and it is going to grow. For example, a lot of these new apartment hotels do not provide any real facilities for training, and some of the people go elsewhere; and I believe when it comes to the preparation of food, Barbadians can be trained in this and can be a little more knowledgeable about how to prepare food, and even the food which we grow.

I have come face to face with this experience because in my own organisation we are engaged in the task of having to see about cooking food daily for people; and hundreds of people in Barbados who are in the catering trade have never gone near training.

The other thing about it that is serious here is that people engaged in the trade are not even concerned about if the persons they employ are really trained, as long as they can get them cheap. Then you go out and people dish out anything to you and pass it over to you as food.
12.50 p.m.

I find even the normal service that you get at a table where people should be trained, and the way it should be served, the people who run these places have the idea that they can pick up any boy or girl and put them there to wait at the table with the cheapest thing they can find sometimes to make a black bow tie around the neck, and if they can find a shirt that was white it is all right. There are a lot of restaurants

around and we have to train these people. I would like to see the Hotel School not only at Marine House but the structural arrangement of the Hotel School should be that there can be enough people in the school to make it possible for classes and courses to take place integrated with some of the systems they have at the Housecraft Centre. It is a matter of maximising the talents you have, and I feel that many people cannot be accommodated.

If you take an analysis of the people who really work in the industry you will see how many of them are untrained, and if you allow them to be untrained, after a period they do not like to be trained at that time, you have to train them when they first enter but not after five or six years because they feel they know it all. We are living in an island where these things seem to be regarded as a matter for the hotel or for the Government and I do not subscribe to that view, I feel that it is a matter for people other than the hotel or the Government, so that you will spread the idea, because if you want to encourage people to go for training, if you want to spread this concept of training you have to go wider.

I do not have to say much, Mr. Chairman, the House of Assembly with all due respect has the same problem. Do you realise that the members of the House themselves — and I hope the Papers will say this — they acquiesce, endure and accept what I would regard as low catering standards, not high. I have seen catering done in this House of Assembly that if I went to another House of Assembly and anybody had invited me to go to have lunch, what I see being put up with here sometimes I would not accept at another House. I am not a frequent visitor to the House's dining room but it is symptomatic of what we put up with and I think that as leaders of a community you cannot be acquiescing to these sort of things, you must start right and raise the standards of people from every corner so that you get good decent standards. I subscribe to the view that people should be trained.

My colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South East, and those persons who like the sport that is regarded as the king of sport pay more attention to training a race horse, not that the hon. member is a hotel owner, but I would like to see some of the hotel people paying the kind of attention to the people who work in the hotels as the owners of race horses pay to the horses. I have never heard a horse talk yet, there is a horse here now that people talk about as if it is a member of the family and can talk. The horse drinks from something that the water comes up automatically, it does not have to wait until somebody brings a bucket of water to it,

and the training of that horse is expertly dealt with. How is it then that the human element cannot really see this sort of treatment in dealing with other human beings, so that when you go into a catering place the excellence in training is something that should be done. It does not cost you any more to train a person right, it costs you more to train him wrong and I do not know why we are so shoddy about it. Too many people believe in the old concept that labour was so cheap in Barbados that it was not necessary to train people. Some of them are belly-aching about the quality they are getting, but that is the price you have to pay if you are not prepared to train them.

There are a few people in this society who are being trained and I think we had an answer from McNamara that if we do this to too many people in our towns by and large they will take over. If you leave so many untrained people around they will take over. I hope the Minister will expand the training so that some of the people from Marine House can find areas outside of Marine House to be able to expand and help other institutions. They cook at Codrington College and many other institutions in Barbados, and training is not wide enough. I would like to see training catering to such a wide area that to find a trained waiter, a trained cook, a trained person in the hotel industry is not a difficulty. This is something that our educational system in Barbados is capable of providing for us and we do not require even importation, we have enough built-in educational ingredients that we can provide right here in Barbados of what qualities we require for the hotel and catering business if we really want to set about training our people.

1.00 p.m.

The question that the Resolution in the sum of \$44,188 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, each seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. LAWRENCE, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item is Item No.2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance. It is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at St. Lawrence, Christ Church.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No.2 is the next Order of the Day.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes my Ministry is called upon to carry out certain acquisitions for other Ministries because of the responsibilities which I, as the Minister, have for lands and because of the fact that, by law, all Government buildings are vested in me as the Minister. I have been asked by the Ministry of Trade to acquire certain properties at Christ Church for the purpose of carrying on there some operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The property to which I am referring is well known to hon. members. It is a property that formerly housed the Exchange of the Barbados Telephone Company. That building is no longer required by the Barbados Telephone Company. We have expressed an interest in the building, and the Company has offered it to the Government because the Ministry of Trade felt it is suitable for the purpose of establishing a depot for the distribution of vegetables and other produce in that area. *(Interruption).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a minute. Will the Marshal please tell hon. members in the adjoining room that we are unable to hear what is being said in this Chamber! The Minister may proceed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Addendum to the Resolution sets out the location of the property, and we have agreed with the Telephone Company on the purchase price. There is not much more that I, as Minister of Lands, can say about this matter except that I know for sure that the Barbados Marketing Corporation is engaged at this moment in establishing depots in certain parts of the country for the distribution of vegetables and other operations carried on by the Corporation. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one such depot being established. Another one is being constructed at Lodge. *(Interruption).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Marshal, there are some hon. members in the adjoining room.

Please ask them to be quiet because they are disturbing us. I can scarcely hear the Hon. Minister.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are other areas where the Barbados Marketing Corporation is planning to set up depots. With these brief introductory remarks, I move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we support 100% any efforts on the part of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to expand its operations and matters of this sort. What worries us about this Resolution is that we have learnt from the Minister that there is an agreement as to the price with the Telephone Company. I think I am right in saying that the Company offered the property to the Government. In this case one would hardly believe that the Telephone Company would be the owners of a property and would not have a marketable title for it. If the Telephone Company has this property undoubtedly, with a marketable title and there is an agreement as to the price, then why is it found necessary for us to acquire the property compulsorily? I would certainly like to hear an explanation from the Minister on this score. As I have heard it from time to time, and as I understand it, this procedure should only be followed when there is a likelihood of a defect in the title for the property and people are unable to give a proper title for the property. This is a case, in dealing with the Telephone Company, where everything is put plainly before us. There is no question of disagreement as to the price. If that is the position, then why should we have to acquire this property compulsorily?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government acquires lands compulsorily for more than one reason. One reason is when there is a defective title. Another reason is when the Government wants to free the land of certain restrictive covenants. That is the situation here. This land is burdened with some restrictive covenants. It is not that the title is defective, but that the Government should acquire the land free from restrictive covenants. If we do not do it this way, then the Barbados Marketing Corporation would have to make an application to the Courts to free the property of those covenants. When we come to this Chamber to acquire property it is to give it an indefeasible right of title and, of course, to free it from restrictive covenants.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have to appeal to the Minister

because he has opened a whole area that has not been canvassed since I have been in here: the question of using the Land Acquisition Act to free a property of the burden of restrictive covenants. I do not deny that it can be done, but it has never been dealt with before since I have been in here. Can he assure us that the owners of the benefits of those covenants are also being compensated? It would be very unfair for the Government to take away a man's right to a restrictive covenant over somebody else's property without making compensation to the persons who are entitled to benefit.
1.10 p.m.

You will not find escape from the Courts by using the Land Acquisition Act, because if the covenant has a value, the owners of the covenant can go to Court under the Constitution because they would have been deprived of the benefit of those covenants without compensation. Can the Minister just tell us whether compensation is being paid?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course as you quite rightly observed, I have already made my reply, but the question of compensation is not considered. It all depends on the type of covenants one is trying to extinguish. Every covenant does not necessarily carry a value; it might be a covenant to restrict it for the purpose of commerce. It may not have a monetary value. I remember distinctly that the owners of Chefette at Rockley had to go to the Court and the Chief Justice sent and summoned the Chief Town Planner to Court to give evidence on the question of freeing the land on which they now carry on their operations as the covenant on that property. The question of compensating the owners at Blue Waters never arose. This is the same situation here. It depends on the type of covenant that one is trying to get oneself free of.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I have not suspended the Standing Orders, but if hon. members of the Opposition have anything urgent and pressing under Private Members' Business, it may well be that they can deal with it until 2 o'clock. In the absence of that, I will move that the House do now adjourn. I am trying to accommodate the Opposition in order for them to say whether they can deal with anything between now and 2 o'clock when we will be willing to remain. It does not seem as

though they have anything urgent, and therefore I am going to move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I think I should have to suspend the Standing Orders.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended until 2 o'clock today.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION RE THE DECLARATION OF ASSETS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. member for St. Thomas. When the time for Private Members' Business expired on the last occasion, the hon. member for Christ Church West was addressing the Chair. I do not now see the hon. member in his place. Is there any other hon. member who desires to speak on the Resolution?

Mr. ADAMS: Since no other hon. member wishes to speak, I propose to wind up.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not here when the Honourable Mover of the Resolution spoke on the need for legislation providing that all members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices including those of Prime Minister, Minister, Leader of the Opposition or Parliamentary Secretary be compelled to disclose their assets when taking office or a seat in Parliament and thereafter

periodically until they cease to hold such office or a seat in Parliament. I do not know what public offices here means, whether it is a public Parliamentary office or public offices of a nature where a man is not a parliamentarian but is holding office like the Chief Justice or the Director of Public Prosecutions, and we should have some clarity about these public offices here. I had not previously read the full context of the Resolution, but it says:

"Whereas there is a need in Barbados for Legislation providing that all Members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices including those of Prime Minister, Minister Leader of the Opposition or Parliamentary Secretary be compelled to disclose their assets when taking office or a seat in Parliament and thereafter periodically until they cease to hold such office or a seat in Parliament;

Be it resolved that this House call on the Government to introduce Legislation to this effect at the earliest opportunity."

I think, Sir, this would need some clarification so as to know precisely the persons other than those people named. Speaking personally, it does not matter to me about disclosure of assets, but apart from saying this is something that other people do, I would like to ask the hon. member if this becomes the most urgent matter in the form of persons holding public offices declaring their assets. A member of Parliament is rated in the same context as a Minister. Why is it that a man in private life who runs a business and is not a member of Parliament is not required to show anything of his assets no matter how many people he employs, but if he becomes a member of Parliament he has to declare his assets? I am a believer that the assets of all businesses in Barbados should be made public. I do not know, for example, the assets of any member of the House of Assembly if he is an employer and we have to negotiate for the people he employs. It does not affect me personally because I believe this would be a good indicator, and if you got this information from some of the members who run for public office, when I have to negotiate with some of them in other areas I would be in a better position to know if the cry of wolf is really true, or I would be able to have substantial evidence as to their assets.

1.20 p.m.

I think the hon. member will agree that this is going to be a paper Resolution, and I believe this is going to be one of those things that you are going to find the solicitors and the lawyers

flouting around it, because, I understand now that if you put some people in court and you have to get the money from them you find that no matter how much money they have, it turns out that it is not their money but it is money belonging to their wives or their aunts or their uncles, or something like that; and I am wondering to what extent these assets are going to be really proved.

The purpose of a thing like this is to have — I believe the idea is to know if a man is in public life, what he has done since he entered public life; if he has used his public office to his advantage or getting money, as some people would say, 'under the counter', and therefore he becomes a wealthy person as a result of these things; and therefore this is a means of tracing him and finding out what happens. However, speaking personally I do not regard this as any party matter. So far as I am concerned anybody can know my assets because I feel what are my assets are what I work for. I did not have a push start, a self-start or any of these starts that some other people have had; so it does not affect me, but I really wondering if it is going to have the effect of saying you want politicians and public people to be men above reproach. If so you have to start off in another way. Do public people, members of Parliament and such people pay their debts? Do they pay people who they owe or do the people they owe have to run them down? Do you have to sue them to get them to pay you?

A man's assets are a lot to do with a man's character. Some people are allergic to paying debts. They believe that these will be dealt with in the Great Beyond when they pass on and that these will be taken care of.

I did not hear the hon. member in his introductory remarks say — and I would like to know what is the basis of this, because if we pass it now — you are satisfied because they do it in Jamaica; the hon. member will pardon me if I am unfair in this. I think that sometimes you have to be original in your own right in some of the Resolutions you want done. If somebody has done something and you feel it is good you do it, but you do not have to do it because they have done it; but I do not consider that.....

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. I will try to assist the hon. member. This matter was already raised by an hon. member in his contribution to the debate — the hon. member for Christ Church South Central; but it was pointed out then that this Resolution was on the Order Paper of the House of Assembly before there was legislation on it in

Jamaica; and it was in our Manifesto — the Manifesto of our party — before it was in the Manifesto of a political party in Jamaica. So this is not anything new.

We were criticised for taking so long to bring it to the stage of debate. We were not criticised for lack of originality; at least not so far.

Mr. WALCOTT: Not so far as Jamaica is concerned because I do not think that Jamaica is the only place; but as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I want to know is, what is the difference between say, the assets of a member of Parliament being made public and any other person holding public office — that is to say, the assets of any public officer being made public.

When you say 'assets' you mean all that he owns. Are you going to ask persons in the public service to declare their assets? What kind of offices do you mean? I do not know. If you are talking purely and simply of Parliamentarians and people who are running for Parliament only I could understand, but here it says: "Whereas there is a need in Barbados for legislation providing that all members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices including those of the Prime Minister, Minister, Leader of the Opposition or Parliamentary Secretary, etc." These other holders of public offices including those of the Prime Minister is what is mentioned. I would like to know what do you envisage by these 'other persons.' Are you going outside the Parliamentarians and embrace these other people? What are the offices you mean?

So far as I am concerned as a person, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say this to the hon. member. I have nothing to hide and for that reason I have nothing to be ashamed of, but, I ask this; if the assets are false, what would happen? What are the penal clauses? What is going to happen if one's assets are false. (*Aside*). You are calling on the Government to introduce legislation to examine this. Well, it would be a good thing for the Government to examine it.

1.30 p.m.

He is calling on the Government to introduce legislation to deal with this. Again, if you ask the Government to do this, the hon. member said that if they put it in their Manifesto they will do it. I think this is one of the things that a party that pledges to do if they get in power should do. I do not think you can quarrel with another Government if they have not pledged to do it if they do not do it. I am not

defending the Government here, I am only saying that so far as I am concerned it would not matter me in any way. If the Leader of the Opposition is the Prime Minister and he introduces a Bill which asks what the assets are I would be quite happy. I have to let the Tax Commissioner every year know what my assets are and I do not owe him any money, but I would be prepared to let them know what my assets are. I think it would put a lot of people's mind at rest because if people know other people's assets they would not talk the foolishness they talk now.

Some people fear that the encroachment into certain aspects of private life will take place and it is going to be asked in what relation would these things be known, are these things going to be made public? I understand in one of these places the assets were made known but are the assets going to be public assets that you put them on the Public Building wall just like if it is a public company? Or is it going to be a question of how you are treating an individual holding a certain public office and an individual not holding public office? So far as I am concerned it does not matter because when you have lived a life that is above reproach these things do not worry you.

I remember reading once that this is the sort of thing that people in Barbados would not be inclined to have done. You do not pay serious attention to people who attempt to speak on behalf of everybody in the world, but so far as a matter like this is concerned it has no meaning to me personally one way or the other how the House would vote on a matter like this because it is immaterial to me. If they vote for it I am in favour of it because it does not really matter, it is for those people who have something to hide and who have been hiding, not people whose assets are those that they have a right to. Personally I am not one of those people who believe that people who work hard should not have assets. If the lazy and indifferent feel that they have the right to have assets I do not think those who work hard should not have assets and save some of what they have worked for for themselves and their families.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in recent years the declaration of assets by members of Parliament and people holding public office, and cries of corruption, various outcries of oppression and very often very despicable attachments to people holding public office have gained momentum, and in my opinion very often without justification. Throughout the world, especially the western hemisphere, there has been an upsurge of people in public offices and

Parliaments who for the most part have sprung from among the working class and entrenched classes from whom power was wrenched, have sought at all times to tarnish the names and characters of the people who have overthrown them. In England Mr. Atlee and Mr. Wilson, though of the same colour, even quite recently an attempt was made to tarnish the name of Mr. Atlee.

When a society is a multi-racial one and the people who hold the seats of Government are black and from the underprivileged class, there are greater charges and greater cries for the declaration of assets and cries of corruption, victimisation and all these high pressured despicable things said about people holding public office. I am one of those people who believe that a man's wealth, his work and his will is his private business. I believe that. It is strange, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would not get a cry for a declaration of assets when the Portuguese had Angola, you would not get it now that Smith has Rhodesia, you would not get it now Verwoerd has South Africa, you would not get it when all the white colonialists controlled all the Governments in Africa, but as soon as there has been an emergence of black people you hear all these cries for declaration of assets.

What is a declaration of assets going to do for the man in the street? Is it going to put an extra pound of butter in his refrigerator? What is it going to mean to him? Purely because it is an attempt to denigrate the successors of power in the country you get these kind of statements. Imagine in 1942 you get E.L.C. talking about this declaration of assets and a few other people, or E.L.C. walking up to Keith Walcott or J. H. Wilkinson or Sir John Chandler and asking them if they had a pen or to declare their assets.

1.40 p.m.

Can you countenance anybody asking A. S. Bryden — he held public office in the Vestry — or who was so mad as to write in the newspaper asking him to declare his assets? They have lost political power now, and they are asking every black man, who is holding public office, so long as he can change a car three times a year, walk about looking clean and carrying a cheque book, to declare his assets. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition that I do not believe in it. He may have a case, and I am not saying that he does not have one, but it is not necessary to pass a law regarding this matter if he feels strongly on it. He should take a stand and declare his assets. Do not wait for the Assembly to vote on it.

I am not running for a seat at the next elections because I have seen that a multi-party

system in a developing country does not suit us. I cannot function in it, and I am not going to run again under this system because I have discovered that. This is the reason why I am not running. Nobody has to pass a law to make a one-party State to get me not to run. That is my feeling on the matter. If you feel strongly on the matter you, as the Leader of the Opposition, should declare your set of standards and show that you believe in what you are talking about. Do not come to Parliament to make us believe that you have to pass a law to do that. If you believe that lawyers should not go to work before ten o'clock you should do that. You do not need legislation to conduct your personal behaviour so long as you are within the limits of the prescribed laws. Those are simple things to me.

In Barbados any white man can come from St. Andrew, St. John, or any part of the country and acquire wealth, and you will always find somebody who will say: "He will always get money because he is somebody's grand son." An excuse is always sought for him, but whenever a black man gets anywhere he is corrupt! I cannot understand it, but it is not anything new. The Vestry in St. Michael for years was selling the Almshouse provisions and so on, and the Vestry was controlled by white people but there was no corruption. John Beckles sold pig food, and they put him in court for buying the pig food. The white people can do anything; they can sell all sorts of things. John Beckles bought the pig food and they said it was corruption.

Now, white contractors built Combermere School in Roebuck Street. Within six years it was pushed down and we had to build a new school. Is there any corruption in that? None at all. They found an excuse to build a new school. They said that the land was moving around. They did not say that the contractors did not put enough material in the foundation to anchor the building. Other people built houses in that area and they stood up. The moment a black man builds a house and it starts to crack, you will be told how much money he wants to make out of the job and how corrupt he is. There is no excuse for the Negro at all, and I do not understand it.

The first time black people started to get jobs in the Banks certain people went around saying that people would now lose their money in the banks, and they were now employing the wrong people. When black people started to work at the Telephone Company, it was said that they would talk everybody's business. When they went to work at the Biscuit Company, it was said that they would eat all of the biscuits and they would put more biscuits in a barrel than 1,000.

Whenever black people are put in authority all types of derogatory remarks are used against them purely because the people from whom they took power have not yet accepted that they are capable of governing. The regrettable thing about it is that there are some black people in this community who will not defend any mistake a black man makes, but they will find an excuse for one made by a white man.

Now, any stupid cry put out by white people against black people will be taken up by black people and given currency, too. It has reached the last stage. It has reached the stage now where members of Parliament are questioning the integrity of themselves. How can I accept this? We are saying that we need to be controlled and monitored. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not support, either in part or *in toto*, a declaration of assets of anybody in this country because I believe a person's wealth, his wife and his will, not necessarily in that order, although the last will always be last, should be personal and private.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid, at this stage, the Government cannot finalise this debate in that the matter is still being considered by Cabinet. I will be moving, therefore, that further consideration be postponed. Before I actually do that, I should like to mention that there are certain procedures even at present whereby Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries are called upon under Letters Patent, to make disclosures of their assets when they are being sworn in. I do not know if hon. members are aware of that. Of course, this Resolution goes very much further. It speaks of Senators and public officers. This matter has not been finally considered by Cabinet, and we are not in a position to finalise this debate at this sitting. Although the matter has been considered by the Cabinet, it was deferred and a final conclusion as to Government's policy on this matter has not been settled. That being the case, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking on the motion for the postponement of this Resolution, it is a matter of great interest to me to hear that Letters Patent exist in Barbados by which Ministers have to disclose their assets. I have read the last Barbados Letters Patent of 1964, or whatever year it was, and I must confess that I am not persuaded that any such condition is laid down therein. Perhaps the Letters Patent have been promulgated by the Governor-General

privately since Independence, which could assist me in this direction. I would ask the Minister if he could be so kind as to make available to me — not being a member of the Privy Council — the Letters Patent which indicate that a disclosure of assets, general, special, or otherwise, is mandatory.

1.50 p.m.

This will be an extraordinary circumstance unheard of as far as I know in any Commonwealth country, but demanded it is true of the President of the United States by his Cabinet, of many Presidents of the United States from their Cabinets, but so far as I know, generally privately demanded as a private condition.

I would have wished the opportunity today of dealing with the speech made by the hon. member for St. Micheal South East, but I will have an opportunity in the fullness of time of commenting; but in so far as he threw out a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition to declare his assets, such a challenge, as I conceive it, if the motion for further consideration is carried, may well be prejudiced by the delay which may ensue before the debate is resumed. I would like just to say something about that. I am ready to declare my assets any time. You can have them written down, I will send them to the hon. member privately and will not ask him to tell me his; I will tell him how much I had when I came to the House, which was very little, and I will tell him how much I have now, which is a little more, but not very much more. My assets are available any time; but there is a reason because this has gone on in all Parliaments wherever there has been a debate. You challenge the man who introduces the Declaration Resolution or legislation and you tell him: "If you want to declare yours, you declare yours, but do not ask me to declare mine". This has happened everywhere.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the hon. member is putting a different interpretation to what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have already spoken.

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of explanation, I said if the hon. member feels strongly about it he does not have to wait for legislation. It is not a challenge. I said if I felt strongly on it I would declare mine also. There is no challenge in it; it is a suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member's use of language is too nice and delicate for me. That is a

challenge; he calls it a suggestion, I take it as a challenge and since addressed to me, my interpretation as far as I am concerned will have to be dealt with. A man must be taken to intend the ordinary and natural meaning of his words, and he cannot stop it from being a challenge by calling it a suggestion. But there is a reason for not taking up the suggestions or challenges.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, what we are in effect doing is continuing the debate, which is not right. The motion before the House is that further consideration be postponed; it was duly moved and seconded. The hon. member can debate perhaps whether the debate should continue or whether it should not continue, but at this stage the hon. member should not be heard to be continuing the debate until that motion before the House is disposed of.

Mr. ADAMS: With great respect, am I not entitled, if I wish, to oppose a motion for further consideration on the grounds that something has been said which requires immediate reply? What kind of parliamentarian are we dealing with? If something is said that needs a reply, I can argue that we should not postpone.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I want to make it clear what I said just now. I particularly stated that the hon. member is at liberty to say whether or not this debate should continue, but not to continue the debate which has been before this Chamber. I do not mind how hot or impassioned the hon. member gets on this. One cannot continue debate on this until the motion is disposed of. If the motion is voted against then the hon. member can continue the debate at that stage. He is at liberty to say whether in fact it should continue or not continue, but not answer points raised by hon. members.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is taken.

Mr. ADAMS: A man cannot give reasons for voting for a measure or not voting for a measure? (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have already made your point.

Mr. ADAMS: What is going on in here, Sir? I am trying to discuss a motion to postpone debate, and I am trying to say why I am in favour or against and the hon. member, every time I try to get to the point, gets up and interrupts on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Mr. ADAMS: Don't encourage him in foolishness. You are there to educate the hon. member; don't encourage him in nonsense. You are the Minister of Education now, you must lead your colleagues along the right path. I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I am not addressing you. I am asking the Minister of Education to assist his colleagues with his long parliamentary experience. Can I be heard on the motion to postpone, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you should not stretch out this debate.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, with great respect, dealing with that aspect, you can always argue against a motion to postpone that matters have been raised in the debate which are of such moment that they deserve immediate reply, and I carefully indicated in respect of the hon. member's argument that I would not wish to deal with the general burden of his speech at this stage, I would save it for reply, but one aspect of his speech which contained what I considered a challenge, if it went unanswered at this stage, the ultimate answer might be prejudiced. That is what I said and I am being very careful to keep within the rules of debate if so permitted. I hope that hon. members who are sitting in their seats and breaking the rules of silence are also trying to keep within the Standing Orders.

Sir, many people say the Government wants to postpone this debate because they are afraid of taking a vote on the Resolution. The

Government will be aware that it is opening itself to that charge, that it is divided, that there are many members who do not wish to disclose their assets. The Minister has given what I take to be a pledge that the Cabinet will consider the matter, so if the Government wishes to have time for further consideration, so be it; but I will challenge the Government to do two things: first of all, to give early consideration to the matter at Cabinet, and secondly, to advise as a Cabinet, speaking of the Government now, not Government members, to allow a free vote in here on the question when it ultimately comes up. This is a dual challenge which I would make to the Government. Bring it back to the House early and then let hon. members vote according to their consciences when it does come up at that time.

The Question that further consideration be postponed, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes our business for today's Sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday the 9th December, 1975, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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