

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th March, 1975

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R.ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport.)

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in receipt of a communication from the Private Secretary to Her Majesty the Queen which states:

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

I am commanded by the Queen to send you the enclosed photogravures which Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh have signed for the House of Assembly to mark the opening of Parliament by the Queen on Wednesday, 19th February, 1975. They come with the warm, good wishes of Her Majesty and His Royal Highness to all members of the House of Assembly.

Yours sincerely,
Philip Moore."

The photographs are on the Table for Members to look at.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: For your confirmation, are the Minutes of this Honourable House for the 28th January, 1975, 4th February and 19th February, 1975.

If there are no alterations or corrections, these Minutes will be confirmed. There being no alteration or corrections, the Minutes are hereby duly confirmed.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation for the year 1973-74.

On behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works, who is absent through illness, I am commanded to lay:

- (1) The Statements showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the months of July to November 1974.
- (2) The Statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations for the months of July to November 1974.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

- (1) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$317,923 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the

Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 30, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

- (2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$318,207 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 31 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (3) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$101,031 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 32, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (4) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$250,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 33 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (5) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$186,383 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 34, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On my own behalf:

- (6) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$291,169 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 35, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Minister of Communications & Works:

- (7) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$129,217 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75, Annexed Estimates, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 36, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

compulsory acquisition of land at Jessamy Lane, Bridgetown.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of (1) a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

- (2) A Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

On behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the registration and discipline of engineers and for connected purposes.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act 1941 be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958 be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the registration and discipline of engineers and for connected purposes, be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is a Special Meeting which has been summoned for today to deal with specific Government Business, and I am sure that the Leader of the House knows that what he is seeking to introduce is certainly in contravention of our Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: It cannot be in contravention, if I ruled it in order. Let me answer your point.

Mr. HINDS: We have not suspended Standing Orders up to this point, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: This answers your point. I am in receipt of a letter dated the 27th February, 1975, from the Hon. Leader of the House representing to me that the public interest required the meeting of this Chamber at a time earlier than that to which the House was adjourned on the last occasion. I am quoting:

- “(a) Receiving any documents to be laid;
- (b) Receiving notice of any measures;
- (c) Considering in all stages the measures listed in the Appendix.”

Therefore, what we are doing is quite within the ambit, and I will see to it that it is kept within the ambit of this letter dated 27th February, 1975.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is not on our Agenda.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, with due respect to what you have just brought to our knowledge, the Bill to discipline engineers has not been circulated to hon. Members, and we are submitting that this is something new that the Leader of the House is introducing and this is in contravention of our Standing Orders, it being a Special Meeting.
12.15 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me rule, please. I do not agree with that interpretation, and I think that the matter of which notice has been given and of which it is proposed to have a first reading done is quite in order. What I would rule is that it cannot be done at this Special Sitting of the House, because I myself do not have it amongst my papers. A First Reading is a mere formality so that while the hon. Member is in order to have a First Reading done, I would rule that it be not done at this Special Sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is quite in order, and quite a good ruling, I think the hon. Member would appreciate that no measure which is not circulated is dealt with until it is circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question is that the Bill be now read a first time.

Mr. HINDS: Divide.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no division on a First Reading. It is an absolute formality. This is the only way a matter can come before the Chamber. This is a First Reading and I am not going to allow a division.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the second paragraph you will see that it says —

“Pursuant to the above representation, I am directed to give you notice that there will be a Special Meeting of the Honourable the House of Assembly to be held at the Public Buildings, Bridgetown, St. Michael on Tuesday, the 4th day of March, 1975, at 12.00 Noon to consider the following Government Business set down for that day.”

At a Special Meeting therefore, no other business can be done apart from what is on the Notice Paper. That is all my colleagues are trying to put to you, Sir. Only the business set down for this day can be done because it is a Special Meeting. While you are allowing the Government to give notices and you are talking about formalities, at a Special Meeting you can only do the business of that day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not only that. The Standing Orders are for me to interpret, or the Chairman for that time that he is presiding. I am here according to the letter as represented by the Leader of the House to receive any documents to be laid and notices of any measures. Now then, the matter rests there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, that is not where the matter rests at all with all due respect to you. According to the Rules, the business is what is circulated to us, not to you. If I may quote Standing Order No. 6(9), it says —

“If, during an adjournment of the House.....The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of meeting.”

The business to be dealt with is the business circulated, not the business that is sent to you. If they sent a letter talking about documents and other things to be laid, that is a

matter between you and the Government, but the business appointed for the day according to the Agenda is the one set out on this Agenda and this alone, and there is nothing in this which talks about laying any documents.

I will also raise this question of whether it is proper for the Government in these circumstances to give notice here of something before it is laid in the House of Assembly as saying they are going to do it. Your Honour pulled me up some time ago on a point of privilege when I gave notice and said in the newspaper that I intended to raise a question on the Hospital on the motion for adjournment. Your Honour ruled in here that it was a mild form of breach of privilege for me to say to the newspaper what I said to you in a letter. I see now that the Government in the media has done the same thing because they wrote to you saying they intended to do certain things today of which notice was not given. I am dealing with Item No. 4 on the Agenda. No notice was given of these things beforehand and if they can write to the newspaper and say that these things will be done today without notice being given to you, Mr. Speaker, I should like you to rule on whether that is not a question of breach of privilege for the Government to do that, because the Government and the Minister who is responsible for this can be in no better position than me as an ordinary Member of this Chamber. I want to raise that and have it clarified.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I have heard is really no point of privilege.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me rule. Having ruled, there might not be any opportunity or necessity for you to make a point. What I have heard is really no point of privilege; it has been a point of order in the guise of a point of privilege.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to raise the point of privilege now. Is it proper for the Government to set down on the Agenda to be discussed matters of which notice has not been given? Must not notice be given first in the Chamber before they can get on the Order Paper? (A VOICE: Are you questioning the Chair?) I am not questioning the Chair; it is a question of the privileges of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the letter which was sent to me, I am here to receive notice of any measures, and that is precisely what we have done.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, you are not with me, Sir. If you look at Standing Order No. 6(9), you will see that it says —

“If, during an adjournment of the House, it is represented to the Speaker by a Minister that the public interest requires that the House should meet on an earlier day than that to which the House stands adjourned, the Speaker, if he is satisfied that the public interest does so require, may give notice accordingly and the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice. The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of meeting.”

Now in fixing the Agenda or Order Paper, can notice be given of matters which are not on the Order Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I have so ruled. It can so happen.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In other words, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, you can come in one Tuesday and say this is the Order Paper for that day without fixing it. That is what it is tantamount to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting with the usual undertaking that if the Opposition has any urgent matter to deal with, we will stay and deal with it.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be any matters that the Opposition can deal with at this Sitting.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, this being a Special Sitting of the House, is it not to be understood that we are to meet and carry out our business as laid down by the Rules without any change? Are we within our rights to suspend the Standing Orders? I am inviting you to examine the situation carefully and assist us. We need your assistance at this hour. It is a Special Meeting summoned to do special business according to a special Standing Order, and I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that under those circumstances you

cannot come here and waive any Rule. We should come here and sit down and discuss business according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree with the hon. Member's interpretation of the Special Sitting. For example Standing Order No. 6 deals with the times at which the House meets and rises for lunch and so on. I think it is a pure formality. Certainly I would concede that in respect of Standing Order No. 16 which is to be suspended, this has been done *ex abundante cautela* and really does not apply in that respect it is a complete *brutum fulmen*; useless in other words.

12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 of Supply to deal with the Money Resolutions which have been circulated and of which notice has been given.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. The House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1974-75 No. 30

Resolution for the sum of \$317,923 - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(1) Cabinet Office stand part. The explanation is given in the addendum; and I therefore do not think I have anything to add.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Head 20 - Ministry of External Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are several items under this Head. One is Item 18 - Communications - for the sum of \$10,750; Item 24 - Maintenance of Vehicles, for the sum of \$3,400; Item 25 - Utilities, for the sum of \$2,000; Item 31 - Contributions and Voluntary Pledges to International and Regional Organisations, for the sum of \$202,724, and Item 34 - Mortgage Payments, for the sum of \$10,750.

In each case the explanations are very clear and there is very little I can add.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore beg to move that Head 20 - Ministry of External Affairs - stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to Item 18 - Communications. We on this side of the House would like to hear from the Leader of the House what aeroplanes are engaged or what airlines carry diplomatic mail and at what cost. This is very important to us because we have information on this side of the House, which, as soon as we hear from the Leader what the position is, we will be able to disclose. We would certainly like to know what the position is.

Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps much which would be brought to light at some stage when we get information from the Ministry with regard to the position in which the Consul General finds himself in New York. We on this side of the House would like to know if it could be really true that he and his household are really putting up at a hotel in New York. We would like to know what is the cost up to the present time, from the time that he took up his responsibility in New York, and why it is that he has not been able to occupy the premises formerly occupied by the Consul General. That is one thing we would like the Leader of the House to tell us.

What we are concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is to know that it was within the knowledge of the Government that the Consul General and his household would have to be at a hotel when he set out from here. It is known that the Government of Barbados owns a house in New York and that this house was to be occupied by the Consul General. I think I am right in saying that. If that is the case, why is it that we now find that the present Consul General has got to be put up in a hotel when the Barbados Government owns a house in New

York? What we understand is this, Mr. Chairman, that when the present Consul General left here and went to the House in New York, he was forbidden permission to enter.

12.35 p.m.

We must understand the degree of embarrassment, if this is true, that not only the Governor General but his honourable wife and other members of his household suffered when such a situation arose. We would like to hear a statement from the Leader of the House or from somebody on the Government side as to the true position of this. Who owns the house which the taxpayers' money was put into? Who occupies it? Is it a fact that somebody is now laying claim to the ownership of the house? If a purchase was effected, was any agreement entered into? We would certainly like to know what loopholes were left there, so that our present Consul General and taxpayers of this country cannot have access to this house. If the Consul General has to be operating out of a hotel after we have bought a house in New York, then something has gone wrong and we should be told about it. When money was needed to purchase the property, Government came to this House and we should be told now why our present Consul General cannot occupy the house as one would expect. It is not a matter to be treated lightly, and we would certainly like to hear, from the Leader of the House, the true position.

There is, Mr. Chairman, the question of Contributions and Voluntary Pledges to International and Regional Organisations. The amount being asked for is \$202,724. Surely the Leader of the House would have in his possession the names of the international organisations and regional institutions to which pledges have been made from time to time, and the amounts which have been pledged to these organisations or institutions. This is knowledge which I think the Leader of the House should have no hesitation in sharing with the Opposition. It is not a secret, nor is it his private property and we would wish that the Minister would make the information available to us so that it might help us to proceed with this debate at a more rapid pace.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would think that the Leader of the House would wish to give whatever information is necessary and which he has at his disposal to help us in this debate. I see that the sum of \$3,400 is required to meet the increased costs of oil and petrol over a period of time. I would like to seek information from the Leader of the House as to what model and what make cars, and the cost of these cars which the Government of Barbados owns at these Missions.

I would expect to know the year, the cost and the make. This is of importance to this side because we were told, whether true or false, that some of these Ambassadors are now the owners of Mayfairs, Lincoln Continentals and Jaguars, and I would hate to think that a country as small as Barbados with people under pressure day after day, hungry and homeless and with hardly any clothing can afford such luxuries at this time. I would be more than grateful to get this information from the Leader of the House at this stage, and I am quite sure that after this I might have a few more things to say.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there were two pertinent questions raised by the hon. Member for St. James and by the hon. Member for St. Peter. They can probably secure their replies by asking proper questions. I do not have all that information here, but I would suggest that if they want to get the entire replies they should ask subsequent questions.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, the Leader of the House is saying that the best way to seek this information is by way of a question, but experience on this side has shown quite clearly.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to make the point but if the imbecile on that side is going to guide you simply because he feels he can direct the Chair from there.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no one in here who can direct this Chair when I am in it. When I say it is no point of order, all hon. Members should know the meaning of a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Just allow me to develop the point Sir. What I am trying to ask the Hon. Leader of the House to do is to arm himself with these facts today because it is very difficult for us to get replies from the Government over a period of time. We have our reasons for this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I cannot give any assurance on that but I will try to get the answer for him.

On Item 18 — Communications, the hon. member for St. Peter was seeking some information. The amount voted and approved in the last Estimates was \$145,056 allocated to various Missions and so on. The Supplementary Provision required for the High Commission in

the United Kingdom is \$10,750. The increase in telephone costs and the cost of diplomatic mail make it necessary to seek this Supplementary Provision under this Item. The cost of dialled units has risen from one penny to one and a half pence per unit, that is, by 50% with effect from 1st August, 1974.

12.45 p.m.

With regard to Item 25, the hon. Member for St. Peter raised a question about the Consul General's premises and wanted to know why his family and himself were living in a hotel. The only information I can give him is not on that specific point but on the supplementary which I am seeking: an explanation in so far as the \$2,000 is concerned. Now, a clause in the lease of the offices of the Consul General makes the tenant liable to pay, from time to time, an additional rent to be agreed between the tenant and landlord related to the cost of the electricity consumed. The additional rent payable by the Consul General, in accordance with the latest electric survey, is \$920.00 per month which has to be paid retroactively from 1st April, 1974. Because of this extra commitment, an amount of \$2,000 is necessary to meet expenses to the end of March, 1975, but that has nothing to do with the question which was asked. I am not in a position to say whether the Consul General and his family are living at a hotel or in the Consul General's premises. I am seeking this \$2,000 in order to meet the requirements of the lease.

With regard to Item 31 — Contributions and Voluntary Pledges to International and Regional Organisations, the sum of \$1,342,225, was provided in the Approved Estimates, and the supplementary provision we are asking for is \$202,724. The amount to be provided as contribution to many of the Organisations is no longer known at the time of the preparation of the Estimates. In addition the Cabinet, from time to time, agrees to this Government entering on membership of new Organisations in the course of the financial year.

Now, the hon. Member wanted to get an idea of the names of the various Organisations. I can give him a copy of the list, if he wants to get it. I.C.O., I.C.A.O., UNICEF, W.H.O., P.A.H.O., I.C.E.R.O., C.C.A., I.T.U., I.N.C.O. and so on. There are quite a number of them, Sir. I will continue: U.N.D.P., U.N.D.I.O., U.N.I.P.A.D.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Will the hon. Member give us the detailed names of these Organisations instead of the initials.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of all hon. Members generally, I will ask the Ministry of External Affairs to let me have a complete list of these Organisations and I will circulate it to members, which I think is the proper thing to do so that they will be fully aware of the various Organisations.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If we find ourselves in a position where the Leader of the House is unable to give us this information at this time, I am going to suggest that he be so decent to this House as to postpone this particular topic. It is unfair, if not to Members on this side, to Members in the back row on the other side and to the public for the Minister to come in here with a document and read initials and expect somebody to know what he is saying. He now tells us that he will ask the Ministry of External Affairs to give a list. It means that somebody has placed a file in his hands; he does not know what is in it, but he is prepared to move a Resolution when we do not know what is going on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: A point of information then, Sir. I would like to know what I am dealing with. I will not be a party to anything of this nature where somebody is going to get up and say: "PAHO" when I do not know what it means and he does not know what it means, and expect me to vote for it. I do not think you would want to be a party to that, Sir. It is a disgrace on the House as a whole if we should go on to deal with this matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: These Organisations are so well known that they are quoted in that way. If hon. Members want me to explain in detail what it is all about, I will promise to help them. These Organisations are time internationally known Organisations.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since these Organisations are so well known, let the Minister call the names and we will get on with the debate. Mr. Chairman, this is a blatant attempt to make a donkey out of the Minister. A file is placed in his hands and he knows nothing about what is in it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is what I get in trying to accommodate them. I was not supposed to read any of this.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir. This is not what anybody gets for trying to

accommodate anybody in here. Let him withdraw that statement. That is total ignorance. We have a right in here as well as you or anybody else. You do not accommodate us in here. You must do a proper job. What are you getting on with?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Item 24 — Maintenance of Vehicles — the sum of \$58,250 was placed in the Approved Estimates and allocated as follows:

	\$
The High Commissioner in the United Kingdom	15,600
Permanent Mission at the United Nations	10,000
High Commissioner in Canada ..	5,500
Embassy at Washington ..	9,000
Consulate General in New York ..	13,150
Embassy at Caracas ..	5,000.

The Supplementary Provision which has been asked for, Sir, is for the Permanent Mission to the United Nations \$1,800; the High Commissioner in Canada \$600, and the Consulate General at New York \$1,000. The increase in the cost of oil and petrol has resulted in increased expenditure on maintenance of the official cars at the Missions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister whether these leases are vetted in any respect by anyone in Barbados: whether in the Crown Law Office, or the Crown Solicitor's Office, or whether the Government employs legal counsel in the United States to vet these leases. During the past year a very serious situation arose, and it is surprising that the Government did not make any comment on it.
12.55 p.m.

I refer to what took place between 1973 and 1974 when a person who is no longer a Civil Servant with the Barbados Government, Mr. Livvy Goring, when he was Consul General in New York, moved from the flat which the Government was renting for him and entered into a lease agreement to rent another place on Long Island. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that part of the conditions of the lease was that this Government had to put in fixtures. I understand that they put in five air-conditioning units, a whole set of curtains, a washing machine, a radiogram and other fixtures, and the Barbados Government was paying \$700 a month as rent for that place. I understand that the lease was signed by Mr. Goring who was then Consul-General. Subsequently Mr. Goring was called back to work

here in Barbados as Protocol officer, and they could not find the lease in New York in respect of this House. I do not remember the name of the man who signed the lease as owner of the house. Mr. Goring left here and went back to New York and resigned. The reason I understand is that when they subsequently found the lease, it was discovered that Mr. Goring was the owner of the house and he had duped the Barbados Government into leasing a house from him for \$700 a month, and he had put as a term of the lease that at the termination the fixtures would belong to the landlord. I think it is scandalous and disgraceful. It smells to high Heaven. I think the Government must bear responsibility for this because they have not made a statement about this, and I challenge them to get up and say that what I am saying is not true. (Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: It is not true.) Get on your feet and say so; do not sit and say so.

I challenge the Leader of the House who is responsible for this to get up and say that what I have said relating to that house is untrue. I challenge the Minister to do so because it is dishonest and shows that more attention should be paid by the Government when they enter these things. This sort of "baball" cannot work, but this is part and parcel of a way of life in this country. It has even hit Canada now, because a man from there had to resign from Air Canada. What has happened is that we have grown accustomed in this country in the last ten or twelve years when people do certain things to saying that other people do them and get away with it, so why can't we get away with it? I think that the papers in this matter should be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions to see whether a charge can be made against this officer, and if so, he should be brought back here and prosecuted, because I do not see why poor people in this country can get prosecuted for doing certain things and a Civil Servant can get overseas and do certain things which are patently dishonest, and because he has resigned from the Government, he feels he can get away with it. I think the papers should be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions to see if something could be done in this matter. I should like to find out whether these papers have been sent to the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The Question that Head 20 — Ministry of External Affairs — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 21 — MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (3) ELECTORAL OFFICE — WAS-CALLED.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under Head 21, the various sums requested are \$10,800 for other Personal Emoluments, \$7,560 for travelling and \$660 for furniture and equipment. I think the notes are quite explanatory.

I beg to move that Head 21 – Ministry of Home Affairs (3) Electoral Office – stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 33 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS, LABOUR AND NATIONAL INSURANCE – WAS CALLED.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, I think I should observe as has been recorded in the notes to this Head that this is really to supplement the administrative provision for Parks and Beaches for this year, and being administrative, quite understandably the details of this Supplementary Provision will show that this will go to the payment of salaries and wages, National Insurance, telephone, upkeep of vehicles, and payment of substitutes.

I beg to move that Head 33 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment the Parks and Beaches Commission for the work they have been doing in and around the Island. At the same time I want to ask them if they have really got a pattern or any work methods in how they are carrying out some of the works they are doing, and I speak specifically of the work which has been done, is still being done, and apparently will continue to be done for some time around the Montefiori Fountain opposite the Law Courts. I have seen dozens of persons working on that area, and I would like at some time to hear what is the cost of beautifying that area. What worries me most of all, however, is what has been happening over the last few weeks. In the Government Programme on the Waterworks Department, the Barbados Light and Power have been saying that there is going to be a shortage of water. In my own constituency of St. Joseph some people in some areas had no water from about Thursday until Sunday; some did not have on Friday and Saturday and some did not have on Saturday and Sunday. When I enquired, I understood that the reservoir at Castle Grant is practically dry and that unless we get some rain,

there is going to be more hardship in that part of the country. That may be a reasonable answer for many of us who can understand that water comes from Heaven and that unless the rain falls we are in a desperate position. But you cannot tell a man coming from St. Joseph, St. Andrew or parts of St. George that this is the problem, when every day he passes around the Law Courts he sees a man with a hose wetting that square for at least three hours at a time.

1.05 p.m.

If it is right that a householder must cut off water, I do not see how it is right that a man can stand there and run water for three hours at a time. Something is wrong somewhere. You cannot beautify the Fountain Gardens when everything is drying up for water. Priorities must be set; something must go.

I wish the Minister to let those people know that people in St. Joseph, in the constituency which I represent, cannot get water with which to bathe their skins. A man in St. Joseph told me last night that yesterday he had to get a bath in Christ Church, and, if you go out there now you can get somebody out there watering the Fountain Gardens. It is not fair to tell people to conserve water when at the same time the Fountain Gardens can be kept watered, and people cannot get water to drink. What are the priorities you have got?

The people in the Parks and Beaches Commission must realize that the conservation of water belongs to them as well as to the people of Barbados and if it is not to be used for growing food, I do not see why it should be used for keeping the Fountain Gardens watered all the time. It is not fair and it should be stopped right away.

The Question that Head 33 stand part was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$317,933 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974–75 NO. 31

THE RESOLUTION FOR THE SUM OF \$318,207 WAS CALLED.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, as is indeed known from the Speech from the Throne quite recently, but even before that, as has been told in the country for some time, it is the intention of the Government of Barbados to set up a plant to manufacture cement in this country. For some years, we have been supplied with cement from Trinidad and Jamaica; in fact they have supplied about 90% of all the cement that we needed in the country.

About one and a half to two years ago, we were informed that those countries would be cutting back on their supply of cement to Barbados, so that there was a bit of a scramble at that time to find other sources of supply to Barbados.

It is the intention of the Government to set up a plant to manufacture cement, and we hope that such a situation will never again recur, but what is more, that we would at the same time improve the export earnings of this country. In other words, it is the intention also to export cement from Barbados. It was always intended that the Government would take a substantial interest in this plant, and at the time it was also intended, in conjunction with a private investor. It is now the intention of the Government to enter into this venture with another Caribbean Government, namely, the Government of Guyana, as a joint enterprise to manufacture this cement.

We have allocated an area of land in Checker Hall. There is a bit of dust and so on that would come from the operation of the plant but this would be less probable than if it was sited elsewhere. The area of land near Maycock's Bay is so sited that the wind would take the dust seaward. It would not normally be a nuisance to people living in that area. It is intended to acquire a substantial portion of land — 60 acres — because it is also intended that some of the material needed for the manufacture of cement would be quarried right there at Checker Hall. It may be found quite necessary at some time in the future to acquire additional areas of land for the purpose I have just mentioned.

Sir, it is intended that this money here, \$318,000 should be paid in accordance with the terms of the agreement which the Government has taken over. The Government took over this agreement from a private investor, because the Government intends to take a very active part in this business. On the terms of the agreement the Government would now pay the sum of \$318,206.25 sometime this month and, I want to make it quite clear that this is merely a part payment for this land. The vendors have agreed

to take a mortgage for the rest of the property in the sum of \$353,562.

I thought I should make it quite clear what are the terms of the purchase of this land at Checker Hall. (ASIDE) I gave the amount of money we are paying now and I gave the balance of the purchase money to be paid over a period of one year. The terms, Mr. Chairman, \$318,207 — the figure is already here. The other figure is, \$353,562. This is a commercial venture, but this is indeed what the owners were selling to private enterprise for, and the Government has taken it over.

Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution to supplement the Land Acquisition vote by the sum of \$318,207 do now pass.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.
1.10 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the Minister give an outline of Government's plans to set up a cement plant in Barbados, something which I believe we have been hearing about since 1961 in their Manifesto and now on the eve of the elections we are hearing about it again. We have not heard very much about it, just some vague details from the Minister. We have not heard of the interest rate, he told us to do our arithmetic, but what I am interested in, is this. I hope that Government gave this very good thought and that they were given first class advice. Sooner or later you are going to hear that they were ill-advised as they were on the crematorium and the Milk Plant, and I am hoping that with this amount of money for this cement plant which on the eve of the elections they are trying to capture the electorate with, that they are not rushing into it too hastily. From 1961 they have been talking about it and they are now finding it convenient to site this cement plant at \$11,000 an acre in St. Lucy. This is a lot of money to pay for agricultural land. I am in real estate and I say this is a bundle of money you are paying for 60 acres of land. I believe you are paying for some of the beach too.

I am only hoping that the Minister and the Prime Minister will not come back in here and say they were ill-advised. I pretend to be no expert on that subject and I am only sounding a warning because we have seen this too often. We have seen it with the milk plant when they had to import milk from Holland because they were producing a lot of bad milk. Then you came in here and said you were ill-advised on the crematorium, and that you were not satisfied

with where the Naval Base was placed. I am only sounding a warning that I hope that you have taken the best advice available and you have had experts to give you an idea of what you are going into. I think that \$11,000 an acre for rab land is a lot of money and I will be keeping an eagle eye on it. I am only hoping that with the cement plant you are not having the same problem. You cannot afford to take up taxpayers' money and use it and then say that you have been ill-advised. This is my belief and sincere wish that we are on a good footing here for the good of all Barbadians. This is a national venture and something which will benefit the people of Barbados, but I am only warning that I hope we are not rushing this deal through and will then come in here and say you were ill-advised. That is all I have to say.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should let this Resolution pass without at least making some comment on the comments which were made by the Hon. Minister in introducing this Resolution. I must say that some of the ~~fears~~ which I had, he gave an assurance about them, and they relate to the whole question of dust which comes quite naturally from a cement plant. The Hon. Minister has indicated that he has been advised that the siting of the plant would be such as to allow the dust to go out to sea and presumably the effect would be minimal to the people in that area. Naturally we are concerned with the effect this will have on people living in the area, and I would sincerely hope that the assurance which the Hon. Minister has given us is one which will not turn out to be otherwise, that is, that the dust will not come back on the land where people are living. Sometimes winds change and cause a tremendous amount of inconvenience by bringing the dust back into the land.

I do not think that I would have to remind the Hon. Minister of the fact that in Jamaica where the cement plant is situated there has been a serious problem with people living in the area. For miles around there is dust in the atmosphere and it can affect people's health and quite naturally, their comfort. This is something one has to be concerned about.

From the point of view of the usefulness of the cement plant, I do not think that any hon. Member would want to question this in view of the building industry in this country. I would think that this particular measure of moving into a cement plant would be to assist the construction industry in Barbados, and I would think that the Government has taken a forward step in this direction and I hope we will be able

to see the result from the kind of lift it will give to the construction industry in Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is only one note I would like to sound on this and it is that in Barbados \$11,000 an acre is a very generous price to receive for land anywhere. I hope that now that this price has been agreed upon — and I am not one of the negotiators, I am not going to say that the land is not worth it — what I am prepared to say is that if the Minister of Labour who has brought down this Resolution has introduced a Resolution that would find \$11,000 per acre being paid for land at this time, I hope I do not hear from any Minister of Government any resistance when some of the same cement workers begin to work in this plant, that there is going to be any gnashing of teeth or anything when a request is being made for workers to receive anything that would approximate to a decent living wage.

1.25 p.m.

If land in Barbados has reached a figure of \$11,000 an acre, then you cannot expect, within the same community, for me to sit back and take things easy. If this is the market price for land, then it means that the movement of money has taken such a turn in this country that a man who is working for \$60.00 a week would not have the same value in that community. When land can be sold at \$11,000 an acre in St. Lucy, with all due respect to the Member for this northernmost Parish, then I am a little bit concerned in the Government paying that for land. It is likely to open the door to some of the landsharks in Barbados to believe that the sky is the limit. I am very, very concerned about these prices. I do not hear much mentioned about these prices. All I hear is that the inflationary position and the wages position are creating problems for this country. I want to say that there is no wage level in Barbados that has reached the astronomical figure that is now being offered for land.

Mr. Chairman, I was a Member of this Chamber and I can remember that the Coleridge/Parry School bought 10 acres of land at £100 an acre. (*Asides.*) It is true that it was bought 30 years ago, but the price of land has now gone sky high. I know that you are going to get problems from the Cement Plant. You are bound to get problems from industrial trades no matter who comes here to look after them. The very fact that there is a change means that you will have to be prepared for new problems, but I am concerned about the price of the land. Now, \$11,000 an acre is a very generous price, and I hope that the Government is getting its full share for this amount of money. I am not in the land

business, but this is going to be a big lead for the people in St. Lucy to feel that \$11,000 an acre would be the price for land up there.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for St. Michael West has sounded a note of warning in a different method from the way that I was going to sound it. I believe I know a lot about the Cement Plant, and I am wondering whether or not the information given in the document is correct. Is the Plant to be sited at Checker Hall? When I heard about it that is not the site where the bore holes were placed. There is another point. I have heard the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in this Chamber refer to plantations cutting up land and selling it at a high price — at \$4,000 or \$5,000 an acre as the maximum. The Government now finds it fit, at this time when land prices are falling, to pay \$11,000 an acre for land. The Government must know the benefits that can be found in that land to have paid such a price. I cannot say if the price is right or not, but I can say that today marks the day when those people in this Island who do not have an acre of land may never get an acre of land. We talk about socialism on one side, but we practise all the tenets of the other philosophy.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that between 1967 and 1968 land in St. Philip could be bought for as little as \$600 an acre and nobody wanted it. St. Philip and St. Peter have the same topography and environment. Some American gentleman, whom they say has connections with the Mafia, came to Barbados and bought land at the Crane Coast at a fantastic price, and overnight the land in St. Philip was sold at \$5,000 an acre. It shows what an indicator like this can do. As long as you get some person moving into an area and paying a high price for land, then every Real Estate Agent or every vendor is going to use that price for the sale of land in that particular area. The Government knows that.

Mr. Chairman, we have had an example of the Government coming to this House to buy land at River Bay. The Government Valuers valued the land at one price, and went back a few days later and changed the valuation to a different price. We, on this side of the House, asked whether the valuation was changed because of the ownership. Take the Land Valuation Act, Mr. Chairman. Their method of valuing land is the last marketable area sold in the specific place. In St. Lucy the Land Valuers are entitled from now to say that the land in that area has just been sold at \$11,000 an acre; the rest of the land is worth \$11,000 an acre, and therefore the people must pay 1% of what the valuation is. That is how land has been marketed.

Mr. Chairman, all along the West Coast the people who have 5,000 square feet of land will tell you that because the land is near the sea it has been valued at \$10.00 a square foot and that is how they pay their taxes on it. The Government cannot have it both ways. Your valuation will now be totally wrong. I heard the Prime Minister say in here that anybody who disagrees with the valuation put on his land could object because he knew a man would not sell his land at that price. What is going to happen to those poor people in St. Lucy now? You will have the Valuers telling those people that land has just been sold at \$11,000 an acre and they will have to pay taxes at the rate of 1%. I do not know whether Mr. Franklyn has returned to Barbados, but I heard that he had gone to Australia checking out how to apply the 3% on houses and land. I am sorry for those people in St. Lucy. (*Asides.*) Mr. Franklyn went to Australia two weeks ago, but I do not know if he has returned to Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether Barbadians will ever be able to buy cement from that Cement Plant, if it is ever established. The Plant was supposed to cost \$11 million, and, as a result of inflation, I think it went up to \$23 million. Now, with the land at \$11,000 an acre, I do not see how anybody in Barbados is going to be able to buy cement from that Plant.
1.35 p.m.

The other thing I heard is that they had to push down part of the beach front to make a pier for the boats, to come in. (*ASIDES*) I can tell you who drew the plans if you want to know. I hope that the Minister has really got his facts right. I would not like to ask an embarrassing question at this time, but I see that we are going to find ourselves in the position of the crematorium, with the land bought, the building started and got half-way and cannot be finished; or like the Milk Plant as my Learned colleague has said, and the next thing is the Coast Guard. You know, there is might and strength on that side. The Resolution will pass, but it is the people outside who are paying. I hope they do not have to cart the dust away from up there like they have to cart the sand away from the Coast Guard Station and litter the road in Welches, because I know that before long this Government is going to find itself with law suits upon law suits, because when the wind takes a turn in St. Lucy, the Government will have to do as with HARP where they passed a law to indemnify them. You cannot sue HARP when they fire off shots and your house cracks. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is not true.) Do not tell me it is not true; go and read the law. (Hon. P. M.

GREAVES: I removed that when I became Minister. You cannot take an injunction to close them down, but that is a different matter.)

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be rude to you so I will ignore the hon. Member. The Government may have to pass a law to stop people from suing them when the wind takes a turn in St. Lucy, because as it stands now, somebody will soon be suing Government for the sand which they litter the Welches Road with when they remove it from the Coast Guard Station. This is what we are coming to — bad planning. They have the numbers and they can come to Parliament and force this through. What I would like the Minister to do before he closes this debate is to pass around at least to this side a copy of the plan to show what area they are buying, so that we can see even if we do not agree. I know what the Minister will say; he is going to say that he has not got the plans, and this shows the contempt with which they treat Parliament. They will come with a Resolution of this nature....(Hon. P. M. GREAVES: You know I do not have the plans; I told you so.) My God; some people cannot help telling lies. I am asking the Minister to pass the plans, but he says that he sent by the Marshal to tell me that he did not have the plans. However, in a matter as big as this, with land selling at \$11,000 per acre — my friends tell me that is about \$3.50 per square foot, but I have not worked it out.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is twenty-five cents a square foot.

Mr. BOLDEN: This just proves something to you. I knew that I would have caught you. When I asked earlier when he introduced the Bill, he said he did not know the price, he had not got it on file, but he can get up and say it is 25 cents a square foot. There is a beautiful word going around for politicians — prevarication. I cannot call big words. I do not know what that means, but somebody told me it means "lying". A school boy passing through the yard when I was coming in asked me if I knew what the word meant, and he told me it means when you are lying. (Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Did you correct the boy?) I could not correct him when I was coming in here dealing with that side.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to be good enough as to postpone this, have lunch now, get the plans and let us see what Government is going to buy so that we would know where we are. I am begging at this point in time. This is a major development in this country — a cement factory in St. Lucy where the land

price has gone to \$11,000 an acre, so let us see at least if it is worth it. I beg you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we on this side do not have any quarrel with the establishment of a cement plant. Indeed we welcome the principle of the establishment of such because we look forward to the day when it will give work to Barbadians. However what we on this side are very concerned with at the moment is the cost of the land involved here. Mr. Chairman, I am going to move before I sit that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed until such time as the Minister can give us some more details which should be brought before us, including the plans. It has always been the practice in this House, though not required by law as in the Waterworks Act, that where the Government is making a purchase of large portions of land that the plans be circulated to Members. This was so when the Government purchased the lands my Learned friend referred to at River Bay. When we questioned that and discovered certain things as a result of the plans being circulated, the Government had to reconsider their position. What I would like to find out from the Government is whether the Government has seriously considered the total effect of paying \$11,000 per acre for this land. The hon. Member for St. Michael North West has said that this is not generous, but I cannot recall any land in St. Lucy being sold for that amount of money before now. I would like to find out from the Minister whether the Government appreciates at this stage the significance of paying that sort of money for land, because it is going to have serious repercussions in the whole economic pattern of this country. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is rubbish.) The Minister may say that it is rubbish, but at a time when the price of land is falling or remaining constant, it seems strange that the Government is going to buy land at this price. I would like to find out from the Minister who owns this land at the moment, because I do not beat around the bush, and I would like to know how the Government arrived at this figure. (A VOICE: It doesn't matter who is the owner.) I mind very much who is the owner of this land, and how the Government arrived at this valuation for land in St. Lucy.

1.45 p.m.

I would like to know whether the Government was advised by their Valuation Department; I would like to know how they arrive at this figure, and whether it was agreed between the parties. I would like to know who acted on behalf of the Government in arriving at this assessment.

This land is far too expensive. The price of \$11,000 an acre for land in St. Lucy is far too expensive. I remember, Sir, not so long ago when the University of the West Indies was established at Cave Hill, for rock land similar to land in St. Lucy the Government refused to pay more than £400 an acre. The Government acquired it at \$1,900 an acre, and that is not so long ago. Graeme Hall Plantation which is far bigger than this — the Leader of the House is familiar with the size of Graeme Hall Plantation and so too is the Minister of Agriculture — the Government refused to pay more than \$450,000 for it, and that is ten years ago, and that was more than 50 acres and bought under compulsory acquisition.

In St. Lucy where one would expect the land to be the cheapest land in Barbados, the Government is setting a tremendous pattern in escalating the land in the parish, and, who can afford to buy land at \$11,000 an acre? I would like to have information from the Minister concerning this. I am not voting for this Resolution until I know who are the owners, and, do not tell me the owners are any company either because as soon as they tell me that the owners are a company I want to know when that company was formed and who are the Directors of it. I think it is ridiculous for us to get in here handing out the taxpayers money to people and we do not know to whom it is going out.

A classical example is what happened to Livvy Goring in New York not so long ago. This idea of hiding behind dummy companies and we just passing and voting money to pay companies should stop. The names of the shareholders in any company should be made public. I do not believe in this thing we call private companies.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that we are going to move that, until the Minister can give the information we want, further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed. Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed until such time as the information I asked for is given — we want to know who are the owners, we want to see the plans, and various things like that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion that further consideration of this matter be now postponed I am going to suggest to the Government that they take a whole new look at land acquisition procedure in this country. A question was sent down during the last Paliament to ask the Government to set out a list of all properties acquired by the Government

whether under land acquisition or not, and the names of the people from whom they were bought.

We are hearing a lot in Barbados about substantial land holdings by politicians. If the Minister of Agriculture does not know it, it was stated recently at a public meeting that he is the owner of either ten or fifteen acres of land at Frère Pilgrim, Christ Church. If the Prime Minister does not know it, it is stated that he is a substantial land holder in St. Lucy and that the Government is planning to buy lands which he owns or in which he has an interest. I know none of these things. The reason why these rumours can spread is because the Government does not act sufficiently openly in the purchase of land.

Now there is a Land Acquisition Resolution down — I am not anticipating it, but I will point out this to the Minister of Lands; so I believe there is a matter of goodwill in this matter — that, where he is coming with the land acquisition Resolution he has the names of all the owners or presumed owners, but where we are merely seeking to supplement even for a specific purpose, you cannot hear from whom you are buying the land. Now I think the time is overdue in Barbados, in the interest of all politicians and of all persons who have the interest of the country at heart, for some form of aliens land holdings legislation to be introduced to provide that nobody can own land in Barbados secretly. The day of the Cayman Island Company must be put to an end. I believe that it would be even in the interest of the former Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Member for St. Andrew if, instead of rumour as to what land he holds or has an interest in, it was obligatory for the Cayman Island Companies which he controls, to have the extent of his control and the names of the shareholders fully published; it would be in his interest and in the people's interest that this be made open. It would be in everybody's interest for this to be done.

The Hon. and Learned Member for Bridgetown who has just sat down said you should say when the company was formed and who are its directors. That is not good enough. A list of the beneficial shareholders should be on the Resolution when the Government buys land, and the Registrar should be instructed that he is not to convey land to a company unless there is a certificate from an Attorney-at-law as to who are the beneficial owners of the shares in the company. In the same way as you cannot record a deed unless the taxes are paid and unless an attorney-at-law certifies that this is the only transaction between the two parties, and so on,

you should not be allowed to record a deed conveying land to a body corporate — which for the benefit of the Minister of Land also includes a limited liability company — unless the beneficial ownership, those who own the company, are set out in the document or in some supplementary document. It is a nonsense that foreign companies can own land in Barbados and that Barbadians can hide behind these companies.

Now by any standards the purchase of 60 acres of land for, getting on to \$700,000 as I understand the price to be, is enormous. Not even in these days of a high sugar cane price is land bought at that price. Sugar cane plantations can be bought at prices ranging, I suppose even now, at \$1,200 per arable acre.

1.45 p.m.

If hon. Members want to know land that they can go and buy at less than this let them go to Blowers Plantation and ask the hon. Member for St. Andrew. He will sell you Blowers at \$7,500 an acre which is less than this, and he is making a handsome profit. Western Investments Limited is the name of his firm although Norwood Holdings are doing the plantation work on it. Seventy five hundred dollars an acre is a very familiar price for cut up plantation land, why is the Government paying this kind of money? Do not tell me, Mr. Chairman, that things do not go wrong, I am appearing now as Counsel in a case and I cannot go into it in the fullness of its details, but I stood up here in the House of Assembly and read the Addendum and took part in the voting on a Resolution and could not see with the document in my hand, and knowing the people concerned, that something so irregular was going on that the Chief Justice has described it as fraud, a matter of land acquisition in which the Crown Solicitor had given evidence about valuations and other matters relating to an acquisition. I do not wish to go any further in the matter because the case is still pending, but that word has been used in Court in connection with a land acquisition, so it cannot be said that everything is perfect.

I think it was before the hon. Member's time, and it is to do with the acquisition at Seawell. I am not suggesting that any hon. Member in the House is in the slightest way connected, I am as connected as anybody, so it does not reflect on politicians, so perhaps it is a good example to draw. It reflects that things can go wrong even though people have their eyes on them. The Prime Minister made a reply on the occasion when I questioned the matter, and it turned out that my question and the Prime Minister's reply neither of them really related to any of the issues

in the matter, and the issue is now being litigated on the basis that fraudulent conduct went on. I am suggesting that the whole matter of land acquisition, whether compulsorily or under the provisions of Head 133, be examined carefully by the Government and that the Government be ready at all times to describe in writing, not just in answer in here, what is in issue. The hon. Member if he wants another example will recall the matter of the road at Maxwell, Christ Church when it turned out that there were facts not known to the Ministry at the time when the Ministry was prepared to take certain steps to assist what appeared to be private owners carrying out a straightforward development. These things can go wrong, they should be fully particularised. Let us find out how we are paying our money.

The land resources of Barbados are not so great that we can afford a policy which was appropriate to the United States in the days when the President could sign a paper and give a man 1,000 acres of land that neither of them had ever seen, no surveyor had ever seen, and all that had seen it were a few buffaloes and Indians. That cannot be appropriate to Barbados. We cannot sell land to people as if they are Red Indians on the frontier. We do not know who these people are that we are seeking to buy the land from. These are matters which must be known. We are too English in our approach to the problems of Government. It is all very well to have a Land Acquisition Act which is like the English Act where a company is a person, we know that a company is not a person, a company is a collection of individuals banded together for some commercial purpose, and we want to know who the individuals are. I am hoping that the Minister who has shown himself very open and frank ever since a rather difficult passage he had perhaps with his first acquisition when he was first a Minister in the House. The hon. Member for St. Michael North West may remember having a difficult passage, closing the file and not wishing hon. Members to see the plans and so on, and the Leader of the House indicated what the practice was in the House. Since that day I am sure, I myself cannot say that I have ever had any reason to complain with the Minister's presentation of land acquisition matters in here, and I am hoping that he will be as open in giving us what information he knows, showing us a plan, telling us why it is \$11,000 when agricultural land can be bought in small parcels for \$7,500. (*Asides*). If it is not agricultural land it is less valuable. (*Asides*). In St. Lucy? Does the hon. Member want me to carry him to show him parts of St. Lucy where they are asking \$2,000 an acre for it? He knows where I mean, I do not

have to carry him. Have you ever heard about Cluffs? Yes, Sir, but \$11,000 an acre is a lot of money and we must hear where it is and what it is, and I hope that the Minister will give us a very full disclosure of all the facts and tell us if he knows who the owners are, and if not, why not.

Hon. A. MORRISON rose.

Mr. HINDS rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will sit.

Mr. HINDS: When I rise I rise to speak, do not tell me that I will sit.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for St. Thomas in his speech in passing made reference to some statement which was made at some meeting.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Member speaking on the motion that further consideration be postponed, or is he making a personal statement to the House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am waiting to find out.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I am referring to a statement made by the hon. Member for St. Thomas about some mention of my owning acres of land. I do not know what the source is, but what I would like to tell this Hon. House is that up to today, I live on rented land and I am not in possession of one square foot of land as owner in this country of Barbados, whether it be Frère Pilgrim or otherwise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a point of explanation.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I would like to get more information on that so that I might be able to take some kind of legal action.
2.05 p.m.

The Question was put and resolved in the negative the Committee dividing as follows:

Noes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN – 8.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this Resolution. (*Asides.*) The hon. Member says I cannot speak on it. What kind of rubbish is that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to what all Members, who have spoken on this Resolution, had to say. I do not at all agree that the sum of money which is being paid for this land is too high. There is one thing to make a generalisation about \$11,000 an acre for land is too high for St. Lucy. Everything is too high for St. Lucy. They would not say that \$11,000 an acre for land is too high for St. Thomas or for St. Joseph, but it is too high for St. Lucy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is displaying some sort of lack of common-sense. Nobody is saying that it is too high a price for St. Lucy. (*Asides.*) It is not a question of the hon. Member living in St. Lucy and the land being in St. Lucy.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the fact that I am living in St. Lucy has nothing to do with the matter, and I want to make that clear. It is on record that several Members have said that the price is too high for St. Lucy.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member must not keep on saying that. I said that I knew where land in St. Philip, at one time, could have been bought at \$600 an acre and that St. Lucy and St. Philip are about the same in topography and environment. I also said that because some persons have paid high prices for land up there the land is now sold at \$8,000 an acre. If the Government paid \$11,000 an acre for land in St. Lucy it would set the pattern for the sale of land in that area and all over the Island. The hon. Minister must not tell this Honourable House now that people are saying because the land is in St. Lucy \$11,000 an acre is too much. What we are saying is that \$11,000 an acre is too much for land in Barbados.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That has been said on several occasions and it is on record that \$11,000 an acre is too much for land in St. Lucy. The hon. Member for the City has said that he has not heard of land in St. Lucy fetching that kind of price. This is ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, \$11,000 an acre is only 25¢ a square foot. Can anybody tell me where he is going to get land for commercial purposes at that price? I presume that hon. Members do not want to get

the answers to the questions they have just asked. They have posed questions and then walked out as though the answers would never be given. Now that I have got up to give the answers they have walked out. They prefer to talk without hearing the answers. It is all right to make some generalisation that \$11,000 an acre is too much to pay for land in St. Lucy. Do they know the land? Do they know the value of this land? This is what confronts us.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not think the House has a quorum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is the hon. Member's duty to bring that to the notice of the Chair; I am not to see that.

Mr. BOLDEN: I said on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the House does not have a quorum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will kindly ask the Clerk to see that the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they walked out because they did not want to hear the answers. I was saying, at the point of interruption, that I was no expert on land value, but I happen to know that land that is not arable land fetches a greater price than arable land. Some of the Members who have spoken on this Resolution have no idea whatsoever of what this land in St. Lucy looks like. I am very sorry, as I have had to tell the hon. Member for St. Peter and Members on the other side, that I did not have the plan with me to show them.
2.15 p.m.

This land that we are about to acquire is brow land; it rises in about three escarpments; it is land that goes right down to the sea. What we are acquiring, Mr. Chairman, is a considerable amount of land with a sea frontage. We are not acquiring arable land at this stage because some years ago the owners of the land got permission to free this land from agriculture, and in fact it has been development land; so what we are at this stage buying is development land. Can anyone tell me in what part of Barbados, St. Lucy or any other part, can anyone go and get development land at 25 cents a square foot? Of course they choose not to use that figure; they choose to use the figure of \$11,000 but they do not bother to convert it to the square foot price, and even when they are told the square foot

price they elect not to use it because it sounds a lot to support their case if the price were said to be \$11,000 an acre and not 25 cents a square foot. We have to face facts. We are not acquiring land for a social purpose like housing, and when we are acquiring land for a social purpose we apply a certain value to the property. We are acquiring land not only for a commercial purpose but for a commercial purpose where it is not possible in many cases in Barbados to use that land for another purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there are very few places in Barbados where we can establish a cement plant. We could not establish a cement plant in St. Michael or St. James; we have to do it in a place like St. Lucy. St. Lucy recommends itself because of its natural geographical situation, bordered on three sides by the sea, but certainly as far as we are concerned bordered by two sides of the sea, that is, north and west. We are able because of the prevailing winds, to acquire the land in this area so that it will not be a nuisance to people; so when we come here for a scarce site, certainly we are going to have to pay a proper price for it. This land has already been approved by Town and Country Planning for commercial use; but where in Barbados can you get land even for residential use at 25 cents a square foot?

Mention was made by the hon. Member for Bridgetown of the acquisition of land at Graeme Hall at \$450,000. I am sure that the hon. Member knows that the Government sold 50 acres of that land for \$1 million. If you are going to talk in terms of respective land values, we sold less land in Graeme Hall for more money than we are buying land for in St. Lucy. We are buying sixty acres of land for less money than we sold 50 acres of land for in Graeme Hall. The price is reasonable because it is beach land which we are buying; we did not sell beach land at Graeme Hall. We are buying beach land, we are buying prime land at 25 cents a square foot. Those persons who know Maycock's Bay know that this is prime land we are getting at 25 cents a square foot; so do not draw a red herring about whom you are buying from, the companies being registered in the Cayman Islands and all this nonsense that has nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, if they want to know who the owners are I can tell them, although I presume they already know. This is land which the Government is acquiring from Checker Hall Plantation. As far as I am aware it is not a company that is involved. I believe the land is owned by three sisters and one brother, inherited by them under the will of their mother. A hidden

company registered in the Cayman Islands is not involved, a company registered in Arch Hall is not involved. It is simply a question of the Government acquiring land where a cement plant can best be sited. As regards the rumours we have heard that Ministers own this and Ministers own that, quite honestly the reason why these rumours can go on is because persons who are in responsible positions can give credence to those rumours. The Minister of Agriculture denies owning land in Barbados, but what is wrong with his owning ten acres of land in Barbados? Can anyone tell me what is wrong with the Minister of Agriculture or any other person for that matter who is a Barbadian owning ten acres of land in this country? To come here in Parliament and to address this forum as though it is a crime for a Minister or a Member of Parliament to own land is absolutely ridiculous coming from such a responsible person. There is nothing that the Government has to hide in this matter. I think the Government is getting this land at a reasonable price, because if one were to apply the normal valuation standards to this land, I have no doubt that this land could fetch twice as much as what Government is getting it for.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say, Sir.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have replied as Mover of this Resolution to the motion moved by me, and when I have replied, according to the rules of this Chamber, no other hon. Member can get up to speak. We have gone through this before. I refer Your Honour to the appropriate Standing Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that this matter is in Committee and all hon. Members have the right to speak according to the Standing Orders for fifteen minutes. Since the hon. Member has not spoken you were not supposed to reply.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am on a point of order, and I want to make my point. I agree that every hon. Member has a right to speak. I know that it is a rule of this Chamber that in a Committee of the whole House or in Committee of Supply every Member has a right to speak for a certain length of time. Now there are certain Standing Orders that govern speeches in Committee and procedures in Committee, and there are some Standing Orders that cover whatever goes on in the House of Assembly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am yet listening to the point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Standing Order 28(15) says: "No Member may speak more than once on any proposition except —

I am sorry, this is not the one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I really think this is.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I think it is Standing Order No. 29 — Right of Reply. It says:

"The mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order."

Paragraph 2 deals with a different matter from what we are dealing with today, because paragraph 2 deals with a matter that is moved by the other side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is exactly according to the rule and according to my interpretation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: What I am saying now, Sir, is this: this is not a motion critical of Government, therefore the exception to paragraph 2 does not apply. What applies is that this is a matter moved by me, and it says that the Mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put. I have moved the Resolution and after such reply no other Member may speak.
2.25 p.m.

I have not denied any Member an opportunity. As a matter of fact, I only rose when Your Honour was half way through, about to put the question. You had already started to put the question, Mr. Chairman. I did not steal an opportunity and jump up after an hon. Member had taken his seat. I only rose after Your Honour had already started to put the question.

We have rules in this Chamber and the rules state that once the mover of a Resolution — and I moved the resolution — has replied, no other Member may speak.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And my ruling is that when we are in Committee of Supply every individual Member has a right to speak for fifteen minutes and the Minister is not supposed to reply, because there is no rule compelling him to reply, neither is there any rule compelling the Minister to answer. Therefore the hon. Member will speak.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Under Rule 8 dealing with the Procedure in Committee of Supply, page 84.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I have already ruled.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: But I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will take his seat. I have given my ruling relative to this appropriate Standing Order. There is nothing clear inside this Standing Order. It tells me that when the Minister replies no other hon. Member can speak in Committee of Supply. There is no Standing Order which tells me that in Committee of Supply after a Minister has spoken, that any other Member can speak. You see, the Standing Orders were given to me, and as officer in charge of the rules I must interpret them according to the Standing Order which I have. In the absence of any Standing Order being spelt out it is my discretion and my decision, there can be no appeal when I have made a ruling.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it may be convenient for us to suspend this Sitting at this stage for lunch.

PROGRESS REPORTED

Sir, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.35 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Sitting is now resumed. When the Sitting was suspended the

House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair. The House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to this Chamber's attention a ruling which I made before the suspension. I would like all Ministers before replying to find out if any other hon. Member wishes to speak on a particular matter, because this is something very technical. What caused me to give my ruling just now, I did not divulge but I can divulge it now that we are back in the Chamber. When the Minister got up, he did not state that he was about to reply, and according to Standing Order 66(8) a Member may speak for 15 minutes at any one time provided that the time limit of the speech of the Minister when moving a Head shall not exceed 30 minutes. (*Aside*). As far as I can see it only becomes convenient for Members to apply the Standing Orders when it suits them, but as long as I am sitting in the Chair, I will rule according to the Standing Orders.

I just brought it to the notice of the House because I had told the hon. Member for St. Peter that he had a right to speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, am I to take it from your ruling that if a Minister states he is going to make a final Reply in Committee no other hon. Member may speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must speak before he makes his final Reply, because after that, you cannot speak again.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I will abide by your ruling but Standing Order 66(8) does not specify this. The whole Standing Order makes it very clear that the Minister has the final right of reply but not in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This particular Standing Order is entitled "Procedure in Committee of Supply".

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I accept Your Honour's ruling and would really advise you to have a word with the Clerk, because it is a little confusing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With all due respect to you, Sir, there has never been any such ruling. All that reply means is that a Member can only speak once for 15 minutes but the Minister is allowed when replying to speak for more than 15

minutes. There is nothing in that rule which says as is set out in rule 29 "The mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order." That has never been applied to the Committee. I have not been in here too long but I was in here before the Minister and it has never been applied in Committee. You will recall that the ruling was that you could speak for as long as you like, and up until today the practice has always been that there is no question of reply in Committee of Supply. You will recall from the first Resolution moved here by the Hon. Leader of the House when he introduced the Resolution the Member for St. Peter and the Member for St. James spoke, then he replied and I spoke in reply to what they said. The question did not arise because it has been the time honoured practice of this Committee that there is no final reply in Committee of Supply.

You cannot interpret reply here to give the Minister a right of reply. I think that rule was interpreted incorrectly, but unfortunately you have ruled the other way, and with all due respect, I do not agree with you on that aspect of it because nobody can tell me you can do the Ministry of Health in the Estimates and take 15 minutes on it. There is no Billy Graham who can speak so quickly as to deal with it in 15 minutes. With all due respect, Sir, to rule that way would be a departure from a time honoured tradition.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the debate on this matter but I just want to make this point. I too was in this Chamber when the old Standing Orders were the rules of this House. I too realise that a Member in Committee got up and spoke as he wanted to speak. In addition to this I was an active Member of the Committee to revise the Standing Orders of this Chamber. Other hon. Members over there were also Members but not many of them attended very regularly. We sat down, because we felt that matters were too prolonged by persons intervening in debates, and we re-drafted the Standing Orders. This has nothing to do with any time honoured practice because these Standing Orders came into practice about two years ago. These Standing Orders were particularly revised to cut out a lot of things like people speaking too many times on one Head. It is clear that paragraph 8 of this Order contemplates a reply by the Minister for a longer time than it gives any other speaking Member. A person speaking can only speak for 15 minutes and a person giving the reply can speak for 30

minutes, so what he has is a right of reply. I really do not want to prolong this matter, I think I have made my little contribution and I thank you for hearing me.

3.40 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this Standing Order is very silent on the matter, and I would suggest to Your Honour, as has been the practice, that wherever a Standing Order is silent that Your Honour should refer to May's. I would suggest that you have a look at May's and this particular Standing Order. It is very silent; there is no room to operate, and the interpretation by you, Sir, may not necessarily be the interpretation of other people. You are going to have this conflict all the time.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it now, it seems as if I will be the last Member who will be allowed to speak in Committee after a Minister has spoken in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No. You must not.....

Mr. HINDS: After a Minister has replied, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Therefore, if I am the officer in the Chair, I will have to decide whether all other Members have already taken the opportunity, which is afforded to them according to the Standing Orders, to speak before the Minister can reply. You will not be able to get up after that and speak again.

Mr. HINDS: I know, Mr. Chairman, that it is an after-luncheon ruling that you have given, and we know what after-dinner speeches can do. However, let us get on with the Resolution. We are in a very unfortunate situation in debating this Resolution in not having the plot before us. If the plot were brought before us now, I am sure that the plot would not show the Government acquiring more than 59 acres of land. That is a definite fact. It means, therefore, that even at 25 cents a square foot, we are voting, what amounts to my mind, a reasonable commission of \$10,890 to pay to somebody.

Mr. Chairman, it is silly for the Minister or any Member on both sides of the House, when discussing the purchase of 60 acres of land, to talk about 25 cents a square foot. It means, therefore, that when the decision had been taken to purchase 60 acres of land at an average of \$11,000 an acre, it must be assumed that if a person were purchasing one acre, or a house spot, the price would be far in excess of \$11,000 an

acre. Whatever price a person is asking for land, the quantity of land to be purchased must bear some relation to the final decision as to the price. If you are buying 60 acres of land nobody would quote you the same price as if you were buying an acre of land. That is what I believe hon. Members, who have expressed surprise at the price of approximately \$11,000 an acre, have taken into consideration. We are buying a vast area of land at this price. As I have said, Mr. Chairman, the plot will show that we are buying 59 acres and not 60 acres.

With regard to the experts on land value, you and I know, Mr. Chairman, that the price of land up North — I do not want to say in St. Lucy because it seems to be an offence to suggest that \$11,000 an acre when you are buying 60 acres of land, is too high a price for land in St. Lucy. I am saying that when you are purchasing 60 acres of land up North, I believe that better consideration should be brought to bear on the transaction. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate that there is a considerable amount of beach frontage involved with this land. I know something about the Maycock's Bay area, and there is a considerable amount of beach frontage involved in the 60 acres of land. As I gather, the Government's plan is to site the Cement Plant near to the beach and the quarry will be in the hills to which the Hon. Minister referred. I wonder whether due consideration has been given to the effects the salt will have on the life of the equipment which will be placed in that position. I am wondering also whether it is a fact that this sort of "gold mine" has been there for so long and has been discovered suddenly and must be sold at \$11,000 per acre.

Mr. Chairman, we understand that the land is to be bought from the present owners at Checker Hall. We have absolutely nothing against the present owners of Checker Hall, but we believe that a better deal could be obtained, in the interest of taxpayers, if a further examination of the whole exercise could be conducted.

3.50 p.m.

I believe that the owners can still feel satisfied as to the purchase price, but a saving would be effected at some point somewhere. As you would understand, Mr. Chairman, we are told today that \$318,206.25 have got to be paid on 6th March. I believe it has been told us — I am not sure on this point and the Minister may enlighten me — that the owners were to make a mortgage or allow some of the money to remain in for a year or something like this. However, we sincerely hope that we are not now merely setting out to spend this money on this site and

just go no further. When this came before me, Mr. Chairman, I remembered the Farley Hill National Park — the amount of money that was voted and then how much real development has one seen that we can call it a National Park indeed.

Mr. Chairman, what we are hoping, if you are going to spend this money in acquiring the land to establish a cement plant, is that we are ready when the sale is completed to begin quarrying and what not. If enough were told we would know exactly what part the Government of Guyana which is supposed to be the other partner in the deal is going to play, whether they would be supplying the machinery, quarrying equipment, and exactly how many people it is expected they would employ initially, and after they have been going for a period of time, what they expect their labour force is likely to reach. All these things we would like to be told in dealing with a Resolution of this nature. Nobody is opposing the establishment of the cement plant. If as the Minister has said we are going to be given a manufacture for export and earn some dollars, it is all to our credit, provided that we do not find ourselves now manufacturing and having to sell it at a price much higher than we can now import for, because that is one of the problems we find ourselves facing from time to time: you set up a factory to manufacture, and mention was made of the milk plant, but the only time they made money was on their imports of the completed product. We are hoping that we are not going to set up this cement plant here and the only way we can make money is by importing cement after we have established the factory. These are things we hope are all ironed out to the advantage of the Barbadian taxpayer. I just want to say, however, Mr. Chairman, that we are hoping that we will hear that the retail price to the local consumer will be no more than the consumer has got to buy it now it is imported into the country. If the present price can at least be maintained, we would have to be satisfied, but under no circumstances would we like to hear or know that we have set up a plant to produce a product — the question of the quality has been settled with the Standards Institute — but that pricewise we are worse off than presently obtains.

The Question that the Resolution for the sum of \$318,207 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES
1974-75 No. 32

Head 25(6) Meteorological Service — was called.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25(6) — Meteorological Service — stand part.

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

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

Head 29(1) — General Administration — was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29(1) — General Administration — stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, seeing this Resolution for the Ministry of Health, one would have expected that the Minister would tell this House about the settlement made with the doctors in respect of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but one seems to have Government by secrecy. One works a secret deal and nobody seems to know what has happened. When the Trade Union settles a matter, it is said that everybody knows what figure the workers are getting.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: On a point of order, looking at the Resolution before me for General Administration, I would like to know how the settlement with the doctors at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital comes into this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I see that additional funds are needed to meet the salaries and wages of temporary, unestablished and casual staff. I do not know whether the doctors at the hospital are temporary or not. What I do not understand is this secret conclave and something is solved and the public does not know what has happened.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not get your ruling on the point I made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not even want me to debate it now. When the Trade Union settles a matter, we hear that they get so much money and everybody knows what the worker is getting. Why is it

that you have this settlement with the hospital shrouded in mystery? I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, when the Government has got to take a very serious look at the services provided at the hospital. The Government must look at the whole hospital and its operation in relation not only to the doctors, the terms and conditions of their appointment but also the question of the treatment of the patients at the hospital. All this is needed from time to time and the time has come when the Government is going to find itself in a position because of the politics at the hospital, because of the tug-of-war which is going on between the consultants. The lack of assistance between the Ministry of Health and the Hospital, the lack of cooperation, the infighting that is going on, are going to land this country into serious problems of health, particularly at the hospital, and I think the time has come when the Government has got to review the whole situation.

Mr. Chairman, I would have expected the Minister to get up in here today and make a full and frank statement of what is going on with respect to the tug-of-war between the consultants. It is the taxpayers' money that they are spending, and it is the taxpayers who go there and suffer because of this sort of thing, and this should not now exist. The taxpayers deserve a better deal than what they are getting at the hospital.
3.00 p.m.

You have a few doctors at the hospital, for their own personal gratification trying to fight each other, as a result of which the patients at the hospital are suffering.

You see, one of the basic problems at the hospital, Mr. Chairman, is that you cannot run a hospital as a civil service department of Government, and until the Minister takes the bold step that is needed to recommend to the Government to remove the hospital from being a civil service department of Government (*Aside*) — I am not concerned with my Government; I am concerned with you now. You are the Minister and you should take the bold step to recommend to Government that the hospital should be removed from being a civil service department of Government. That is one of the first steps to ensure that the hospital is being run efficiently. That is the first step. I am not saying that this is the sole step; it is the first thing you have got to do, take it away from being a civil service department of Government — you will have this problem at the hospital.

We have, Sir, made recommendations to the Sanitation and Sewage Authority — I think it is so called — which is a separate entity responsible for the scavenging and various things of the country. Well, take the step in respect of the hospital. That is the only way you are going to get it functioning properly. So long as people can talk about an eight to four job and such things, it cannot work.

Now I am not advocating a system whereby you do not pay the people. I do not believe in that at all. I am not advocating a system whereby the doctors should not be paid, but the point, is, Sir, that under the present system it is not operating in the interest of the people. The Minister is a doctor, and the Minister would know within himself that the present operations at the hospital are not in the interest of the masses of this country.

I would go as far as to say this. I think it is reaching such proportions that the Government should establish a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the whole relationship between the consultants at the hospital, the way they function and the way they operate. I heard someone recently talking about these separate little Republics in Barbados, but at the hospital they have little dictators; each consultant is a dictator unto himself, not acting in the interest of the masses of the people in this country.

That is what is needed, Sir; to investigate the role of the consultants and to make recommendations as to how best the consultants should operate. It may be that in the past the system under which they operated was satisfactory. I will go as far as to say this, that you have consultants in this country, you go and see them privately and they charge you a fee — I can get up in here and talk about the doctors because everybody has a habit of getting up and licking lawyers in this country, and I can talk about doctors. There are doctors in this country, you go and see them privately — consultants — and they tell you the operation will cost you so much money, and the person says, 'I cannot afford to pay that' and the doctor will tell them 'If you give me so much money I will get the bed for you quicker and you would not have to go on that long waiting list at the hospital.' The Minister should know this; the Minister is aware of this, and this is wrong. This is what is called "bed-money." This is what a doctor at the hospital in Trinidad was fired for not so long ago. "Bed-money", they call it. This is wrong.

So that you need to look at the whole relationship of the consultants at the hospital and see what recommendations can be made. It may be in the past the situation was all right but today it is not all right.

I hear for instance, of certain doctors at the hospital writing prescriptions, getting medicines and then turning around and selling the medicines. All of this should be investigated. There is evidence. If you establish a Commission of Enquiry you will get all the evidence you need. These things are not right and the Minister knows they are not right. This Minister has a special responsibility because not only is he a Minister but he is a doctor, and I know he has the welfare — medically speaking, I do not know of politically speaking — of this country at heart, Sir, and he should now translate that interest which he has medically, to political interest, and see to it that at the hospital, things are being run properly.

Why is there a situation that doctors have to go on strike? I understand at one stage, Mr. Chairman, — if I may give an instance of what I mean — that if there was a serious accident and a doctor had to be called out, he never got paid for that, but the other persons, who were called out, like the radiographer who had to do X-Rays, got paid for over-time; if the Lab Technician came out to match blood and blood groupings, and do things of that kind, he got overtime pay, but the doctors never got overtime. Now the doctors there were obviously not being treated properly, let me put it that way.

You have a situation at the hospital where a man would start work at 8 o'clock one morning, he will work until 4 o'clock in the evening, and then he will come on again at night and work from 8 o'clock at the night until 4 o'clock the following afternoon. (*Aside*) I could call many instances of that, if the Minister wants to know. It is wrong, because it is not fair to the patients; because you cannot tell me a doctor is going to start work at 8 o'clock a Friday morning, he works until four o'clock, then he works from 8 o'clock the Friday night and right through the night until 8 o'clock the Saturday morning and then goes on duty again until 4 o'clock the afternoon. Now really, Mr. Chairman, do you really believe that a doctor could be doing justice to the patients he is seeing? It creates hardships on the doctors and it is unfair to the patients; they are not getting proper care in those circumstances. The doctor is bound to

get tired; the doctor is only a human being; he is bound to get tired somewhere along the line, and so long as he gets tired the patients are not being treated properly.

So, Mr. Chairman, time does not permit me to elaborate on this occasion, but I think the time has come before it gets any worse, that the Minister should recommend to the Government the establishment of a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the entire hospital services and to make recommendations for efficiency.

4.10 p.m.

The Minister says it is a waste of time. He is a doctor and if he feels they are getting good treatment, the people will know one of these days.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks from this committee the sum of \$93,000 to meet salaries and wages of temporary and casual staff to the end of the current financial year. Of course this comes under the Ministry of Health and Welfare, which covers a very large area. No one would expect us to come in here today without thinking about the problems at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It seems to me that there is always a problem at the Ministry of Health and Welfare. I have been giving this careful thought for a while. Recently there was the sanitation problem where the Minister set about to solve the problem by having the Act amended. No sooner had he finished, when there was a strike at the hospital on his hands. I think the Minister himself should examine himself as a doctor and ask himself why it is that he as Minister of Health and as a medical practitioner, still practising, is having these problems at the hospital. I have given it a lot of thought and I can only come to the conclusion that it is professional jealousy at the hospital which is responsible for the breakdown there all the time. The professional jealousy stems from the point that the Minister of Health being a doctor himself finds a direct clash with the Specialists and the senior people at the hospital, and that is the problem there. I do not believe it is anything to do with overtime because when a man is dedicated to his profession, he will give of his very best at any time. The Minister would hardly like to accept the advice of a doctor at the hospital because the doctor's diagnosis and his, might not be the same. Professional people, whether they be lawyers, doctors or engineers, never see eye to eye.

I will make this suggestion. Since the Minister is a man of courage, he has had the courage to challenge the Prime Minister of

Barbados to be the Chairman or President of the Democratic Labour Party until he was undermined by some of the others, I would not call on him this evening to resign as I did in the past, but in the interest of all concerned and especially the poor people of this country, those who go to the Dispensary for medicine and have to wait from morning until four or five o'clock in the evening because there are only two Druggists dispensing the medicine. The Sandifords, the Lowes, and people like that, would not know what I am talking about because they do not go there, but I mean the poor Joneses out there who cannot even afford the bus fare to go to the hospital for the medicine and who are the professional victims at the hospital.

I have heard of a Board or Commission of Inquiry. In 1956 I think it was my colleague here who brought to everybody's attention the rats in the hospital biting the patients, patients sleeping two and three in a bed, and the Government set out to let go a blistering attack on the then Government of the country, the Barbados Labour Party, and we set about to remedy that. We built the hospital and sent people out for training. They came along and opened the hospital, and since then there have been problems and problems at the hospital.

I have been a patient at the hospital on several occasions, not as anybody, I see myself as John Citizen, and I will say this, that I have heard visitors and Barbadians alike support the staff at the hospital under the trying conditions they work. That is, the junior staff, the nurses, the orderlies and the people in the kitchen all try to do their best, but at the top, you have the problem. What are you going to do at the bottom if you have this problem at the top? It is like when Mr. St. Clair Clarke, the Chief Fire Officer, was humiliated by the Prime Minister; if he takes it out on his junior officers, you cannot blame him. As long as you have professional jealousy which I believe exists between the Minister and the specialists at the hospital you will never be able to rectify the problems you have there.

They are now spending \$36 million on the hospital. Now they are going to have an out-patients clinic and so on, but in the meantime you cannot get more than two druggists to look after more than 1,000 people per day. The Sandifords and the Greaves do not go into the hospital for medicine, they go to Ford's Drug Store and C.S. Pharmacy. The Minister must do one of two things, ask the Prime Minister to give him a change of Ministry and let one of the others who is not a doctor take over and remove the professional jealousy which exists between

the Minister and the specialists at the hospital. When they come in and ask for \$93,000 do not think the Minister will escape. It is true he had a little mix-up with the PPM and he might be behind the movement of the PPG but though he is power hungry he means well. I will not call on the Prime Minister to remove him as a Minister of Government because he is an able man, but I would suggest to him for the sake of peace and in the interest of all concerned, in particular the poor people of this country, to ask for a switch in Ministries. Let somebody else go up there and dictate to the specialists at the hospital what is the policy of Government. Anybody can argue that they should have an injection in the neck for arthritis when the doctor may tell you to use bush tea. Do not think these doctors are real doctors, they are bush men, it is like having John Connell being called a lawyer in the same breath as calling Henry Forde a lawyer. There is a special breed of lawyer and a special breed of doctor. If you went to Harrison College and lived in Belleville you are a different person from the other person who lived in Baxter's Road.

4.20 p.m.

My colleague on my left is fortunate to be the son of a wealthy man. He happens to be a lawyer because his father made some money regardless of how he got it, but he is not in the Bernard St. John or Jack Dear group. There is professional jealousy in the Courts, in the Hospital, and so on. I had to tell some friends of mine that I do not know a lawyer in St. James called Grafton Merritt who could beat me. Nobody can beat Barrow in St. John because he is a lawyer and will win his seat. The man who is a doctor, or an architect, has no place in this community. He is merely the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. Well, you have another thought coming.

Now, I am suggesting to the Minister that, to prove he is not responsible for the misgivings at the Hospital, he should ask the Prime Minister to transfer him to another Ministry. It is true that when he was the Minister of Home Affairs he started chasing out the white people. They have now brought in a "joker" and he will never do that. Anyway, I still respect the Minister of Health because he is a good man. Look at this \$93,000 here this evening. Some of his colleagues say that he practises his profession before he goes to work on mornings. There are also several lawyers who do not go to the Court, but they have other work to do. The doctor practises his profession on mornings and that is where the jealousy comes in. He is a doctor as well as the Minister of Health. The Leader of the House, when he was Minister of Health, did not

have those problems, but he had different problems. At one time it was the accommodation of friends, but it is now a problem of professional jealousy. They do not believe that you are a doctor although you are a qualified Medical Practitioner. In the interest of all Barbadians, since you are trying to solve the problems of the Sanitation Board, you should endeavour to sort out the problems at the Hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attack the doctors as my colleague says I should attack them. I know that a doctor can feed you with a long spoon and give you some water to turn your head behind your back. At the age of 46, I have no plans of pushing off yet. In the interest of all concerned, I still have to call on the Minister of Health to ask the Prime Minister to reshuffle the Ministries and ask him to transfer him to the Ministry of Agriculture, for a few days at least, to see whether he can stimulate Agriculture because that has been neglected for a long time. Every time you look at the television you can see something about Agriculture; you can hear people telling you to plant cane although the Prime Minister did not want to see a blade of cane grown in Barbados. He should ask the Prime Minister to transfer the Minister of Agriculture to the Ministry of Health and transfer him to the Ministry of Agriculture where there is no professional jealousy and he will make the grade.

Mr. Chairman, there are about 36 Indian Doctors at the Hospital but only two Dispensers. The Leader of the House once told us in here that Barbados is turning out enough nurses not only to supply the Hospital, but for export. He said that Barbados could satisfy the staff at the Hospital and also send nurses overseas. I do not know whether that is so or not. I will have no confidence in the Minister of Health if the Minister remains in that Ministry. In the interest of all concerned and in the interest of his own prestige, the Minister of Health should ask for a transfer to another Ministry. I am not going to ask him to resign, but I will watch him with an eagle's eye.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to come here this evening and hear this long barrage as a result of a Resolution for the sum of \$93,000, which is primarily concerned with the administration of the Headquarters of the Ministry of Health and Welfare. However, a number of points have been raised which, although I would have preferred to reply to them during the consideration of the Estimates, I will reply to them at this stage.

There is a lot of confusion in people's mind in Barbados about the administration of the Hospital. If one takes seriously the history of the Hospital in this country, one will observe that it started out in 1834 as a small Institution for those people who were given their freedom from slavery and who were no longer financially capable of paying the doctors. Looking back, one will observe that during the period of actual slavery the owners of plantations used to see to it that their slaves received proper medical attention. They employed doctors on their plantations to provide adequate medical attention for their slaves because they looked on slaves as their private property, and, obviously, a man likes to take care of his private property.

Now, after the abolition of slavery in 1834, the erstwhile slaves, like free men, went their own way and the European people continued to have good and adequate medical attention because they could afford to pay for it. The Negro was unable to pay for proper medical attention and he had to make out as best he could. We have against that background the grandmothers, the obeah people and so on servicing the needs and ministering to these erstwhile slaves. That double standard of treatment, which started soon after the abolition of slavery, continued right down to 1955. The only difference now is that we no longer have slaves and plantation owners and we no longer think in terms of Negroes and Europeans, but we have a double standard in Barbados where people who can afford medical attention get it in quantity and in quality, and those who cannot afford to pay for it get very little although this medical attention is given by the same doctor. The man who can pay goes to one doctor and gets the best of attention, but if you cannot pay for medical attention you will go to the same doctor and get an entirely different type of treatment.

Mr. Chairman, the Hospital has been run by a Board from its early inception in the history of Barbados. It was in 1857 when the Barbados Government decided to subsidise the Hospital and made the first grant of £1,100. 4s. 9d. towards the administration of the Hospital. It will be well to observe that the total Budget in those days was hardly more than £16,000. All along the Hospital has always carried away a sizable share of the finances of the country.

4.30 p.m.

The hospital was run by a Board up to 1947. In 1926 a Sub-Committee on Public Health in this country reported on the administration of the Hospital by Board, and I would ask the

member to go and read it because he may not necessarily want to feel that I am correct. It condemned the administration. They had sixteen directors on the Board, very few of them attended any of the meetings, none of them knew anything about hospital administration, and moreover they were incapable of coping with the doctors. The Royal Commission that came out here after the riots recommended that all these institutions be centralised. It was left to the Government of 1947 to abolish the Board and bring the hospital under the administration of the Government, and in all fairness one has to admit that the hospital is in no way run worse since 1947 than prior to 1947, and I do not think things have changed drastically in Barbados to warrant serious consideration being given to the institution of a Board, because one may very well be putting the hospital back in a position where doctors are in a position to dictate what should be and what should not be in the administration of the institution.

One of the things you have to bear in mind, is that in the history of Barbados, especially the social and economic history, doctors more so than any other professional persons have occupied a special position; they are like *prima donnas* in the society. This is due to the fact that for a very long time the economy of Barbados never provided enough opportunities or avenues for social upliftment to the people of this country. You either had to be a plantation owner, you had to be in commerce, or become a priest or a doctor. The scope for people to move up the social and economic ladder in Barbados was drastically limited. Here again you get a sort of dichotomy in thinking in the people of Barbados. At one time they criticise the doctors, and at another time, they envy them because they make money. Up to the present day, although there are many other avenues which have been provided so that people can make money, and get up the economic ladder, you still find that the social opinion and prestige seem to be in favour of the medical man. People still look up to him; people still have this big reverence for him, this big fear, as is expressed in the term: I don't want to complain because the doctor may give me medicine to poison me, and things of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in Barbados is that we are dealing with a group of people who are not yet community-minded, and it is unlikely that they are going to become community-minded in the very near future. Regardless of whether I am Minister of Health, or not — and before I became Minister of Health, I would like to remind the hon. member for St. James that problems at the Hospital led to my

appointment as Minister of Health; the problems will continue because of the attitude of certain people on the staff of the hospital. It is the attitude of the doctors and the attitude of the people at the top of the nursing profession. You may say get rid of them, but when you get rid of them, they do not cease to exist in the community. One of the funny things about doctors in Barbados is that people have a reverence for them that very often they do not show to other professional people. You walk around Barbados and you hear people swear that they went to Dr. "X" and were it not for him, they would not be alive. You go a step further and another group would be swearing by Dr. "Y" and as you go along you find that each individual has his gathering of people, people who are loyal to him and swear by him, even although that individual may be the one creating the problems inside the hospital. What are we going to do? This is the problem with which we are faced, and it is a problem which was going on even before we came into power, and unless the people in the country are prepared to face up to these problems fairly and squarely and demand what is their due, it will continue. One of the problems we are faced with in Barbados is that people do not demand their due. You deny them, you ill-treat them and they go to one side and grumble, and then they will come and say I have told you to see if you can do anything about it, and if you do not do anything about it, they say, well o.k. I can't do anything about it! That is how they approach the problem, and this is a very interesting social problem in Barbados. There are no ready solutions to it, and the solution does not reside as some people seem to think in taking it out of Government administration, or appointing a new Minister. That does not solve the problem at all.

When you advert to the recent problem of the doctors in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital I would like to remind people that Government is conducted on a certain basis. Ministers have certain responsibilities and the responsibility for determining salaries and conditions of service is not mine, it is the Prime Minister's in his capacity as Minister responsible for establishments. I have never taken part in any discussion or arguments for or against the doctors as regards the conditions of service which they had. They may say so, but one thing they cannot tell you is that they ever met me and discussed anything with me. They have never requested any meeting with me; they have sent their letters direct to the Chief Establishments Officer who is a Permanent Secretary under the Prime Minister, and who was advised by the Prime Minister what to offer and what not to offer. I can say quite boldly that

they have never requested a meeting with me. As a matter of fact, I will go a step further and point out that when a meeting of the consultants of the Hospital was hastily called as a result of the strike and some of the consultants expressed their views about how the matter was handled by the Chief of the Medical Staff and the Hospital Director, they stated that in their view the doctors should have gone and seen the Minister of Health because they felt the Minister of Health would have got a speedy solution. The reply made was that it had gone too far for that and the particular individual said he did not care whether they went on strike or not, he is well off and nobody can do him anything. This is the type of problem you get in an institution like that.

Let us make it quite clearly. I had absolutely nothing to do with the negotiations at the hospital. It is not my responsibility. It is the responsibility of the Prime Minister in his capacity as Minister responsible for Establishments. So anybody trying to give the impression that I was there and could not solve it has got the wrong impression, because if I had to solve it, it would have been solved within twenty-four hours.

Mr. CRAIG: I wonder if the Minister would say why he made a statement on the radio in connection with the same hospital dispute.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I could not ask him a question; why is he asking me one now?

Mr. CRAIG: I am not asking him a question. Would the Minister state why?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I made a statement to refute certain remarks which were untrue which were put out by that group, and if you check my statement you will see that I let people know the bed strength of the hospital, what the doctors were getting, what they were asking and what had gone on up to the time I made the statement. That is my responsibility because they were making remarks which tried to mislead the people of Barbados about the state of affairs, and I considered it my responsibility to clarify them, because when doctors talk about a hospital having 800 patients, the hospital has never yet in its whole history had more than 545 patients per day since it was opened.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I wonder if the Minister would agree that correspondence reached his Ministry about the dispute since the month of January, and the Minister said absolutely nothing about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: What has that got to do with the present discussion? If you advert to the statement I made, I told the press then when the correspondence first reached the Ministry and what was in it, but I do not deal with it. My Ministry in that particular matter is just a post office; it comes to me and goes on to the Chief Establishments Officer. So it is not a question of ignoring it; that is how the Government is run. I think the sooner the people of this country get a better idea of how the Government runs, they would be better in a position to place the blame or the kudos where it lies when necessary. People are likely to feel that because it is a matter surrounding the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I am the Minister, that everything happens with the Minister of Health. People are likely to feel so. I do not blame them; it is only an erroneous impression which they carry because of mis-information or due to ignorance. I do not blame them for that. In stating the facts as they are, I would like to repeat that I am not responsible for establishments; I made no decisions regarding payments and conditions of service. That is a matter for the Prime Minister in his capacity as Minister responsible for establishments.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, since the Minister said he has no responsibility for this, I wonder if he has had any discussions with the consultants at the hospital about the terms and conditions of their service in relation to their posts as consultants. He can forget the other fellows.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.
4.40 p.m.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: As regards the hospital, everybody has his approach to the solutions to the problems there. That is his right; I do not deny any person having his approach at all, but at the moment, the Government has proposals to be implemented shortly as regards the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

As regards the problem, which we understand, and which we have reasons to

believe it is true because I have checked it out, about people having to wait long periods of time to get drugs, we have made attempts to get the druggists in this country to come together to service the people of the country. These discussions are still going on, and it is not right for me at this stage to comment on them, but I do believe if we get a favourable outcome of these discussions, that we will be better placed to service the people who go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital getting drugs, because I do admit that that is the problem. I have seen it for myself when I visited there.

As regards the doctors who work long hours, it is amazing to me, Sir, because there are occasions when you come in here, or you also read in the Press, or you hear people criticising and saying the doctors are not working; that people go to the Casualty Out Patients Department and wait a whole day to see a doctor; and now, recently you hear the opposite, that doctors work long hours. It is extremely difficult inside the Queen Elizabeth Hospital — and the director of the hospital is the best person placed to answer why — it is extremely difficult, Mr. Chairman, to say that doctors work 130 hours a week, or they do not work. They do not punch any clock, they do not sign any register. I want to make that quite clear. (*Aside*) I am not in a position to determine that. The person best placed to determine that is the hospital director.

As regards this accusation or this allegation that they work 130 hours, I can say that I have asked the hospital director to produce the evidence. I have not got it yet.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This is the very point I am making, Sir. Because of the tug-of-war at the hospital, somebody has stopped the director from supplying the Minister with the relevant information, and you cannot get it unless you have a Commission of Enquiry. Summon people to give evidence before a Commission of Enquiry. You are asking for certain information; the information is there. Everybody knows that doctors work this way. I can tell you the name of a doctor who last month complained when I was at the hospital talking to him about these long hours he had to work. So the information is there. If the director is not giving it to you, somebody is stopping the director or the director is wilfully refusing to give it to you. So the only way to get it is by having a Commission of Enquiry.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member may have a case. One swallow does not make a summer. He may know of a doctor who works all these hours. I was at the hospital as an intern and I know some doctors who worked long hours because they were interested; I also know that there were many other doctors, who would not work, when I was there. You had to hunt them down; and there is nothing to indicate that there is any total change in that type of behaviour. Some will work. We are not saying that some do not work.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Listen to the Minister when he says some will work and some would not work. It means that there is something blatantly wrong with the conditions of service and the operations at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.... There must be something wrong that the Minister can say some doctors will work and some will not work. Why should some be working so hard and drawing the taxpayers' money and some not working and drawing taxpayers money? That needs investigating. Something is obviously wrong. I am not calling on the Minister to resign. I am calling on the Minister to recommend to the Cabinet to establish a Commission of Enquiry.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: You are harping on this point forever about establishing a Commission of Enquiry. I am telling you that a Commission of Enquiry is not going to reveal anything new. I am telling you that.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Does the Minister think or believe that if a Commission of Enquiry were held, that it would reveal that doctors are putting people in the Intensive Care Unit only to get money out of them? That they have no right being in there? Would it reveal that there is a strange relationship between the director of the hospital and the Ministry of Health?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am going to ask you, Sir. Is it proper for a member to be interrupted by posing questions to him constantly on a point of order? You should be able to stop this promptly and do not allow the person who interrupts to develop the point at all.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: These types of remarks that we hear in here constantly and

repeatedly, Sir, whenever the hospital or something pertaining to the Ministry of Health comes before this Chamber do not improve the situation in any way. It seems to me, as I said on an earlier occasion, that the hospital seems to be a nice political football. It is the type of thing everybody gets an opportunity to get up and say something about, because in the minds of the people health is something very close to them; it is something that, as soon as you hear about doctors or of nurses, the immediate thing is that somebody starts wondering, 'if I get sick and there is not any doctor there, what is going to happen?' So their feelings are more expressed than their ability to analyse the data put before them.

We hear this over and over, but this type of harping upon what goes on at the hospital, whether it be on a Board or a Commission of Enquiry, or on how doctors work or do not work, does not help to make the position any better. It takes a different type of action, which many of the people who would get up in here and harp about what is going on in the hospital, are not prepared to take.

We have had a particular case where a politician has had his experiences with a particular consultant and when we thought he would have complained to the Medical Council or take some legal action, he backed down. If people who are better placed in the society to make complaints to the Medical Council or to take adequate action to ensure that their rights to proper health care are not abridged, do not do it, what you think about the man at the bottom? Getting up in here harping about the hospital, is not going to improve the situation. A lot has to be done with the medical students' training; you have to go as far back as there; the training of the medical students.

So when we start thinking about changing things in Barbados, we just do not change things by making a lot of criticism and making emotional appeals because some people may react. We have to look at the whole system, going right as far back as the training of the medical students, the training of the nurses and the training of the other people who work in the hospital.

As we are dealing with a small society, where in that institution as many as 1,500 people are being employed, you find that that institution reflects what is going on in this society because you get a lot of personal grouses and personal prejudices coming into play. One person working in the hospital

sees Mary coming from her village to the hospital to get medical attention, and because she and Mary do not get along well, she says 'what you come in here for'? These are problems that go on in the hospital that come up because of the fact that you are dealing with a small society. Mary comes in and she says 'what you come in here for', and then you get another one saying she does not like John because they have some problems back outside and she doesn't want to have anything to do with him. You get all these problems. (Aside) They don't get those problems at the St. Joseph Hospital; they do not get those problems up there because they do not get the number of people, the volume of people, who go in at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, going up there. These are things that one has to look at carefully. One should not get one's judgment beclouded by political considerations; you have to look at these things carefully.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if the situation at the hospital is such that if he as Minister of Health speaks the truth about the doctors at the hospital, he receives a letter from the attorney threatening him with a libel suit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Absolutely no point of order.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: You seem very curious about a letter. I have not received a letter. The Ministry has received a letter.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong this matter any longer.

The question that Head 29(1) stand part was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division.
4.50 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$101,031 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75 NO. 33

The Resolution for the sum of \$250,000 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As the Addendum sets out, Sir, the Government of Barbados has agreed to purchase an equity in L.I.A.T. (1974) Limited of \$750,000 payable in three (3) instalments. The sum of \$250,000 is required to meet the payment of the first instalment.

The position is that at the third meeting of Ministers in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, the representatives of the Caribbean Community countries, on 4th February, 1975 achieved a certain measure of success at this meeting which was chaired by our Prime Minister. The consideration of the future of inter-island air transport services in the Eastern Caribbean was discussed and all the CARICOM countries were represented by Ministers. In addition to Barbados both St. Lucia and Montserrat were represented by the Heads of the respective Governments. The Caribbean Development Bank was also represented. At that meeting, they reviewed the development affecting LIAT (1974) Limited since the last ministerial meeting which was held in Antigua on the 18th November, 1974. They also received a report by Canadian Consultants based on the state, an evaluation of possible operative plans for the airline, and considered a number of alternatives with a view to making the airline as viable as possible in the immediate future. The Governments reaffirmed their position in so far as various undertakings which they gave at previous meetings were concerned, and the Barbados Government did likewise. The meeting was able to agree only on 67.5% equity. This was because of the reluctance of the Trinidad and Tobago delegation to make any equity commitment at that stage, but the Minister who led the Trinidad delegation however gave an undertaking that he was prepared to make recommendations to Cabinet for the provision of a soft loan of \$750,000 to assist in meeting the immediate cash requirements of the airline.

The position is that at its meeting on the 6th February, 1975 this matter was considered by our Cabinet which concurred in the proposal to advance the sum of \$500,000 in two instalments of \$250,000 each at the end of March and of June, 1975. At this third meeting on 4th February, 1975 on behalf of the Government of Barbados the Prime Minister on the 11th February, 1975 accordingly signed a guarantee for \$500,000 to support a temporary working capital loan for LIAT (1974) Limited pending agreement by the Barbados Government and its Cabinet.

I have given that background to explain to Members the interest which the Government has taken in the aspect of LIAT (1974) Limited, and

the steps we have reached so far. This amount of \$250,000 is in order to enable the Government to meet its first instalment which falls due at the end of this month.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, few speeches short or long before illustrated the patchwork nature of the Government's approach to the policies which are needed to revitalise Barbados' position within itself and in the world at the present time than the speech we have just heard from the Leader of the House.

In this part of the world, especially airline economics are proving very difficult. The number of airlines which are running into difficulties in the Caribbean reads like an honour roll in the world's airlines. Pan American is seeking to abandon some of its Caribbean routes because it is getting so bankrupt that it has to depend on the Shah of Iran to bail it out within the current financial year. BWIA, reeling under the blows applied to it by the Prime Minister from time to time when he seeks to destroy people's confidence in an airline that many of them depend upon to get them from Barbados to New York, Miami or London, reeling under the difficulties that it is facing as a result of there being too much competition for the available air traffic in the region, is giving a worse and worse service. LIAT, which ought never to have been allowed to be sold to British interests at the time when it was, finds itself dragged down in one of the major bankruptcies of the last 12 months, when my understanding is that it was never making money even at that time.

This is a situation which cries out for a firm, positive policy enunciated by someone who can command the confidence of those with whom he has to work. If there is one which has also to be amply demonstrated is that the Prime Minister cannot demand the confidence as Minister of Civil Aviation of those with whom he has to work. It does not matter how much he was the Chairman of the LIAT salvage operation, I would imagine that he was put there in the hope that sitting in the Chair he would be less capable of making some of the destructive statements that have caused greater harm to the relations of other Caribbean islands in this matter of Civil Aviation in the past.

5.00 p.m.

It is known that other Prime Ministers, Mr. Compton for instance, still harbours a healthy

distrust of the Prime Minister from the years going back to 1965 during the Little Eight Negotiations — even Mr. Gairy. It is known that they were determined that Barbados would be kept in as subsidiary a position as possible in connection with the whole Liat operation. If possible Barbados would find itself in the position of putting in money but with no real control.

Now, if this were a commercial deal straight and simple, I would have to say that the Opposition would be opposed to it, because I do not believe that, as an investment, the moneys which are to be used to bail out Liat will ever share any returns to the Government of Barbados. However, that is not our position because we have in Barbados, on both sides of the House, a responsibility to see that communications in the area are maintained, and Liat is, undoubtedly, very important to our communications in the Islands of the Eastern Caribbean.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, the Eastern Caribbean still forms one region. There may be an appearance of competition in tourism, there may be an appearance of competition in other things, but we are the same people and, indeed, even in hard economic terms when you promote the tourism of one Island you promote the tourism of all. You cannot reach many of these smaller Islands, Mr. Chairman, except through the medium of Liat, and Barbados, I believe, gets what is known as a trans-ship flow of traffic. People arrange to come to see a few Islands in the course of a vacation and Barbados, being a trans-shipment point, gets some of the business at the beginning and at the end of the vacation. Some people overnight in Barbados as the case may be; therefore, I think we have some duty to maintain an inter-Island chain of communications. But we have a greater duty to put forward a policy to which all the Eastern Caribbean can subscribe. We have a duty to think in terms of concentrating the available traffic in one flag carrier. I feel this very strongly and the Barbados Labour Party has said this, I believe, on at least two elections. The Party has paid lip-service to it, and the lip-service is now abandoned by the other side.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot reasonably expect to have I.C.A., B.W.I.A., Eastern, T.C.A. and British Airways all competing against each other for the traffic between New York and Barbados, London and Barbados, Toronto and Barbados, and all of them making a profit on their operations. Since they do not all show a profit on their operations, we get an irregular service —

not irregular in the sense that when they have a scheduled flight the planes do not fly. You are told that B.O.A.C is flying to New York this season and then suddenly you hear that B.O.A.C. is not flying to New York any longer. The British West Indian Airways want to fly to London, they are not allowed to fly, and then you hear that there are available seats to London but British Airways and I.C.A. are not sufficient to take the traffic. These things happen, and they happen because there is an unnecessary and unbridled competition between the West Indian Governments themselves to capture what is only a gradually rising market.

Now, I read in the Press that International Caribbean Airways is now owned 51% by Barbados. I do not remember that coming before the House of Assembly, but I can be corrected by hon. Members on the other side on that. Certainly, there has been no major statement of policy relating to it in this Chamber. The Leader of the House should be in a position to get up and tell us what is the intended relationship between Liat, I.C.A. and the other carriers, whether West Indian in origin or non-West Indian and movements in and out of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has become over the years a self-declared expert in Civil Aviation, and like all experts he wants his own advice to prevail. It would be much better if he gave up his portfolio to another Minister who is better able to assess advice without the benefit of past prejudices from its leader. There are numerous other Ministers who are underworked -- not for goodness' sake the Minister of Tourism; I would want things competently done -- on the Government side and who could handle some of the problems involved in the whole airline business.

What situation is it where Barbados says it owns an airline with a majority share for \$350,000? A maintenance contract to run an aeroplane for example I.C.A., will cost more than that per annum, and yet we expect to embark on an airline for three hundred and something thousand dollars. You are making yourself look ridiculous when you set that forward as policy. What serious control could we have over I.C.A.? Perhaps you mean that you bought the furniture at the Airport; you have the services of two or three members of the staff, and there is a certain amount of goodwill. I.C.A. would at least have goodwill if it is an airline. Suppose it does not have an aeroplane, it will at least have goodwill. What sort of business can you buy with \$350,000? This is a ridiculous joke, Sir.

Now, if Montserrat had purported to buy an International Airline for this sum of money, all of us in here would be invited to laugh at Montserrat. I can imagine what the Prime Minister would have said. He would laugh and sneer, but Barbados is put in this position and we are expected to take it seriously. The Government is there to rule. Members of the Government look at the Opposition and say that the Opposition do not say what they will do. We tell you that we believe in a flag carrier for the whole Eastern Caribbean; we believe it is possible to amalgamate the short-haul and the long-haul service in one.

Just to take an example, Sir. You cannot run an airline properly today unless you have a computerised reservation system. A part of the reason why the American domestic airlines are now doing so well is that they are able to fill their aeroplanes and run their aeroplanes economically. Go to any part of the United States; go to Washington, as I have done, and ask for a ticket from Montana to Minnesota. You can stand up, a girl comes and presses three or four keys, and she can tell you which airline will have a seat from Montana to Minnesota at a particular time. That can be done because there is a computerised reservation system. Now the computers which make this system possible are expensive, and small airlines cannot afford to have them. By small airlines I mean airlines that may have a country's name which appears to be significant, but when you go into the matter they might not be carrying as many passengers as Liat. Take Iran Airlines, for instance, that the Shah is now trying to amalgamate with Pan Am. Certain airlines appear to be big because they are flying two or three big aeroplanes and that is all there is to them. They fly a few big aeroplanes and a few small ones. Some of them do it profitably, and some do it not very profitably, but their profitability is reduced by the fact that they do not have a computerised system of reservation. They take a long time, occasionally, to know whether a flight will be filled or not; they over-book or underestimate the number of passengers and get all of the difficulties with which we in Barbados are so sadly familiar.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why the Shah has agreed to amalgamate with Pan American is that they will now have the services of the Pan American computer for their international flights. Now, all of this points to the advantages of large-scale airline operations, but in the West Indies it seems that Barbados is leading the way in fragmentation.

5.10 p.m.

Now Laker Airways who run ICA have no computerised reservations system that I know of, with the result that, for example, when I wanted to travel once on ICA, the Station Manager — I find him a very pleasant young man — Mr. Stuart, told me to pack my bags, come to the airport and bring my cheque book, and if we can get you on the plane you can write the cheque there and then. I went to the airport one evening about 11 o'clock and waited until after 12 o'clock and got on the plane and went to London like that. This is amusing, but it is old fashioned, old timed and old hat. An airline cannot run like that. It cannot hope to maintain a profitable operation upon that basis. You cannot maintain a profitable operation like B.O.A.C. in these places where they do not have access to an adequate reservations system and so they are overbooked and put off people and have to face law suits, but the Prime Minister as Minister of Civil Aviation is creating a situation where it will be impossible for B.W.I.A., LIAT, ICA ever to be more than up and down airlines scratching about at the door of modern airline operations. This is my view of this. Instead of a policy, we are given a Resolution in the House, explained by the Leader of the House, who with the greatest goodwill in the world on our side we would not be prepared to tell him that his explanation has assisted us or could assist us, because I do not think the Leader of the House is the person who would be put forward in the ordinary way to deal with the intricacies of airline economics and airline policy.

If we are to deal with this, we should have the fountain head himself here at the House telling us what the Government plans for a future air policy in and out of Barbados. We will support it, but we are supporting it really under pressure, and if we could sensibly vote against it as a mark of disapproval of the policy generally, we would, but we do not think it would be fair in all the circumstances.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the same strictures as the Leader of the Opposition. I feel that some more information could be given due to the fact that we are dealing with a Resolution in all its stages today, and it is stated in brackets that the item is a new item. It means therefore that we have never dealt with this item before.

In respect of the purchase of equity for \$¼ million, I do not have the same strictures

as the Leader of the Opposition in that in Barbados Barbados unfortunately and even the Caribbean as a whole, there is a small population of less than four million people, and in the Eastern Caribbean it must be less than three million people, and therefore the travelling public within the area itself, even when you add tourism, is not going to rise to the level of the systems that have been used between the two large countries of the world, New York and London, from the point of view of traffic. On the one side you are thinking in terms of 200 million in relation to Europe and on the other there are 200 million in respect of the United States, therefore you are talking in terms of 400 million people moving between these two points.

Where I agree with the hon. Member is that if you are going to have a policy on Civil Aviation or on the question of purchasing an airline, I think it is the Government's business to say to the House what the policy is as it relates to this new measure so that the House and the public would know that this is a new item with which you are dealing. The Hon. Leader of the House spoke of viability. I do not in my own way always subscribe to this phrase. The economists have given some people terms to use. When you talk about viability, do you really intend to make the service viable in an economic sense, or do you intend to make the service an efficient and workable service? You have to subsidise some services because a service cannot be viable in itself from the point of view of making people pay all the charges for it. It has been proved very conclusively that throughout the world there are these hidden subsidies that go into airlines, even those that you say, pay their way. The British Government makes a substantial contribution to their airline; the German Government does, the United States Government does. One of the reasons why Pan American and Transworld Airlines met their difficulties was because the United States Government said it was going to restrict the amount it had been giving to the airlines, and for that reason, they have been running into difficulties.

I am a believer that if you know anything about the Eastern Caribbean, you must have a kind of service. You had it some years ago; let us begin to understand that you cannot talk about regionalism on the basis of catching the Lady Joy or taking one of the schooners and going out. Those are all right when you are bringing fruit or freighting goods, but if you are thinking in terms of

people, you have to think in terms of air transport. Air transport is expensive to run because a pilot is not a cheap person to come by; a pilot is not a jackass rider. You can buy a jackass and ask anybody to ride it and even there, you are looking for trouble; so you cannot buy an aeroplane unless you are sure that you have the pilot, and you have to pay good salaries as they relate to the airlines.

This is where, maybe the Governments are going to run into problems, because, — and I do not even speak for the Barbados Government, but for all the Caribbean Governments now, — there is a tendency with the bureaucracies that in areas like these, they will buy an airline and as long as they buy an airline they think they can get it to function cheaply, and they sometimes run into problems with the people who have to work on them. Now I have to sound a note of warning; whether it is LIAT, ICA, A.A., S.A.S. whatever the initials are, we have to make up our minds that transport is an important service and it is a service you are rendering for which you have to pay the people who are working in it. The Caribbean Governments have run into problems with the people that work at airports. We are going to put out equity in this, and I am not going to say today that because you are putting \$250,000 as a down payment against \$750,000 that this is the end. I know it cannot be the end. It is the beginning, because the tourists will give you an inflated traffic during the period of the tourist season, and after that, you have to rely on your own people in the Caribbean who travel.

Mr. Chairman, the Caribbean people in themselves are not travel-oriented people because they do not have the resources and the surpluses to travel like the Americans or Europeans who are themselves more travel-oriented. They would travel on the basis of a holiday, quicker than a person in the Caribbean, even a person with the same sort of money. On that basis, you are likely to find that your service is not going to be as profitable as in the other areas of the world. There is a big traffic between New York and Washington for which Eastern Airlines run like a shuttle service. You do not require a ticket before you go abroad; you pay as you go on board the aeroplane. This is because you are dealing with large populations; people coming from south, people going to the eastern sea-board and people coming out of the United States both ways. You find a traffic

rate that is terrific, and every half hour there is that flight because there is the volume of traffic to warrant this.

Now I am a little concerned, Mr. Chairman, because in my own work I have been having difficulties with the airlines, because there have been redundancies at these airlines, and there have been new people operating here. If we were not tolerant here in Barbados, the services would have been disrupted during the present tourist season on the grounds that some of the operators put to us that they cannot afford to pay what we can regard as modest wages to people who have to work in some of these services.
5.20 p.m.

Now I would like to sound a note of warning, that if you are going to have anything approximating to a good service whether it be the airlines or whether it be in the road transport, we have to make up our minds that the people who work in that service have to be paid. From what I have seen and what I have said already today about prices, what I have said already about things we have to do, there is no point in beginning to believe that you can beg the question of asking people to subdue themselves, who are at the lower scale of earnings, when they can see and hear what is going on around us. It is pointless. They are not going to do it.

I am agreeing with this, and I want to make it clear that I am agreeing with it on the basis that I feel, that it is impossible to develop the Caribbean without adequate services for people to move. There was a time when the old politicians felt that the only thing to move is goods, not people. People are not important. You move cargo, you move oranges, you move bananas, you move fruit, you move timber, but people must stay put. Now they realize that since you are talking about tourism — and I am not so glad about that because it would seem to me and I am not a party to this sort of thinking — that the only time you can move is if you are moving on behalf of a tourist. I am not that kind of tourist oriented. I have always been a believer that if Barbados must be made good for the people who live here, then it must be made good for everybody else who comes, but if Barbados has to be made good for someone else, then to become good for me afterwards, that is not good for me.

So the countries must be good for the people who live in them. I have visited

countries and they do not make the countries good for me as a visitor. I go to London, I go to New York, I go to Brussels, I go all over Europe. Mainly when you go to these countries, you see these countries are oriented for the people who live in them.

I am satisfied that you must have this service, and keep it running well. It should have been dealt with before. I am aware of the problems of Governments. The Caribbean Governments are like poor people. The Caribbean Governments remind me of some men who want to gamble but none of them have any money, and they turn out to be four cents gamblers, and when each fellow puts up a penny, each fellow looks at it very hard; they are not ready to gamble yet.

Running a Government is a serious business, and I have dealt with some of the Governments; and sometimes I hear the Ministers here talk about the stringencies of life, but when you are running a Government you have to make up your mind that you are running a Government. If you are going in for certain things, you cannot go in for certain things unless you have the money for those things; if not, you are not ready for them. You cannot travel on an airline service if you only have bus fare; you have to look for an old bus; but when you are going for an airline service, you must have money to pay for an airline. It is a service that you have to perform. You cannot go in for a one-plane service because as soon as that one plane is broken down, the whole thing comes to a standstill. You have to be ready to capitalize the service at the point that it should be capitalized in order that if one is down you can keep the service running. That is how it becomes viable and worthwhile. It becomes very uneconomic if you want to run it on a one-basis level. It is like running the Hilton Hotel with one pot; you are not ready for the Hilton Hotel. That is how you cook at home, and in some homes you have more than one pot.

So I feel that we should have this LIAT service — which is a good thing to have, because it employs West Indians. The hon. Member for St. Joseph spoke about the computerized service. Again, that will come. I will throw out a note of warning. There is no point buying a computer to put half dozen people's names in it, because the rental on the computer would increase the cost of the operation. I know what he is speaking about. He is speaking about this type of thing. LIAT

is very famous for telling you that they are over-booked. I took a football team to Grenada in 1960, and you know a football team is not less than eleven, and as a touring team we took fifteen people plus friends who went; we had about 21 people on the aeroplane, so we booked both ways — firm booking. When we were ready to return from Grenada — and to travel from St. George's to Grenada to Pearl's Airport is longer than travelling from Grenada to Barbados — so after all that early morning grind, getting up at 5.30, we were told that we were over-booked. I said, how could we be over-booked? You mean that we are booked over, because we booked a long time before the aeroplane arrived. We could not persuade the people, because unfortunately they had brought people in from Trinidad and they could not make the people get off the plane, so we had to wait in Grenada another day at the expense of the airline, and as they were young footballers those who had no work to do were very pleased that they were at the expense of the airline, and they started to eat on a different basis. Their appetites increased and they called flying when they went back to the airport.

Well it is that kind of thing that I know the hon. Member was speaking about, but I am not concerned about that. What I am worried about is, if you are able to have a computerized system, by all means have it, but I would say that if you have an efficient service going and the travelling public would have confidence in the service, then the airline would be serving the needs of the people of the Caribbean and it would be a vital link for the tourist who would be coming from North America and Europe.

5.30 p.m.

I feel however that the Leader of the House has some information on that, but for this new Item I feel that the Government should take the opportunity to inform the public about this matter so that in the passing of this Resolution, you give the public a full explanation about the whole ramification and the expenditure we are going to use so that there is no question of hide and seek but you are spending money from the public purse in the public interest and I am a believer that as it is taxpayers' money, they have a right to know all about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in view of the points raised, especially by the last speaker, I will just give a brief rundown on the equity capital. This is the possible

capital and loan inflows and application of funds from the various countries. Antigua, Dominica, Grenada and St. Lucia will all bring in 7.5% equity which is equivalent to \$375,000 each. St. Vincent will contribute 5% equity which is \$250,000. St. Kitts - Nevis - Anguilla 2.5% equity which is \$125,000, Montserrat 5% which is \$250,000, making a total of 42.5% equity, and in terms of money \$2,125,000. Barbados is taking 15% equity which is \$750,000 in terms of money, Guyana 5% equity or \$250,000, Jamaica 5% equity or \$250,000. Trinidad and Tobago has not yet agreed but they are giving a temporary loan. The chances are that they will take 15% which I understand was agreed upon some time ago but the final agreement has not taken place. The total amount of equity so far with the exception of Trinidad and Tobago will be \$3,375,000. The Antigua Government has contributed \$50,000, and the net capital and loan inflow will be \$1,485,000, which is expected to be received by the end of February or March, so the idea is that the immediate loan being provided plus the amount which will be financed, plus a loan so that the airline will be able to continue functioning, we hope, on a better basis. I think when the Estimates come up you will probably get a fuller story from the appropriate Minister.

The Question that the Resolution for \$250,000 do now pass, was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1974-75 No. 34

THE RESOLUTION FOR THE SUM OF \$186,383 WAS CALLED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 5 - Judiciary - Item 11, Travelling in the sum of \$580, stand part, the position is that the sum of \$14,620 was voted in the Current Estimates to meet the increase travelling allowances for the staff of the Judiciary and the Station allowances for Magistrates as follows:

Magistrates at Districts C and E and at Belleplaine \$40 per month each or \$480 per annum; and Magistrate at District B \$25 per month or \$300 per annum.

At a meeting held on the 12th December, 1974 it was agreed that with effect from 1st December, 1974 the following increased rates

of Station allowances payable to Magistrates should be made;

Magistrates at Districts C and E and at Belleplaine \$80 per month each or \$960 per annum, and in the other case of the Magistrate at District B \$50 per month.....(Mr. HINDS: Let that pass.)

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Head 16(2) - Prime Minister's Office - Civil Aviation was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Item 8 - Maintenance of Buildings in the sum of \$19,482. The sum of \$80,000 was provided under this Item in the Current Estimates to meet expenditure for the buildings and air conditioning units at Seawell Airport. The sum of \$68,482 was expended as of 31st December, 1974 leaving a balance of \$11,517.18. Because of the greatly increased cost of building material, the amount of \$31,000 is required to meet likely expenditure to end of the current financial year. Taking into consideration the balance of \$11,517.18, the additional sum required is \$19,482.82.
5.40 p.m.

As far as Item 13 is concerned, Supplementary Provision in the sum of \$166,320 is required to meet Government's share of the running costs for the current Financial Year of the MTS 32D Radar Simulator installed at Seawell Airport in March 1974. Included in the terms of payment accepted by Government for the supply and installation of this equipment was that Government should meet half of the running costs incurred. The Government's contribution amounts to approximately \$13,800 per month, or \$166,320 per annum. No provision was made in the Current Estimates to meet this expenditure, and a Supplementary for the entire amount is now being requested.

I beg to move that Head 16(2) - Civil Aviation - stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is right that I should ask the Minister just a few questions in respect of the Radar Simulator. I believe he will have information in his files to tell us whether the Simulator was new when it was first obtained. I think the Minister told us that it came from Canada. If he has not said so yet, then he would be in a position to say so now. So far as the arrangement with respect to servicing the Radar Simulator is concerned, is it a case where the Government made arrangements with contractors or with sub-contractors? If it is a case where the Government made an arrangement with sub-contractors and consequently had to face the high cost of \$13,800 a month, what explanation does the Government have to give in this respect? Why did not the Government make arrangements with contractors instead of sub-contractors? What does the Minister know about computer devices and HARP with regard to the servicing of this piece of equipment?

Now, we very well know that, with this type of equipment, the Government would have had a survey carried out before embarking on the purchase of such equipment. Can the Minister tell us what was the age of the Radar Simulator before it came to this country? I am sure that the Minister will be able to tell us the original cost of it, so that one would be able to compare the cost of servicing, bearing in mind what we have seen here as the Government's share of the cost of servicing this equipment. Surely, the Minister will be aware that there have been considerable staff retrenchments over a certain period. I refer to the staff formerly employed for servicing this Simulator. What is the position now, and what is likely to be the position in the future? Servicing this Simulator is not an undertaking for novices. Since all of the senior staff have been laid off, what assurance can the Minister give us now that this Simulator will be serviced and maintained in such condition as to render the type of service that would normally be demanded by the Government of Barbados on behalf of the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister is as aware as any one of us about certain things. He visits the Airport very often in the course of his duty. I am saying that the Minister is not satisfied and could not be satisfied with the insanitary conditions to be witnessed at the Airport from time to time. We are satisfied that there still obtains at the Airport this silly system of employees, who are engaged in the cleaning of the Airport,

looking over their shoulders or under their arms to see friends or relatives coming to the Airport to see a friend off or something like that. I believe that the time has come when some sort of training should be given to these people. Some sort of instruction should be given to them to the effect that they are earning a livelihood, and, if Her Majesty the Queen is due to arrive at the Airport, their duty is to keep the place tidy and clean. They should not be looking around to see if somebody from their village is at the Airport watching them mopping the floor and so on. It will be necessary to get rid of that sort of thing. Until this is done, the Government will be spending money for the purpose of keeping the Airport tidy, but we will never be able to see it at the standard which we all desire.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister himself has noticed, from time to time, the condition of the buildings at the Airport. During the course of the day you will find people making their beds in the Departure Lounge and so on, and we are asking the Minister to do something about this matter. We are sure that there is a definite need for more seating accommodation to be provided at the Airport. What does the Minister intend to do about this? You will find that it is due to the absence of this kind of accommodation that tends to create some of the unhealthy situations that we witness from time to time at the Airport.
5.50 p.m.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to be given the assurance by the Hon. Minister that the money that is spent for maintaining the buildings at the airport is well spent, and that service is rendered for this. We have learned from the mouth of the hon. Member for St. Michael West, the Trade Unionist, that where people are employed they have got to be paid for the services they are expected to render. We would like to know that they render these services for which they are paid. We cannot, Mr. Chairman, just sit here and vote money for keeping the airport clean, for keeping the buildings in a state of repair so that they do not become an eye-sore to all of us who have got to go there and to others who come in from other places and spend their brief time there, and we are asking that everything possible be done that we will know for ourselves that the money voted is well spent.

One last point, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the servicing of the Radar simulator, apart from the Barbados Government having to

pay half the running cost, what specific arrangement was made with respect to the servicing costs?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member must recall that I am not an expert on these matters, neither is it my portfolio as such, but I will attempt to give him all the information I have. We are dealing now again with Item 13, the maintenance of wireless equipment, and the amount required is \$166,320.

The Space Research Corporation.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, does the Space Research Corporation have any relationship with HARP?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As far as I know, the answer is "yes". The Space Research Corporation has recently provided and installed a MTS 32D Radar Simulator at the airport. The terms of payment accepted by Government are as follows:

(1) That the following cost be shared equally between Government and S.R.C.:

(a) The basic cost of the MTS 32D Radar Simulator including cost of installation and checking of equipment - \$357,080 US.

Mr. CRAIG: I should like to call to the attention of the Leader of the House that there is no quorum. You have eighteen seats and they must come in here, and sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thank the hon. Member. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the following costs are to be shared equally by Government and S.R.C.:

(a) The basic cost of the MTS 32D Radar Simulator including cost of installation and checking of equipment - \$US357,080;

(b) Planning Expenses - \$US65,825;

(c) Maintenance cost and spares - \$US100,000

making a total of \$US522,905. The running costs, as I explained earlier on, as incurred.

2. That the Government's share of (a), (b) and (c) above, that is, \$US261,452.50 be reduced by \$US99,917.50, made up as follows:

(a) \$US75,000 rebate on original simulator;

(b) \$US24,917.50, payments already made by Government at \$US4,983.50 per month for the period February to June, 1973, making a total of \$US99,917.50.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Leader of the House has brought a Resolution for a sum of money. We are now to ask if it is for US dollars because the Government's share of certain expenses has been paid in US dollars. If the Government has got to conduct its business in US dollars, we have got to ask the Minister if he is coming for US dollars to pay for this exercise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The amount we have come for is in Barbados dollars. The hon. Member asked for further information as from the inception and I am trying to give you the information. The business was conducted in US dollars; do you want me to say Barbados dollars when it is US?

3. That the resultant amount, namely \$US162,535 be paid by Government over a five-year period commencing on the date of the first payment in equal monthly instalments with no interest charges added.
6.00 p.m.

That the cost involved in planning expenses be substantiated by SRC supplying to Government the relevant bills and receipts; that the cost of running the school be met by SRC initially, and at the end of each month the relevant bills and receipts for the expenses incurred be supplied to Government for reimbursement of its share.

(6) That at the end of the five-year period mentioned in the third paragraph above, ownership of MTS, 32D, radar simulator would automatically be transferred to the Government of Barbados without further payment by the Government.

Supplementary provision is now required to meet the running cost of the simulator at a cost of approximately \$6,600 US (Bds \$13,860) per month.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. With this type of arrangement, with these research people tendering bills at the end of a month and Government then to bear its cost, can the Minister tell us whom Government has there on the staff to look and see that these bills are not just "jacked up" so that Government's portion is skyrocketed month after month? This is the most vicious, arrangement that could ever be made on behalf of the taxpayers of a country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Supplementary Provision is now required to meet the running cost of the simulator at the cost of approximately \$6,600 U.S. (Bds \$13,860) per month.

So that for twelve months the amount is \$13,860, per month. Twelve months at the rate of \$13,860 is equal to \$166,320.

That is the explanation Sir.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$186,383 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN — 8.

Noes: Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. W. C. B. HINDS — 3.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75 No. 35

The Resolution for the sum of \$291,169 — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to authorize Supplementary

Provision under Head 32, Item 15, Industrial Development Corporation in the sum of \$291,169 to enable the Corporation to carry out its programme to the end of the current fiscal year.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution is completely out of order. This is a Resolution that was circulated this morning. This is not contained in the notice circulated to Members and therefore there is no way that this Resolution can be done. This is not contained in the list of things in the special agenda sent out on the 27 February, 1975. It only goes down to No. 34.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House will have to report progress, ask for leave to sit again, and allow His Honour the Speaker to decide this. We cannot decide on this matter in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I agree, Sir. In view of what Your Honour has just said, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
6.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Your Honour will recall that this morning I gave notice of a Resolution for the sum of \$291,169 standing in my name, and it is to be placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75 Part I — Current, No. 35. It deals with the supplementary for the Industrial Development Corporation to enable them to carry on their functions. The hon. Member for the City objected on the grounds that it was not included, but I remember that Your Honour read the letter which had a general omnibus part at the end. I thought you had made yourself clear, I do not know if the hon. Member was in his seat, but the fact is I thought you had made yourself clear when you ruled that by virtue of the letter and by virtue of your consent, you had given to the letter which I wrote to you and copied one to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I wished to deal with all these Resolutions in all their stages today provided

that the copies were circulated. If the hon. Member did not have a copy, I would go along with him, but if he had a copy of the Resolution, then he would have known.

Mr. SPEAKER: After consultation with the Clerk-at-the-Table I am now looking at Standing Order Number 6 subsection 9 and I am ruling that I am going to allow the Hon. Leader to do the Resolution of which notice was given today. The last sentence of subsection 9 of Standing Order Number 6 reads as follows: "The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of meeting." The initiative is entirely with the Government to set down the Business for that day. On top of that, it seems that the Government is under no obligation to give prior notice as to the content of the Resolution that it seeks to do, but that the Government is entitled to circulate the Business at the time of the meeting as has been done today, copies of the Resolutions that the Government is seeking to have done at a Special Meeting of this nature. Over and above the Order Paper which has been circulated to Members, my ruling is that it is quite in order for the Leader of the House to proceed and that properly before the House is a Resolution for the sum of \$291,000 mentioned by the Leader of the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, there is procedure for this business, and this same Standing Order Number 6(9) sets it out — and I am sure that you will agree with me on this point — that when representation is made to you by the Minister it has to be made on the basis of the Business that is set, and that Business and that Business alone upon which representation has been made to His Honour the Speaker must be the business.
6.20 p.m.

In other words, when Your Honour decides that this business, for which representation has been made to Your Honour, warrants a Special Meeting, then that business alone should be discussed at that Special Meeting.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The last sentence to which Your Honour referred under Order Number 6, Rule 9, says:

"....The business set down for that day shall be appointed by the Government and notice thereof shall be circulated not later than the time of meeting."

I am in receipt of a letter dated 27th February, 1975, signed on behalf of the Clerk of Parliament which stated:

"....Pursuant to the above representation, I am directed to give notice that there will be a Special Meeting of the Honourable the House of Assembly to be held at the Public Buildings, Bridgetown, St. Michael on Tuesday, the 4th day of March, 1975, at 12 noon to consider the following Government Business...."

It then goes on to adopt the words of Standing Order Number 6, Rule 9:

"Government Business appointed for Tuesday, 4th March, 1975 at 12.00 o'clock noon."

It goes on to give the notices of the Money Resolutions down to Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 34. Nothing else was mentioned on that, and that is the notice which was circulated to us. There is nothing about Supplementary Resolutions Nos. 35 and 36. I cannot see how these things can be said to be included. If you give us something when we come here, that is not circulation within this meaning. The Business to be done for the day shall be appointed by the Government. When they put that in writing, it is what they will be doing. They cannot come here at a later stage and say notice was given of this and that. I was given documents after the luncheon adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled, however.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On another ground, Mr. Speaker. As far as I am aware; this was handed to me after lunch by the Clerk of Parliament. I do not think the Members of this House had any time to consider this Resolution. Under the Rules, you have the power to disallow this because the Opposition did not have time to consider it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I received my own copy when the Sitting of the House started.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You received your copy when the House started, but you were out of the House for a period of time and you could have read yours. You did not have to remain in the Chamber and take part in the debates. Other Members were in here taking part in the debates. I received my copy after 2.30 p.m. I do not think it is fair to circulate documents to Members at that stage and then ask them to consider something without giving them time to go through the documents.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, we had this problem earlier this morning, and I was under the impression that you, Mr. Speaker, gave a ruling about the Business as set down for a Special Meeting today and ruled that the Business for today should be discussed. I have not yet received my copy. We may as well throw the Standing Orders away, Mr. Speaker, if Business other than the Business set down can be discussed. What is to prevent the Clerk of Parliament from circulating something again and telling us that it must be discussed in all of its stages? This is what it is tantamount to, Sir.

Now, I am not shirking my responsibility. I am prepared to see the Business of the House go through, but we should not be treated in this manner. There are Rules sometimes and no Rules on other occasions. This morning I was under the impression that you had agreed with the stand taken by the Opposition that only the Business set down for the Special Meeting should be dealt with today. This evening at 6.25 p.m. your ruling is that the Leader of the House should continue with other matters. The Government has the numbers, but I have no intention of taking part in this particular Resolution. I shall absent myself from this Chamber during the consideration of this matter because it is not fair to the Opposition. We are small in numbers, and it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to protect the Opposition at all times. Why should they be allowed to circulate something at three o'clock and ask us to consider it? Mr. Speaker, you have objected to something of this nature already, and you agreed that the Government should not bring things in here and ram them down the throats of members on both sides of the House. We are now asked to consider a Resolution which is not set down as the Business for the day as set out in the Standing Orders of the House. If this is going to be done because of the numbers of the Government, then I will walk out on this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely going to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Members had spent the 3½ hours, which they claim they have, reading the single page — we know that

their reading rate is not as fast as President Kennedy's; his is 700 words a minute — which was included in the Circular Letter and on the Notice Paper, then they would not have to fall back on the long-stop position that they had not sufficient time to consider the matter. This is not the first time in the history of Parliament or of this House that the Leader of the House or any other person has asked for permission to deal with a matter in all of its stages.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Can he rise on a point of order in the middle of a sentence, Sir?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is incorrect for the Hon. Prime Minister to say that this Resolution was circulated with the letter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said an item notice of which was included with the Circular Letter, and I went on to say that it is not the first time in the history of Parliament that a Leader of Parliament or of the House has had to ask for permission to deal with a matter in all of its stages, notice having been given. Notice was given of this matter this morning. I only reiterate, Sir, that they do not understand the nature and function of Parliament in a democratic society. They think it is a talking shop. If they had spent the time studying the matter, then they would not have been wasting time now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, notice of this Resolution was never given and circulated on this Notice Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is recognised.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will read the letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow you to read the letter; I have quoted from it already today, and I have given permission that the Resolution be done.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is he wasting time for now?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply, and that there be instructions to deal with these two Money Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

6.30 p.m.

Members of the Opposition left the Chamber.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75
No. 35

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks to authorise Supplementary Provision under Head 32 Item 15 — Industrial Development Corporation in the amount of \$291,169 to enable the Corporation to carry out its programme to the end of the current fiscal year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75
No. 36

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 1 — Post Office — under Annexed Estimates, stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before Your Honour proceeds, there are persons within the precincts of this Chamber disrupting the proceedings of this Chamber including hon. Members from the other side who have refused to take part in the deliberations and I ask that they be all removed forthwith. I am drawing the attention of the House to the matter in accordance with the Standing Orders. This is the only real point of order that has arisen in this House in about five years, and it is a point of

order. The business of the House cannot proceed with unauthorised persons disrupting the proceedings, and I ask that they be removed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marshal, could you kindly ask all unauthorised persons to leave the precincts of the Chamber, and all authorised persons to be silent.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, each seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the seven Money Resolutions were read a first, a second time, and agreed to respectively.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments to revise the fees thereunder.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill arises out of my Budgetary Proposals of 1973 when I stated that the fees chargeable by Government Departments and Ministries in respect of services would be reviewed in order to bring the fees chargeable in line with present day costs and money values. There are only amendments to this Bill and they are to increase the fees in Section 22 from \$200 to \$500 and in line 3 of the Rum Duty Act, and in the Brewery Act, Section 3, to increase the fees from \$100 to \$500. It is purely a matter of arithmetic.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and it stood part.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will be very short. It relates to aspects of rum duty and brewery duty, but is not exactly within the Act, but it relates to the question of what fees should be raised, and I hope that you will hear me for a minute.

Very recently it was discovered that a certain hotel had been selling spirituous liquors for some years in the case of both without having paid the necessary licence fees. I know that is a liquor licence rather than a rum duty, but the subjects are connected. I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Finance that he should have another look at the Liquor Licence Act, because I was informed by the tribunal itself concerned that the maximum fine which was imposable of \$500 was the only penalty he could apply other than the confiscation of all the rum and drinks which he found on the premises and which could not in any way have amounted to more apparently than a few weeks' profit from illicit sales. I would suggest that while they are looking at this enactment raising rum duties and the Brewery Act for fees, that there could also be a look at the penalty in the Liquor Licensing Act which is in a sense associated with this subject.

The Question that Clause 2 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.40 p.m.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

THE BILL TO AMEND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1958

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item is a Bill to amend the Local Government Act 1958. The Honourable Prime Minister will deal with it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short measure. In my Budget Speech, I indicated that the trade tax under the Local Government Act of 1958 would be changed from 19½% to 20%, and that would be the effect of tax. This Bill therefore implements the proposals which will make accounting, I hope, a lot easier, and probably bring a small amount of additional revenue to the Government.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and they stood part.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

THE BILL TO AMEND ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT 1941

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941. Again that is a Budgetary Proposal.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in the proposals which I made to this House on the 21st November, 1974, I stated *inter alia* that the

rates of Estate and Succession Duties had been fixed as long ago as 1941 and that the time was ripe for a revision in the rate, and that basically the scale had been increased by about 2% in estate duties, and successive duties by about 10%.

I also took the opportunity to eliminate succession duties on estates below 2,400 in value. The present Bill therefore, with the long schedule, revises the existing rates of estate and succession duties, and this will have come into effect on 22nd November 1974.

The tax bills for the period 1974-75 were already sent out so we could not revise those taxes. They come into effect on the 1st April.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in the course of Estate and Succession Duties practice, many Attorneys-at-Law to my knowledge have found certain difficulties in respect of the exemptions and the Clauses to be contained in the back of the present Schedule A to the Estate and Succession Duties Act. There are a number of exemptions which appear to have been repealed by this Act, and I certainly myself would welcome them since I know that up to last week, apparently with no knowledge of this Act, the Department of Inland Revenue was still sending out opinions based on what I now take to be repealed provisions, and it would make me very happy indeed, Mr. Speaker to support the substitution of this Schedule A which removes all these exemptions that were of little value to the taxpayer but an immense amount of trouble to his legal advisers.

However, there is one thing with which I find a little difficulty, and I would particularly ask the Minister of Finance if he could be kind enough to give his attention to this. At the back of the present Schedule A, as I understand it, there is an exemption of succession duty where a successor is a wife of the predecessor. This is standard form that a widow does not pay succession duty; she only pays estate duty.
6.50 p.m.

As I see it, if the whole of Schedule A is now repealed there will be no such exemption, and if you look at Schedule B you will see that Schedule B omits wives. The reason why Schedule B omits wives in assessing succession duty is that wives are not liable by reason of Schedule A. I do not

believe that it is the intention of the Government, however inadvertently — and if I am wrong in this I wish to be corrected — to make wives pay succession duty at the maximum rate, because it is the only rate which will be possible. As I take it, the exemption for a wife has *per incuriam* been repealed. I have had to borrow a copy of the Act from the Clerk of Parliament. I do not know if one is available to the Minister of Finance but I will be glad to return this to the Clerk of Parliament and direct his attention to page 663. If there is an easy answer to this, I will be glad to have it. If the Prime Minister looks at page 661 he will see that that starts Schedule A and it starts with the rates of duty. Pages 662 and 663 contain exemptions, and the top exemption of the second clause is of succession duty.

In my respectful submission — and this has nothing to do with politics, this only has to do with the difficulties I have had with the first series of exemptions, because I think they are used by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to mislead himself rather than to assist himself, — I believe that those exemptions can easily be lost. If enquiries are made, it will be discovered that there are at least two cases which are in the hands of the legal advisers to the Government, in one of which they have been unable to give an opinion for more than a year upon the meaning of the second exemption; exemption A in the second part of the section. I will be quite happy to see those go, I do not know of anybody who gets benefits from it, but there is nothing that I can find anywhere else in the Act that exempts a wife from succession duty except what we are now repealing. As I said, there may be an easy answer, but I have looked at this and I have been giving very close attention to Schedule A of the Estate and Succession Duties Act in the course of professional work over the last two or three months and I am quite unable to find what would retain this in the Act if we now repeal it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I can give the hon. Member an explanation. This is a very unusual Schedule because usually the Schedule would set out figures and rates and matters of this kind, but on the back of Schedule A to the main Act there are about 11 paragraphs which in my opinion, in agreement with the hon. Member, constitute part of the Schedule. It appears to me that the draughtsman was looking at page 661 alone and merely substituting the rates without realising that the printing on the following two pages were not part of the main Act but were

an integral part of the Schedule. I do not like to give travelling opinions, and it is not frequently that I find myself in agreement with the hon. Member either on points of law or points of fact, but since I myself entertain a considerable amount of doubt in this matter, Sir, I would ask that further consideration of the Bill be postponed because it does appear to me that there has been an oversight on the part of the draughtsman.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in seconding that, I will have to be a little more political, because we often say in here you should not have hasty legislation, we often say in here that the draughtsmen do not know what they are doing. One of the matters which is concerning me with this Schedule is that a man who left less than \$10,000 in Barbados but left \$16 million in New York is being assessed the duty on the \$10,000 on the basis of one of these sections which is an exempting section. I think it is foolishness. I am working for his estate, but the executors in New York have instructed me to accept the opinion of the Attorney General of Barbados. These are virtually the only circumstances in which I would obey such instruction if I get it in the course of professional activity, but I cannot get the opinion because these four sections are so complicated that nobody has worked out all the implications, and it is over a year that this \$16 million estate is tied up in New York because they are waiting on a few thousand dollars in Barbados. All they are waiting for is for the law officers to give an opinion, and we cannot get it.

I would ask the Prime Minister to have it gone over, not just to change figures, and see what it means in the light of modern views of the law on succession. Let a tax lawyer look at it, certainly at page 662, and have it examined so that at least somebody in the legal department will know at the end of it what to advise the Commissioner of Inland Revenue the various paragraphs mean.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad also that it is being postponed because although I selected the matter of the wife, it will be observed that we are also appearing to repeal succession duty relief for religious or charitable gifts, and again I do not believe anybody in the House would wish to remove from religious bodies the right to receive bequests free of succession and estate duties in the circumstances set out here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to say that I can be political too. I do not think that if a person had a conflict of interest in getting revenue for the Government of Barbados and giving revenue to the Treasury of the United States that he should have any doubt where his loyalties should lie, particularly if there is an ambiguity. To me the law is clear for any person succeeding to a property of a person whose estates is liable here in Barbados. Under clause (c) on page 662 he is liable to pay on the whole section, because it says "for the purpose of ascertaining the value of any succession under this Schedule in the whole interest of each successor in all the real and personal properties of the deceased situate outside of the island as well as the property within this island shall be taken into account." That does not appear to me to give them relief, it appears to add an increased burden on paying on whatever they may have inherited.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was the lucky benefactor then he is giving himself counsel and I can understand his difficulty in that case, but if it is for some American citizen then the Act is clear, but the position right now is that if we proceeded with the matter we may be doing a great injustice not only to ourselves but to the treasury of Barbados, and I am merely waiting for it to be seconded.

Mr. ADAMS: Just to wind this up, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot wind it up, we will go on like this all night.

Mr. ADAMS: What the Prime Minister has read is an aggregation section which would seriously affect the revenue. It is not a liability section, it is an aggregation section, but he is right in saying that it might very seriously affect the revenue if it was amended in error.

The Question that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
7.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. 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 Vacluse Plantation, St. Thomas. It is Item No. 1, Sir.

**RESOLUTION FOR THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
VAUCLUSE PLANTATION,
ST. THOMAS**

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as is set out in the Schedule, this area of land is roughly about one acre. It is 42,000 square feet and it is required for the purpose of establishing a reservoir in the Vacluse area to serve a number of areas in St. Thomas, St. James, and even St. Michael. The reason that we are acquiring it in this fashion is that the vendors, apparently do not have all of the titles in order.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this closes Government Business for today's Sitting.

I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. on Friday, 7th March, 1975.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the business for which the meeting has been called is completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Notice was given of new matters.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: There are other items on the Order Paper, Sir. There is a Bill to provide for the registration and discipline of engineers and connected purposes. There is also

a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Jessamy Lane, Bridgetown, and a Bill to amend the dogs Act.

Mr. ADAMS: These items were not on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The items were given notice of today.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, with great respect, the Order Paper does not contain any portion that says Government Notices. At a Special Meeting you can only transact the Business set down. That is my respectful submission.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that it was proper for Government to give notice of any Motions that it has intended to do.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Question that the House be now suspended until 3 p.m. on Friday, 7th March, 1975, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
7.05 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. However, the House needs to be properly constituted.

Mr. Clerk, please have the Bell rung for two minutes.

The Bell was rung accordingly but no quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no quorum, this House is now automatically adjourned until Tuesday, the 11th March, 1975 at 12.00 o'clock noon.
3.05 p.m.