

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th September, 1975.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister Without Portfolio); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C. B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H.deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 23rd September, 1975 were circulated and are before you for confirmation. There being no amendment those Minutes have been duly confirmed.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the honour to lay the Training Report for the year 1st April, 1974 to 31st March, 1975, and as Minister of Finance and Planning the Sixth Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank at 31st March, 1975.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$3,150,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$773,372 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 11, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. and also the Resolution to amend the note to Item 5, under Head 11 - Pensions, of the Current Estimates 1975-76.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Free Hill, St. George, for the provision of a site for the pulverisation plant.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Brewery Act, 1975, a Bill to impose a levy on all sugar and fancy molasses produced in and exported from Barbados, a Bill to validate certain matters respecting land valuation and land tax in Barbados and a Bill to amend the Statutory Boards Casual Employees (Pensions) Act.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. W. R. LOWE on behalf of His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN gave notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the safety of the individual is of paramount importance for his survival;

AND WHEREAS the individual should have the maximum protection by the use of safety equipment at all times whenever the safety of the individual requires such use of safety equipment;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House requests the Government to consider as a matter of urgency the introduction of the necessary legislation to make the use of safety equipment compulsory when the use of such safety equipment is essential for the preservation of life or the safety of the individual.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, is this motion now to be seconded by the hon. member for St. George South? It sounds like a motion from the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member should have said that he was giving notice of the Resolution for the hon. member for St. George North.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: With all due respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it is your Resolution it does not mean that you can spring it on us as a motion for debate, that does not sanctify it as any motion having predominance over any others. Are we debating this Resolution now? The two of you as officers of the House should be more familiar with the orders of the House, and to spring a motion like that on us....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not the intention.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That was your intention, but I would just like some clarification, Sir.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect it was my fault for not mentioning that this notice was given on behalf of the hon. member for St. George North.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is asking leave to give notice on your behalf.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand it now.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. GREAVES: To ask the Minister of Housing, Labour, Lands and National Insurance —

Can the Minister state when the proposed housing project for St. Lucy will begin?

And will he state (a) the area where the project will be developed (b) the size of the project (c) the facilities to be contained in the project (d) whether or not the houses will be for rental, for sale or a mixture of both?

To ask the Minister of Communications and Works —

Is the Minister aware that there is a serious problem of flooding in Crab Hill (near Stroud Bay Road), Grape Hall Corner and in Pie Corner, St. Lucy?

And is the Minister aware that when there is a downpour of rain these areas are flooded to the extent that residents experience considerable difficulty in getting into and from their homes?

Will the Minister investigate this and ensure that proper drainage for these areas is provided without delay?

To ask the Minister of Health and Welfare:—

Can the Minister state whether or not Government has a policy on the sale and use of drugs after the expiry date fixed by the manufacturers has elapsed?

Is the Minister aware of the complaints to the effect that at St. Joseph's Hospital, St. Peter the practice exists of administering to patients drugs the expiry date of which has elapsed.

Will the Minister take appropriate steps to investigate these complaints and such other action as is necessary to put an end to such practice if found to exist?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been asked by the hon. member for St. Michael West to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Is the Minister aware that the residents of Headley's Land, Deacons Road and Crab Land, St. Stephens, are without street lighting?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to have street lights installed in the above areas as soon as possible?

To ask the Minister of Communications and Works —

Is the Minister aware that the following roads are in a state of disrepair: Weekes Land,

Deacons Road, Yearwood Road, Wavell Avenue, Dears Land, Black Rock, 2nd Avenue Fairfield Road, Lennox Avenue B, Goodland, and Cadogan Road, Grazettes?

Is the Minister aware that these conditions are causing a considerable amount of inconvenience to the residents?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to have these roads repaired?
12.20 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Brewery Act, 1975, be read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to impose a levy on all sugar and fancy molasses produced in and exported from Barbados be read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to validate certain matters respecting land valuation and land tax in Barbados be read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Statutory Boards Casual Employees (Pensions) Act be read a first time.

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

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

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 22 asked by the hon. member for St. Peter is ready.

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 30 asked by the same member is ready.

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 37 asked by the member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition, is ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 42 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is now ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 9 asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas is ready for tabling.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11 asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas has been tabled.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to suspend Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's Sitting on the understanding that certain hon. members who have urgent matters over there will deal with those matters later in the Sitting. I am aware of one: the amendment to the Fire Insurance Act which Report has been tabled and which we can now proceed with. It has met with the Cabinet's approval, and the Government side is willing to support it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have no objection, on this side, to the suspension of Standing Orders provided that we take the luncheon break at two o'clock. We have a habit, when the Standing Orders are suspended, to go beyond the particular time. We want a clear undertaking that there will be a break for lunch at two o'clock. Secondly, on resumption after lunch, we will do the Fire Insurance Act under Private Members' Business, and we will deal with the Questions immediately after lunch and not later in the day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has been asked for and granted, and those Standing Orders, as stated by the Leader of the House, will be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting. The question is that those Standing Orders.... (Asides.) The Leader of the House is there. I gather that....

Mr. HINDS: It is not a question of the Leader of the House being there. The Leader of the House has always proved himself to be a leader, except when the Prime Minister is present.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That has no point of order at all! It is my pleasure to say that those Standing Orders have been suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting, and all conditions will be agreed to.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 7

A Resolution in the sum of \$131,710 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Item 2 — Other Personal Emoluments in the sum of \$11,000, the position is that the staff in the Accountant General's Office has been experiencing some difficulty in reconciling the Paymaster Account. As a result of that the Data Processing Unit have been called in, and they will be expected to do overtime work for about 300 hours per person for 15 days. The exercise will cover a period of approximately 15 weeks, working at 20 hours per week. Each operator will work 300 hours. Since there are 10 operators they will be working for 3,000 hours, and will be paid at a rate of \$3.25 per hour and the Supervisor at \$5.00 per hour. That is how the amount is made up. It will be \$9,750 plus \$1,500. That is to bring the work up to date, and they will be paid at the rates laid down by the Government.

I beg to move that Item 2 stand part.

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

The question that Head 19(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 13(2) Printing Department \$150 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In this case, Mr. Chairman, an amount of \$150 was provided under this Item to meet the cost of travelling for

the financial year 1975-76. On the 12th August, 1975, an amount of \$86.10 was spent, leaving a balance of \$63.90. The van is 10 years old and, due to periodic breakdown since the beginning of this financial year, the Driver/Messenger has had to use his car to expedite the delivery of work to certain Departments.
12.30 p.m.

This has resulted in the level of expenditure under this item being overspent, and this amount is to reimburse the driver for the use of the car when the van was broken down. That is as far as Item 3 is concerned.

In the case of Item 8 — maintenance of vehicle and plant, the sum of \$23,630 was provided under this item to meet the cost of insurance and maintenance of the van etc. The position is that when the amount of \$23,630 was voted, expenditure was \$19,012.68 leaving a balance of \$410.00. An amount of \$14,025 was paid to Messrs A. Barnes & Company under the IBM Service Contract leaving a balance of only \$9,500 for other expenditure. The van has been undergoing repairs periodically since May 1975 and is presently undergoing repairs which, is estimated, will cost approximately \$600.00. The running cost of the van, gasoline, oil and servicing to the end of the Financial Year is estimated at \$500.00.

Over and above that certain items of machinery in the printing section including the stitching machine, the cutting machine and printing machine are in need of parts to maintain their maximum efficiency; and these parts are estimated to cost \$6,600. Some of these parts are to be imported from the US.

I beg to move that Head 13(2) Printing Department stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, nobody would try to deny the driver/ messenger or any other member of the staff of the Government Printery the opportunity to receive his just dues in respect of work executed at the Government Printery or for the Government Printery; but we are particularly concerned with the fact that the van in question is said to be 10 years old. Now, if we look at those figures we have got to ask ourselves where has the van been performing during that 10 years period. We must tell ourselves mainly on the highways of the city of Bridgetown and hardly over and beyond there, and one must come to the conclusion that a vehicle subjected

to use on the roads of the City of Bridgetown is a vehicle less than five years old than a vehicle called upon to perform in Belleplaine, Bissex Hill, in St. Phillip and the like. Just doing a little delivery service for the Government Printery, a vehicle 10 years old should not be causing the type of anxiety that we have seen expressed here today.

Can the Minister tell us what it is costing the Government to maintain this particular 10-year-old-vehicle? If he can do that we will see whether or not the Government has given consideration to the fact that a Board of Survey has been found necessary and a request made for a new van should have been made if it was found that the cost of maintaining this vehicle is too cumbersome for the taxpayers.

When we come to the maintenance of vehicle and plant, here again, Mr. Chairman, one has got to be pretty cautious, and more so at a time such as this when you find that not many days ago the same Government Printery has been reported to have undergone some type of explosion. We are happy, if the truth has been told, that no damage was done to any of the machinery. We are also glad that no member of staff has been reported to have suffered any injury; but in asking us to vote money for the Government Printery at this stage, it is only fair and reasonable and just that the Minister should give to this Hon. House some sort of statement as to what exactly has taken place.

If a survey is still being carried out, it will lead us to believe that the damage has been more extensive than newspaper or other reports have led us to believe; but we have to try and relate this explosion or whatever it is took place there with what we have seen took place earlier at one of our Police Stations where you find that no reports of any of these cases have been given. What we are wondering at is that for too long it has been the custom of Government to try to keep the public starved of vital information for what reason I do not know. It cannot be for security purposes.

12.40 p.m.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that this country is in such a state, our security is so threatened that there is an activist in this country at present who has been known to go to the Attorney General of this country and to tell him that he is going to see explosions here, bombings there, fires taking place in Roebuck Street and the like. We are to ask for a denial of the statement I have just made, and we are to ask, if there can be any denial,

exactly what action has the Attorney General or the Government been able to take in a matter of this sort. I am not in a position to say that what took place at either the Black Rock Police Station or at the Government Printery was the work of the activist to whom I referred, but what is very remarkable, Mr. Chairman, is that the activist has been bold enough to say time and time again how he has been let down by the Government party after having given top members of the Democratic Labour Party hundreds upon hundreds upon thousands of dollars. All of these things, Mr. Chairman, are the things that add up and when summed up totally threaten the security and the liberty of the subjects of this state.

We cannot tell the Government how they should run their business, but we believe that in a matter such as the Government Printery and the explosion which has taken place, it is high time that something be done, despite the fact that we know that the Police must be carrying out investigations. But what we are concerned with is that a public enquiry into matters at this stage can put a halt to much that might happen in the future in this particular respect, and it would set the public mind at ease about a lot of things that are known to be taking place in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we would not like under the present circumstances to deny the driver-messenger at the Government Printery what is his just due, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we cannot see how we can be expected to vote a single penny to do anything at the Government Printery at this point in time in the absence of a statement coming forth from the responsible Minister for Government letting us know what has been found out so far, something to allay the fears of the people. This may have taken place at the Government Printery yesterday, but how do we know when it will be this Honourable Chamber in which we stand now. We want something said from the Government benches as to what has taken place. If a stop can be made now by such a statement, if any measure can be taken, we want the Government to act now and not wait until it is too late.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you know I envy the hon. member, and there are not many people I envy. The first thing I envy him for is the amount of time he has at his disposal. I also envy him his flair for the dramatic; but one thing I do not envy him for is his patriotism, because if the hon. member for St. Peter has a fund of such important

information, one would have thought that a person who knows members of the Police Department as a journalist and otherwise as well as he does and has friends amongst members of the Police Force, would take the information to the Police Department so that they can be assisted in their investigation, but he waits until he comes in here and makes a lot of statements which are unsubstantiated.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I also told the House that the Attorney General, not of Bermuda, of Barbados is in possession of the information. He should take action first.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Attorney General is not in here to refute the statements made by the hon. member. I can only deal with what I know, not with hearsay. This is a Resolution dealing with transportation at the Government Printery. The Hon. Leader of the House normally looks after the affairs of the Government Printery. As far as we can understand an explosion or a series of explosions took place at the Government Printery about 1.30 on Saturday morning. Soon after the crack of dawn, at first light as they say in Julius Caesar, the Cabinet Secretary, the Leader of the House, not necessarily at the same time, myself — I did not go with the Leader of the House, and one of the senior superintendents of Public Works went with the police and examined what had taken place. About 130 panes of louvre glass were shattered and there was no damage to any of the equipment inside. The Government chemist came and took away what he thought might assist the police in their investigations, and I personally saw that there was no damage done. I cannot assist the hon. member or the police as to the identity of the persons, if any, who created the explosions, and I can only invite the hon. member since he seems to have so much more information than any of us to try to assist us in some way. He is the man with all the information and he is asking us for information. The only information I can give him is that all the damage took place in one room — in the binding section of the printery. I saw all the machines myself; I examined the machines. There was a wooden table broken up which had some papers on it, but none of the printing and binding equipment. There is some equipment in the binding department which as the hon. member knows rules lines. These are the kind of machines I saw and none of them was damaged; so the hon. member would be pleased to hear that. I do not think he would be displeased. There may be others in his political

organisation who may be displeased, but he personally as a printer of long standing would not like to see machines damaged. That is all the information I have.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, you will understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Prime Minister undoubtedly has sought to impute improper motives, not to me — he would know better — but to other members. (A VOICE: No point of order.) How many Chairmen of Committees are there? Who is in charge?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am in charge and I am saying that there is no point of order. It is as simple as that.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of privilege, the hon. member said he is not saying it of this member, but of other members of his political organisations who would like to see machines damaged.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never said anything like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing imputed in relation to any hon. member in this House. Political parties carry hundreds of people.

Mr. BOLDEN: He said there are others in political organisations. He excluded the hon. member only. That is what he said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said there may be members in other organisations.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member would like more information, but that is all the information I have. (Asides).

Mr. BOLDEN: I would like the hon. member to go further and say what he would like to say. (Asides) Probably I would get a job if you make one tomorrow.

The question that Head 13 — Cabinet Office (2) Printing Department, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.50 p.m.

HEAD 19 — MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS — (1) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Head 19 — Ministry of Communications and Works — (1) General Administration was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 19 (1) stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, before this Head is put to the vote, I notice that this Head seems to continue the street lighting programme which was discontinued in 1973. What I have to say will be very short because it is in the form of an appeal which I am making to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works relative to the constituency which I represent, St. Lucy, and I do not think I would need to convince him of the need for additional street lighting in that area. I have already been in communication with the past Minister on this particular matter, and I hope that when the programme resumes we will be able to get some additional street lighting in the parish of St. Lucy. I am drawing to the attention of the Minister that Greenidges is one large residential area which is without street lights and I am asking him to have some mercy on the people of that area to provide street lighting for them. Also Glendalough which is the district between Josey Hill and Rock Hall. It is a small district but nevertheless I feel, and the residents feel, that they are entitled to street lighting in that area, and I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister will give some serious attention to this and that we will see the results of this attention by the putting in of some street lights in these particular areas.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are glad to see that the Minister of Communications and Works is now sincere enough to let the public know that street lights were disconnected in 1973, and in addition to what was not lighted during the period the Minister must know still that throughout several districts — and I speak moreso of the country districts — many of the lights which ought to have been burning have not been burning for periods in some cases of three, four, five, six and seven weeks at a time. As one would know, Mr. Chairman, it is not always easy for residents in the areas where such a situation obtains to get a message to the Barbados Light and Power Company because of the absence of telephones in the immediate vicinity of some areas. It means therefore, Mr. Chairman, that some of these people although the land is there are still denied the facility that it was intended by this Hon. House should be provided for them, and I am just drawing to the Minister's attention the extent to which those people have suffered.

It has been known that in those areas where street lights seem to have gone off for some length of time that there has been an upsurge of house breaking and petty theft from those residents in those areas. In other words, the thieves take the opportunity of the darkness and go to work on the poor householders. We are asking the Minister now to see to it that routine maintenance, not the type of maintenance that Light and Power would want to make us believe they had been carrying out, but that all these areas be serviced more regularly than they have been in the past, so that if we are to have X number of lights burning in the parish of St. Peter, that those lights with but a few exceptions must be seen to be serving the people of the parish.

I have asked the former Minister of Communications and Works to pay some strict attention to placing a light at the second bend from the top of Benn Hill, St. Peter because it is a point at which several accidents have been known to occur. The police records at District E can bear this out, and we are asking that a light be placed there to see if it could assist the residents of the area and to avoid such incidents to which I have referred.

In the same way, Mr. Chairman, a survey must be carried out of all these parishes to see the needs of the parishes at this particular time. As you know, there are lots of people who own plots of land in areas and would be glad to move and go there, but the absence of facilities such as light and water stop them. If electricity is to be extended, let a survey be carried out and let it be done in a way that people can go and occupy their own lands and save them from renting and living under the types of conditions that they do not wish for themselves, nor would you or I wish for them, but we are asking that the Minister of Communications and Works make a note of it and see what can be done for those people who live at the Castle, St. Peter, that is, Castle Cabbage Walk and Lower Castle near to Diamond Corner. They have been suffering for too long. There are others who are suffering still, but I feel that if the Minister were to give his instructions to do something to relieve the suffering in any area in any respect he could rest off for a while and serve some other parish, because we would wait until he is making the rounds again. That is the way we are trying to deal with the Minister at this stage.

It is known, Mr. Chairman, that this question of street lighting will continue to cause problems because each and every one cannot

and will not be able to be served all at the same time, but if a proper study could be made of the situation we would be able to see whether we could serve at little cost the greatest number of persons on the list of this street lighting programme. I do not want it to be said that any Minister only puts lights where his Party is holding a seat, I do not want to hear that at all, I am looking forward for a service in the parish of St. Peter, a street lighting programme to be carried out in this parish as never seen before. The reason is that the present Minister must realise that the people have been waiting long and that they richly deserve services now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wonder if the Minister could just give us some information in relation to the number of lights which have been disconnected at the moment and a breakdown of the cost of the reconnection of the lights. At the same time if it is the intention to reconnect all lights that are presently not connected.

1.00 p.m.

Is it costing the Government anything to have these lights disconnected at the moment? How much do you spend monthly for keeping them in that condition? If they do not intend to reconnect the lights, could the lights be moved to assist the programmes in other areas?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to answer that question at the moment. I would like to get the information from the hon. member and supply him with a reply at a later date.

The question that Head 19(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 20(3) – Secondary Education – was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the note to this Item is quite clear. There can be no controversies about this.

I beg to move that Item 3A (New) other Personal Allowances in the sum of \$6,360 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are in total agreement that these teachers or others at these various schools, who have to accept additional responsibility, should be compensated for that responsibility in fair measure, but this responsibility arises, Mr. Chairman, out of a bad

system. We have found that the Government has been trying to place too many Secondary Schools together in the parish of St. Michael. That is why you will get this sort of confusion: part of St. Leonard's is in the Farm, and part of the Farm is in St. Leonard's, and so on.

The bad system started in 1962 when the Minister for Education started to encourage children to leave the parish of St. Lucy and come to St. Leonard's School to get the same type of education that they ought to have been able to receive in their own Primary Schools in the parish of St. Lucy. The same thing relates to the parish of St. Peter. At the Garrison Secondary School in St. Michael today you will find children who come from the 18-mile stone at Boscobell, St. Peter, all the way to the Garrison Secondary School to get a little secondary education. There must be teachers at that school who must have some added responsibility resulting from all of this, Mr. Chairman. You and I know that after those children have to rise so early in the morning; board a bus and drive such long distances, when they reach the school they could do with a little sleep before they start to do the school work.

We are not saying that there is no added responsibility, but we are asking the Minister to examine the present system, see how it is working, and stop these children from being driven from the country districts to receive in the parish of St. Michael what they should be able to receive much nearer to their homes. It is a very serious matter, Sir. All of this relates to the millions of dollars that we are spending on education and getting no results. This is one of the reasons why they are getting no results: some of the teachers have too much responsibility which they cannot discharge. The system needs to be examined, and the sooner it is gone into the better it will be for all concerned.

A favourite word of the present Minister of Education is that there is no 'magic' in this. We do not expect him to work magic overnight, but we are asking him to be advised by competent people. I do not want him to be advised by people who have made the supreme sacrifice. We do not want this sort of sacrificial-lamb business any more. We want nation-builders this time to work along with the Minister to give him good advice and let us see how best we can have the system going, so that we will not find these masters and mistresses with this kind of responsibility being attached to them that they cannot really discharge in truth and in fact.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The member has a facility for drawing red herrings across the trail. My entire family walked through Turner Hall woods for 10 years in order to catch a bus. What is catching a bus in the country to go to school in town to do with this Resolution? What is wrong in catching a bus from St. Andrew, or St. Lucy, to come to Harrison College or to the Lodge School?

The question that Head 20(3) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Ministry of Health and Welfare was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as far as Head 22(5) St. Michael's District Hospital is concerned, there are 3 Items to be dealt with. The notes are fairly adequate, but I will give an additional explanation. As far as travelling is concerned, the provision in the 1975-76 Estimates was \$375. At the time of the preparation of the Estimates no account was taken of travelling for two Resident Doctors and the Works Supervisor who, from this year, had to be paid from this Item.
1.10 p.m.

We must have this supplementary vote of \$1,500. As far as Item 6 is concerned, within the last two years the life span of items such as utensils, brooms, and mops has deteriorated considerably. As far as the other item is concerned, that is clear.

I beg to move that Head 22(5) Ministry of Health, St. Michael's District Hospital — stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$131,710 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 8 (CAPITAL)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a Resolution for \$3,180,293. The

first Head is Head 119, Ministry of Communications and Works, Item 7 — Public Transport. I beg to move that Item 7 under Head 119 for the sum of \$230,293 stand part.

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

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Under this item dealing with Public Transport, there are a number of points that I want to make in connection with the transport system in St. Lucy, and generally speaking, in the northern part of Barbados. To say the least, I think that the time has come when the Hon. Minister should give consideration to this matter because it is giving some considerable inconvenience to a number of people who have to rely solely on the system which is provided by public transport, particularly for getting to their jobs and indeed for moving around and getting into Bridgetown and other areas.

If one were for a brief moment to examine something which is in need of very close scrutiny you will see what I mean. I refer to the system of transfer which exists. If my memory serves me correctly, this is about the only area in Barbados where the transfer system exists — the Speightstown area. There you have a situation where a person can take a bus from St. Lucy or from certain parts of St. Peter with the intention of going to Bridgetown; but the bus is not going to Bridgetown, so they have to catch a bus from Speightstown to go to Bridgetown. This system is causing a lot of inconvenience and unnecessary hardships. Some people are called upon to pay two sets of bus fares. Where the transfer system exists, possibly for a passenger to get a transfer ticket to catch a bus to go to Bridgetown the person has got to take another bus and go to the office in Speightstown to get a ticket to get to Bridgetown.

This, Mr. Chairman, is causing a lot of hardship because there are a number of instances particularly when it is raining when you have to go to the office to get this transaction carried out. It is not to say that Barbados is the only country experiencing a problem of this nature. There is a transfer system in other countries where a person who begins his journey on a particular bus has a transfer ticket issued to him immediately.

We should examine this matter in that light and see whether this system of transfer and the problems which result from it cannot be reduced as much as possible. One would expect

that any such system which is introduced would be for the benefit of the people who have to use the system; and I am hoping that the Hon. Minister will have a serious examination of this in order to ease that particular problem.

The other problem which I would make reference to is the fact that I note that some additional chassis are being bought to provide for transportation in Barbados. I would like once more to draw to the attention of the Minister the state of transportation in St. Lucy. There are some areas where after 7.15 p.m. you do not get a bus going into certain parts of St. Lucy. I think that it is time that this matter be investigated because there is a considerable amount of unease about this matter. The reason is that there are people who would like to get transportation going into the parish at a later time, and it is not there. I hope that the Minister will give some serious thought to this so that those people can get additional transportation at a later time.

Next I would refer to the whole system of transportation, generally speaking, within the parish. I think that a lot could be done to update the system. There is a bus which goes to the St. Lucy Parish Church and terminates the journey there except for about two periods in the day when it goes to Pie Corner. It is my contention that the route could be extended to make provision for the bus leaving Speightstown to go into other areas because there are often a number of people who are left stranded when the bus terminates its journey at the St. Lucy Parish Church.

I hope that the Hon. Minister will give careful attention to these points. The first is the question of the transfer system which to my mind and to the mind of a number of people who have to endure this system is a bad one and we feel that a better one could be provided to make it easier for people to benefit from it. I do not consider it fair where a person is making a journey on two tickets and has to pay two sets of bus fares. That should be discontinued.

1.20 p.m.

That to my mind should be discontinued. If a person is living at, say, Hope Road, Crab Hill or Pie Corner and pays one bus fare into Bridgetown, if the journey for that bus terminates at Speightstown, he should be given a transfer ticket to let him go right through, and this should be issued on the bus rather than the person having to get off and pay more bus fare or find an office to get a transfer ticket.

The other point is the provision of more buses at a later time, and the whole idea of looking at the complete transportation system in the parish of St. Lucy with a view to improving it to meet what is really happening in the parish today.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot for a single moment expect that an Hon. Minister looking to face an election not many months from now is going to come and state Government's policy on public transport other than in perhaps his party's manifesto, but we are not concerned with their party's manifesto, Mr. Chairman. We are concerned with the Minister being pressed into service for the benefit of the public on this question of public transport.

Now here we are again, Mr. Chairman, faced with providing the Transport Board which is really now performing only one-fourth of what is now recognised as public transport in this country with \$230,293, but we have got to look for a lot more because the same Transport Board has got to pay the Public Utilities Board something like \$14,000 for the public hearing that has taken place some time recently. They have not paid that bill yet and heaven knows when it will be paid. They could have tacked that \$14,000 on here and let us pay it. You will find that the Rocklyn Bus Company and the Elite Bus Company have got to pay about \$7,000 each for their part of the hearing, plus other expenses; but what we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that since the Government considers that the public must be supplied with public transport, Government should make a comprehensive statement on the transport system and let the taxpayers know whose system must be met through this Honourable Assembly and which system out of the concessionaires' pockets or however, and what must be done with the system as a whole, because I feel that if Government wanted to show the public that they really meant to do something for the public in this matter of public transport, with these 38 chassis that are now to be imported for the Transport Board they could very well consider the plight of the fleet of the Transport Board and weigh it against the plight of the Rocklyn Bus Company and the Elite Bus Company; and surely if the public were told tomorrow that 20 of the chassis would be going to the Transport Board free of cost, and that 12 would be going to the Elite Bus Company at a low cost and giving them 20 years in which to pay, and giving the Rocklyn six of the chassis, instead of giving the Transport Board all 38, they would be satisfied. After all these other bus companies are providing a service and we have got to stop looking at it through cock-eyes as we have been doing in the past.

We have been told, Mr. Chairman, that there are lots of buses belonging to the Transport Board that have not been put into operation for a considerable amount of time. A lot of them have been idle in the yard of the Transport Board. What is the point of bringing in 38 more chassis. You will give them 38 new chassis and they will put 40 of the present ones to lie idle in the yard of the Transport Board. The whole system needs a complete re-examination, and the Transport Board has got to be told that the moneys that are collected by them cannot be spent as they are generally spent. You will find that they have taken a lot of money and put there to equip some training coach or whatever it is. That is nonsense. After they equip this training coach the Chief Personnel Officer is going to come out and admit how unmannerly, ill-behave and uncooperative the same people they are training happen to be. So what nonsense are you doing?

We have got to take into consideration, Mr. Chairman, the part played by the other buses. We cannot close our eyes to it, and I challenge the present Minister or any Minister to touch a single pick-up before elections. I challenge them in any Government policy statement to say or do anything about these pick-ups. They cannot do anything about them. We have also got to acknowledge the part that the Elite Bus Company and the Rocklyn Bus Company have played alongside the Transport Board. Could it be right, reasonable and just that at every turn of the tide the Minister can march to this Honourable Chamber and say he wants money for the Transport Board to pay its bills? The Transport Board is rendering the same service as the Rocklyn, the Elite and the minibuses. Tell us what to look forward to in the future. There is not much future for this Government, but what we must be told, Mr. Chairman, is that we will not be seeing these continual raids on the taxpayers' pockets to satisfy the willy-nilly operations of the Transport Board. There are all sorts of over-heads, big heads, double heads and two-heads. That is the kind of operation they are carrying on, and that is why we have got to come here so often for money to satisfy the operations of the Transport Board. Not a penny has ever been sought to help the Elite; not a penny has ever been sought to help the Rocklyn or the pick-ups. They are all making it on their own.

We are asking the Government to review the matter. Do not go about making any more contracts for any more chassis through the Crown Agents or anybody else. You should be reasonable and just and take transport as a whole and decide what must be done about it, and if

you are going to help one, be honest enough about it and decide you must help all.

1.30 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution raises a very serious problem which will exist between the Transport Board, which is Government owned and Government backed, and the other bus companies, whereby the Transport Board is serving particular areas and the other concessionaires having the remainder of the island. The difficulty which I see here is that the Transport Board can come to Parliament time after time, year after year and get huge loans to increase their fleet while the other companies have not got that facility. I remember some time last year the then Minister of Communications and Works came to the House boasting that the Transport Board was now paying its way but this certainly did not reflect the true position because the Government has had to write off a few sums for the Transport Board.

Mr. Chairman, the problem arising here is that the last Minister of Communications and Works said his policy was not to increase the number of mini buses that were operating on the respective routes. At the moment if you think about many country districts, like St. Joseph, people are constantly complaining of the inadequacy of the service which they are receiving from the concessionaire who is running that route. I believe the concessionaire would like to provide an adequate service, but with the high cost today I am sure he cannot do it and it raises the problem where the Transport Board can get its equipment out of Government as against other concessionaires, but in the meantime those people living in the areas served by other concessionaires are experiencing hardships because of the policy of the Minister not to increase the number of mini buses operating. I must say now that I wrote to the last Minister setting out the complaints of the people of St. Joseph, in particular nurses who work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and who complain that when they come off duty at 8 o'clock there is no bus to take them to St. Joseph, and they have to pay taxis on Sundays. The bus service operates in the morning and in the afternoon and if they are working on the midday shift it is impossible to get to town other than to hire other transport. People complain that in the morning they cannot get enough buses to take them to town. I have had to deal with accident claims where a bus struck a wall and there were so many people in that bus that many of them got hurt because of other passengers of the bus falling on them, but the Minister wrote me back to say that he had carried out an inspection and it did not show

that there was any need for additional transport in the St. Joseph area. Why is it then that people keep complaining? The problem is that the concessionaires cannot increase their fleet to accommodate the travelling public, and on the other hand the Transport Board can satisfy certain areas and increase the buses, and even in those areas the mini buses are still operating.

I think it is time that Government takes a comprehensive look at public transport in this country, it is not good enough to come out and say that the mini buses are conflicting with the other concessionaires. The position as it is now is not a very good one, for every mini bus operator will tell you that the police from the Bridge and Harbour hound them down left, right and centre. I had one case where a man found himself with 16 summonses over a period of a month, and in one case he had five summonses in one day from policemen who charged him with parking. They tell you that it is a bus, that a bus has a permit to run from point A to point B, and the stupid thing about it is they tell you there is to be no parking in Fairchild Street. How can you move from point A to point B and not stop along the way? The Government is at a loss about what to do with the pickups and the only thing I can see now is police harrassment of them in and around Bridgetown. One good thing about it is that the police have not won a case yet because the Government up to now has not brought down regulations to control something which has crept into Barbados over which they have no control, the mini buses.

As far as the Public Utilities Board is concerned, that should be abolished. I have told one of the members that already, I think the Government needs a Commission of Enquiry and I am not talking about the King Commission, nobody knows what is in the report and I do not believe that even Mr. King himself knows what is in the report, but I would hope that the new Minister of Communications and Works would publish the King report in its entirety that everybody could see what has been decided on and what is to be done about the problem of supplying buses to the Transport Board without making some sort of arrangement for the other two bus companies. I understand that the other bus companies have to operate with the fares laid down by the Public Utilities Board, but if you are saying that the Government is giving the school children tickets at a reduced price you have to ask, is the Public Utilities Board fare of 15 cents is a reasonable fare, if not, who is providing for whom?

Those are the questions I would like to see answered. The Government should look at a

policy where if they are supplying buses to the Transport Board they should give the other concessionaires free interest concessions because they are doing a public service, they are taking people down to the Harbour and up to Newton where the Government is subsidising the people who operate in those buildings, so in truth and in fact the Transport Board and the other concessionaires also subsidise those people and I would like to see this Minister create a reasonable system to deal with the mini buses and at least stop the police from hounding them down with the ineffective permits which are issued from up there, because as far as I am concerned they are useless. That is why you have so many mini buses running without permits, and the police cannot convict one of them because there is no law under which to convict them. All of them will run and they cannot stop them no matter how much they say they are stealing from the buses.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman, the entire transport system in Barbados, the very system in which the Government found itself with the buses reflects the type of indecision that has plagued the transport system for the past 20 years. I believe as a person not contesting the next election I can say one or two things that people who will be looking for public support will not be able to say. I will say that despite the pronouncements by people like E.L.C. and his free enterprise theories, it is time that the entire transport system in Barbados is viewed in the same light as the medical services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the water services at the Waterworks Department and any such utility service.

1.40 p.m.

Communication in any system, whether it is communist or free enterprise, is the lifeblood of that system. It is time that Government adopts the attitude and take over all of the buses, and we would not have the type of argument produced by the two gentlemen on the opposite side that the Government will have to subsidise private enterprise. If Government is going to subsidise private enterprise, then take over the whole thing and subsidise it. The only way you can have control over the accounts of any public enterprise, whether subsidised or not, is to have your own accountants doing the job of accounting.

Mr. Chairman, one of the real misfortunes in the transport system is that the poorest people in the community have to pay the most. When you get hucksters moving from St. Lucy and St. Philip into Bridgetown, you cannot expect them to start off with an expense of \$2 before they

sell one lime and expect them to carry the workload of this community before they leave their homes on mornings. You talk about hucksters, but there are girls working in Swan Street who, for some stupid prejudice because they can wear shoes, refuse to get unionised and are working for \$25 a week. They come from St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Philip, from the last part of Christ Church and St. Joseph and they start off with an expense of \$12 a week to go to and from work on an income of \$30 a week! But you get people living in Bank Hall who, to all intents and purposes, are better off. The bus fare is so low in St. Michael that people can afford to travel on the bus eight times in one day. People get on a bus in Fairchild Street and get off at Bay Street. I feel it is time that the people in the urban areas be called upon to subsidise their brothers and sisters in the outlying districts by paying higher bus fares.

This stupidity about a stage is all nonsense in a community the size of Barbados. In London and New York, from St. Philip to Bridgetown would be one stage, and everybody would pay the same price. It is time that you add the total fare structure together and find a medium. If anybody is stupid enough to get on a bus in Fairchild Street and get off at Beckles Road, he should pay 50 cents or walk. They paid 4 cents and the fare went to 10 cents; they paid 10 cents and it went to 15 cents. Our people are not in the habit of walking, and they are not going to walk unless it is absolutely necessary. (*Asides.*) Talking about not coming back, I will be more dangerous when I am not a candidate, my son. I will have more time to devote to the others because I will not have myself to protect. With regard to the hon. member who talks about this Party has no future, he may be right. It does not have much future, but we have all passed. I prefer to live in the hope of the future than in despair of my past.

Mr. Chairman, it is some time now, about twenty years, that the transport system in this country has been in a state of flux, and it is time that those 13 or so angry workers in the transport system be given the same type of security as the people in the Public Works Department, at the Hospital, and at the Waterworks Department. It is time that they be given the type of security in return for the demands made on them. It is time that these people who are saddled with the responsibility of taking people to and from work be repaid by giving them security so that they will not be like drop-outs. It is time that they be fully drafted into the Government's Pension Scheme and become established workers. The only way to do

it is to take over the whole transport system; insert a head in the Estimates for \$X million for transport in the same way as is done for the Hospital and the Waterworks Department. That, Mr. Chairman, is my feelings on this issue.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, before I speak on the substantive motion, I should like to say that when I hear the hon. member for St. Michael South East speak in this House I always listen with rapt attention. Quite a lot of his ideas are progressive ones. There are ideas that some people will shudder at, but there are ones that I think we should pay quite a lot of attention to. Perhaps his freedom of speech, if I may put it that way, is another demonstration of the constricting whole of the political system of members of Parliament. He is quite right to say that members hesitate sometimes to speak their mind because they know that the electorate do not like to hear certain things at a particular time. That is one of the greatest tragedies of the 2-Party system of democracy where one is up for election and one is forced to compromise, because of political expediency, on one's principles. I think the hon. member's speech may be dubbed today as the speech of the liberated parliamentarian. I congratulate him on a very brilliant speech.

I should like to declare an interest in this debate, since I happen in my professional capacity to be the Legal Adviser to two of the bus companies, the private concessionaires, and I think it right that I should make this clear to the House. Obviously, I will abstain from voting on the matter on that ground. I believe, according to the Rules of the House, I should not vote. Let me say that I think the Government has had all the advice it possibly needs on the question of the reorganisation of the transport system in the Island. I think that the Government must now make up its mind as to what progress it will make towards the complete nationalisation of the transport system, or a mixture of the system to accommodate quasi public and private enterprise. 1.50 p.m.

It is unfair to the private concessionaires that they should be asked to continue without having a definite policy statement on this matter. The people who run the private sector of public transport are not people who have been born with even a silver spoon or a brass spoon in their mouths. Invariably they have worked hard and they have in many ways made sacrifices in carrying the private transport system.

I think that the hon. member for St. Michael South East is quite right when he says

that the country as a whole must pay for a proper system of transport within the country. The businessman in the industrial estate in Newton to which the hon. member for St. Joseph referred gets a direct benefit from the transport system to his factory and invariably to his shareholders by the early and regular transportation of his workers to his place of work. Likewise, the doctor who has his clinic in Bridgetown must depend on the transport system invariably to bring his nurse and his patients to him; and if, therefore, he is taxed by this House indirectly to pay towards the cost of this system, in my view there should be no quarrel about that.

I think that this fundamental fact points towards a system of transport which must receive direct subsidies from Parliament, or it must by way of public transport — a quasi public body — or private concessionaires be subsidised by an exemption from taxes in one form or another. That is a decision which Government must make, and in my view, make rather rapidly.

I should like to say that a standard form of bus fares for the whole island was canvassed at two Public Utilities hearings. Part of the difficulty in initiating such a system is because of the lack of adequate provision for intra-parochial transport, and also it is affected by the fact that there are three separate entities at present operating the system. If there were not three separate entities, it would be easier to transfer in between stages, and the people in the urban area would have to carry a higher percentage of the cost of transport rather than the opposite which is happening now where people from the country areas are paying a higher percentage of the cost.

As for the travelling public, I think they need to be educated on one or two things. It is not true that because a person lives, let us say in the Bay Land, which is a shorter journey to Bridgetown than for a person living, let us say, at Weston in St. James, that the cost per mile for the man coming from the Bay Land must of necessity by distance be lower than the cost per mile to the man coming from Weston; because there are so many stops between the Bay Land and town that the wear and tear on the bus may be heavier than in the long distance haul. Any recognised authority will tell you this, and all of these factors have been brought to the attention of the Public Utilities Board.

When you look at the people who operate the mini bus system — and we have them here with us — there must be found some way of integrating the mini bus operation into the

existing system. What has happened is that the mini buses have been allowed to go without any form of control as to scheduled journeys or fares or stops, and on the other hand the concessionaires have this sort of control on them and the system has become chaotic.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the transport system from the time I was a lad and was adopted by people who ran buses; and I remember the days of the penny buses when you used to pay a penny and go as far as you like. Indeed my parents operated in the area where for the first time I got to know of the existence of the hon. member for St. Michael South West; because that was the area we ran; but there was such competition that after a while it was frustrating, as the hon. member for St. Michael South West will tell you. It was frustrating the energy of everybody in the system, and I would hate to think that we would allow the transport system to keep going back to that stage until it becomes chaotic.

I know that the former Minister of Communications and Works was conscious of these factors which have been drawn to his attention and he was minuting the situation quite carefully. I believe that the King Commission reported to him in 1973 or 1974 and that report has been under study. I think that the concessionaires have given their comments on it.

Not everybody is of the same mind as to what should be done, but I would like to see the Government make a decision on it as soon as possible; but in the mean time I still think this House is going to have to subsidise the Transport Board. There is no doubt at all that its fleet is much better today than it was, let us say six years ago; and I wish that there could be some system to help the Elite and Rocklyn bring their fleet to the same standard in terms of engineering efficiency and cleanliness and what not that we get in the public transport system. I hope that the Government will make a determined effort to reach a final decision and that liberated Parliamentarians like the hon. member for St. Michael South East should speak on this issue.

Finally, I think that one cannot ignore the strong plea made by the hon. member for St. Peter on this issue to help the private concessionaires when a final decision on this issue is made. I will soon finish, Sir, but let me talk about pensions for workers. What the hon. member for St. Michael South East said touched a chord which is very responsive to this side of the House. I have heard in four years in Parliament the hon. member for St. Peter

speaking very movingly concerning the plight of the workers at the Transport Board and of the necessity for them to be given security of tenure and to be provided with pensions just like other people who are working in other areas of Government.

I believe that we did pass some regulations in this House giving the Minister power to designate certain people in the Transport Board or categories of workers who should be granted pensions. The Board has been without the funds, but I think that it is about time that the country as a whole be made to pay for the workers in the transport system. They should be no worse off than their counterparts in other aspects of Government and the economic life of this country; and it is rather hard to know in 1975 that they do now have a separate system of pensions other than what they get by way of national insurance.

The evidence of the recent inquiry revealed that as far as private concessionaires are concerned it is in their discretion whether they touch their own pockets to provide some pensions. It is an untenable system for employees who have given so much to the country and who have served the economic necessity of the country as a whole. I am very strong in the belief that there should be a proper system of pensions for the persons within the public transport system of the island.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, politics have a very interesting way of getting involved in issues which more often require a critical analysis and a purposeful evaluation; and the transport system of Barbados is one of the issues of this country in which politics is very intimately entwined; and because of that it is difficult to get any clear and meaningful understanding of the problems and of any proposals put forward by anyone to improve the transport system of this country.

2.00 p.m.

Because of that, it is difficult to get any clear and meaningful understanding of the implications of any proposals put forward by anyone to improve the transport system of this country, because whenever proposals are put forward very often there is an ulterior motive operating to enhance one's position with the voters of this country. Unfortunately I am not one of those people who are particularly interested in enhancing my position in the eyes of the voters. We are a small community and we have certain constraints financially and otherwise, and as the proverbial saying goes, we have to cut

our suit to suit the cloth. Some of the grandiose schemes which operate in other countries, however appealing they may be to the people of this country, cannot apply in Barbados because of the constraints under which this community operates.

I have stated elsewhere that at the moment I am having a complete reappraisal of the transport system, its efficiency, its advantages and disadvantages, its weaknesses and everything. I have also stated that in the total transport system of this country I see a place for minibuses. Where I do differ from other people on this matter is that I do not feel that anybody can just buy a van or buy some lorry and convert it into a minibus and run it. If the minibuses must be permitted to operate in Barbados, their role and place in the whole transport system must be properly regulated and they must operate under similar conditions which are being imposed on the other concessionaires. I think it would be unfair for them to operate otherwise.

In the Transport Board alone there are 800 people who seek employment and the benefits from working there. These people have a family of three dependents per person making it roughly 3,200 who benefit by the Transport Board. This has nothing to do with the other concessionaires. These people pay National Insurance and income tax and I think we would be guilty of an unpardonable breach of faith if we sat down here because of some motivation and allowed the transport system to fall into disruption and decay, throwing away thousands of people who now seek employment with these three concessionaires. I think we have to take a serious note of that.

I am also concerned about the pressures which are put on the people living in the outlying districts because of the high bus fares. We have to look at that very seriously. I have my own views about that. It is not my intention to disclose them at this stage. I am concerned about the whole transport system and before I make a pronouncement on that, I have to look very carefully at the circumstances and conditions which now surround the whole transport system in this country. I would like to remind hon. members that despite the empathy which they seek now to indicate they have for the transport workers and minibus operators and the general public at large, there can be no overnight solution to the transport problem in this country. It has been there for a long time. It may have been patched up, but if we are going to have a long lasting solution to the transport problem in this country, then it takes time to analyse the

situation and to pinpoint the discrepancies and find a solution. I have no overnight solution for that. I have my views on what can be done.

One other thing which I consider can be done is to have a subsidy for the transport system. I am of the view that in a country such as Barbados where large sums of money have been spent on education, where large sums of money have been spent on health, large sums of money can also be spent on transport. It is my view that transport is as much a social measure as education and health. It is only because of the views of many social and political leaders in this country that for a long time too much emphasis has been put on other areas and very little has been put on transport. Transport is equally as important a social amenity in this country as education or health, therefore people must view transport in that light. I know people get uptight when they hear some talk about education because it means something to them; when they hear about health it means something to them, but they are not too concerned about transport; but if the people who now ply the minibuses or run the other buses do not operate tomorrow, Bridgetown would be a ghost town. Many of the children who are so enthusiastic about the facilities being provided for education would not be able to get to school, many people would not be able to get to work; Government would not be able to operate because many Civil Servants would not be able to get to work. I think it is high time therefore that we start ascribing to the transport system and the transport people the importance which is rightly their due and which has been denied them for far too long.

I feel very strongly that we should examine the implications of a free transport system in this country. It would not be free in a sense because we know we pay taxes, but I think we should look at the implications of it because there are many benefits to be derived from such a system. We would have no problem with money missing. Many of the problems which we now have due to the present system will disappear if there is a free transport system in this country, but when we are talking of providing a free transport system we have to think in terms of providing \$10 million. It is not a small sum of money. I am not saying for a moment that it cannot be found. What may be necessary would be to look around for the areas to be taxed so as to create this type of money, or to look for areas where Government can have economies effected and thereby make this money available to help the system. These are some of my views and I will in the very near future, before the end of this year, be able to come in this House and say how I see

the transport system and where I am going to move.

The question that Head 119 – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption

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

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and the first question stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Peter.

QUESTION RE PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE ON VARIOUS SCHOOLS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 22.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,

To ask the Minister of Education, Community Development, Youth Affairs and Sport: What was the per capita expenditure on

Grammar and Comprehensive Schools for the academic school — years 1972–73, 1973–74 and 1974–75 respectively; and what is the estimated per capita expenditure for Grammar and Comprehensive Schools for 1975–76 respectively?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to the question is as follows:

Per capita expenditure in Grammar and Comprehensive Schools was as follows:—

GRAMMAR 1972–73

1972–73	\$617.63
1973–74	735.20
1974–75	835.62

COMPREHENSIVE

1972–73	\$226.26
1973–74	339.93
1974–75	391.27

Projected expenditure for 1975–76 is as follows:

GRAMMAR	\$922.63
COMPREHENSIVE	441.46

The high differential is due for the most part to the greater percentage of graduate staff in the Older Secondary Schools than in the Newer Secondary Schools. In addition, sixth form schools, because of their greater staff-pupil ratio, account for an even higher per capita expenditure.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of Government's decision to do away with these sixth form schools, does the Minister still see that the projection for 1975–76 still obtains?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Minister is not aware of any existing decision to do away with sixth form schools in 1975–76. The academic year for 1975–76 has already started and it would be extreme folly to do away with sixth forms in the midst of an academic year.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Minister really understands or appreciates what is meant by the midst of an academic year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not consider that to be a supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: I now have an opportunity to ask a supplementary. Can the Minister tell us what is Government's policy with regard to

employing retired persons in the older secondary schools for the academic year 1975–76?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The employment of people in the older secondary schools fall under the aegis of the Governing Bodies. The Minister only assumed office on 15th September and the matter raised by the hon. member will receive his serious and detailed consideration.

QUESTION RE DEFECTS IN
SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 30 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,

To ask the Minister of Education, Community Development, Youth Affairs and Sport: Will the Minister cause a survey to be carried out in all Grammar Schools and Comprehensive Schools to ascertain the number of children whose progress is hampered by defective eyesight, defective hearing and the presence of bad teeth in the mouth?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to that question is as follows:

Consideration is being given to the establishment of a School Health Service and any survey will await the establishment of such a service. The existing arrangements for referring pupils to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Health Centres will continue until a well organised School Health Service can be put into operation.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us what progress has been made with the establishing of this school health service? Is it merely at the consideration stage or has it been embarked upon? Whilst the grass is growing the horse is starving.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As a matter of fact some of the aspects of the system have been in operation because there is a dental school system at the moment, but in order that the system should work properly all necessary details and defects are being ironed out and we hope in the new year, perhaps in the new financial year, to organise it in a way that would give maximum benefit to the maximum number of children.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, are we to understand from the Minister that the survey has already been carried out, hence the necessity to create the system to which the Minister is

referring? The question asked if he would carry out a survey to determine the number of children and what not, but in view of the fact that the Minister has now told us that they are establishing the service, getting this in order to run the service, are we to understand that the survey has already been carried out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all teachers have been advised in the course of their teaching to note any child that suffers from any defect in hearing, sight or in any way seems to the teacher to be retarded in learning because of some defect, and they should be referred to the hospital, to the Government Optician as well as to the Dentist if the teacher suspects that there is any defect, and there is absolutely no need at this stage for a survey. It is not as pressing since it is an on-going programme where children can get treatment for defects.

Mr. HINDS: Since the Minister relies so heavily on the teachers to pinpoint these cases, is the Minister aware that teachers in themselves suffer from defective eyesight, defective hearing and have a lot of bad teeth in their mouths? Will the Minister carry out a survey of the teaching staff to determine this?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister state what is Government's policy in relation to those persons who have been found to have defective eyesight, defective hearing and other defects which prevent them from learning? I am not dealing with the physical treatment of these people, what is Government's policy to bring these people back up to standard?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Government's policy is that it is committed to give an education to every child regardless of its handicap, and steps have been taken and will be taken to do this. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member knows that we have a school for the deaf which has just been established, we have a school for the handicapped in St. Thomas, and all areas of defects will be dealt with by my Ministry to see that despite the defects of the child he still can benefit from specialist education. We already have two schools functioning dealing with that.

3.25 p.m.

We have two Schools functioning and dealing with that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps the Minister does not understand the question. I am not dealing with those people who are found to be definite defectives, but

with persons whose defects can be treated and remedied. I am talking about those children who have fallen behind other children and who could have an adequate school life if they were given the necessary training. What programme does the Government have for the immediate training of such children? I am dealing with children in the Primary Schools.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: In several of the existing schools there is a Specialist Teacher who does remedial teaching to those children who are slow learners and who are backward.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 37 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who I do not now see in his seat. I will ask that the reply be laid.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 42 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy who is also not in his seat. I will ask that the reply to that question be laid.

Question No. 9.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay the replies to Questions Nos. 9 and 11.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those questions will be laid. That brings us to the end of Question Time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken to deal with the matter of which the hon. member for the City has given notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 standing in my name be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day.

BARBADOS FIRE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select

Committee on the Barbados Fire Insurance Bill, which has been circulated, be now adopted.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass, and be cited as the Barbados Fire Insurance (Amendment) Act, 1975.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as previously stated by the Leader of the House, this is all the business we propose to do under Private Members' Business today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business do now resume.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76. No. 8

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see, the notes to this Resolution explain in fair detail the purpose for which this \$1 million is required to supplement Head 125, Item 5. It deals primarily in connection with the completion of the National Insurance Building as well as to supplement the vote generally. Of the \$1.15 million voted only \$48,606.47 remains in the vote to date. In other words, over \$1 million has already been spent. It is intended to complete the National Insurance building by putting a rail around the top of the building; by putting a wooden partition in the Conference area to be used as the Labour Department; it will also be used to acquire some lands and to construct a car park for roughly 140 cars. This, Mr. Chairman, is what the Resolution is about.

I move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seeks to justify how he proposes spending the amount of money asked for today, but surely we would not be asking to much of the Minister if we asked him to give us a breakdown on how the money already voted had been spent. If we find that the money already voted has been spent in the way that it ought to have been spent, then we would feel more justified in voting a further sum to be spent on the completion of this building.
3.35 p.m.

We believe that the work must be completed, and it must be completed to the satisfaction of all concerned and more so to the satisfaction of the taxpayers; but we are not 100 per cent happy that the original sum voted was spent to the best advantage at all times. I have on a previous occasion sought to draw to the attention of this Honourable House and to the attention of the Minister that there are contracts that have been awarded with respect to this building that everybody who knows cannot be happy about.

We would just like to satisfy ourselves that the Minister himself is satisfied when he stands before this House and asks that we vote further sums for the completion of this work — that he is satisfied that the money already voted was well spent and that there was nothing that

could cause undue concern to anyone and particularly to members of this Honourable House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member has asked for a breakdown of the expenditure on this item; but in dealing with the breakdown I want to explain to the hon. Member and for the benefit of this Chamber that the National Insurance Building was not financed out of this vote. This is a recurrent vote. The National Insurance Building was financed out of Capital Estimates, but out of this vote some aspects of it had money spent on them.

I would like to give the breakdown. The new National Insurance Building, \$877,163. Maxwellton Service Commissions, \$18,666. Extension of the Training Centre, \$69,235. Government Information Office \$1,890.93. Ministry of Agriculture Extension, \$49,100. Fire escape stairs at Marine House, \$22,150. The old Waterworks building in Coleridge Street, \$56,963. Repairs to Blenheim, \$2,125. Incinerator at Marine House, \$4,000. This makes a total of \$1,101,393.83. That gives the expenditure so far out of this vote.

The National Insurance building was contracted at a price of \$4.367 million. I believe that it was won by contract for that amount of money. There were a number of alterations here and there and the additional amounts that were required to be expended I think were very reasonable – less than \$2,000 for a building that was contracted in 1972 to cost \$4.367 million. Prices have moved since 1972 – prices of materials which include cement and other materials. I think that we have come out of this reasonably well with a price of \$4.556 million. I think quite frankly that we should congratulate ourselves, bearing in mind the price increase of materials as well as the changes that have been made here and there.

The Question that Head 125 – Ministry of Housing, Lands and National Insurance – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 126 – MINISTRY OF TOURISM

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 126 – there are two new items. Under Item 1, Caves Development there is the sum of \$1,200,000.

Under Item 2, Conception Centre at Dover there is the sum of \$750,000.

In the note as circulated Sir, in respect of Cave Development it is very full and contains most of the information. It is proposed to develop Harrison's Cave at Sturges, St. Thomas as a means of protecting valuable natural resources for the benefit of the community and visitors to the island. The project which is expected to cost approximately \$1.8 million will be done in two phases, (1) the developmental work on the more accessible part of the Cave system which is approximately 15 feet long and contains stalactites and stalagmites and (2) lakes, streams and waterfalls.

The infrastructural work includes the construction of an access road, a parking area and an underground tunnel to provide an entrance to the cave. (c) The commencement of construction work which would include a cafeteria, a gift shop and a waiting area, offices and toilet facilities. (d) The purchase of lands required for carrying out the physical development of (b) and (c) etc. Hon. Members have all the notes and I am only giving a little additional information.

Then it goes on to speak of Phase 2 which will be further development etc. This matter has been under consideration by the Cabinet for some time and it was decided that Harrison's Cave should be developed as a tourist attraction among other things.

Negotiations have been entered into with an expert from Denmark, a speleologist, Mr. Ole Sorensen, and he has been engaged as manager/consultant in charge of the project for a period not exceeding five years. Legislation has been passed in order to administer this cave and the Authority has been actually appointed.

The Minister, through the assistance of the Caribbean Conservation Association, secured the services and advice of other experts, Mr. & Mrs. Russell Gurnee from the U.S.A. They investigated the matter and reported favourably to the Government; "the development of the cave is well justified when comparing it with the development of show caves in other countries. When Harrison's Cave is open to the public there will be sufficient cave scenery and display to please the most sophisticated visitor. The proposed development as planned seems to be the most practical method of exhibition, and in Step 1 there should be little damage to the cave environment."

So we would like to extend our appreciation and thanks to the Caribbean Conservation Association for having secured the services of these experts, Mr. & Mrs. Russell Gurnee, who have gone into the matter and have made a report; so that this seems to be a feasible proposition and should be a big tourist attraction and a boost to the Tourist Trade.
3.45 p.m.

This seems to be a feasible proposition and can be a big attraction to boost the tourist trade. There are some photographs which I have and in case any hon. member is interested he can have a look to see what they are like. We are willing to show them around.

With respect to the Convention Centre for the sum of \$750,000, the Convention Centre is the building which was taken over by way of exchange from Cable and Wireless and converted into a centre. It will be equipped to provide two convention rooms with capacities of 140 and 130 persons respectively, three committee rooms, staff rooms etc. This is all set out in the Addendum.

I beg to move that Head 126 – Ministry of Tourism – stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House promised to let us on this side of the House have some photographs. We appreciate this, but bear, in mind, Mr. Chairman, that we on this side of the House would find it extremely difficult at a time such as this to vote in favour of spending this \$1.8 million as the Government proposes spending at this present time. I for myself must say here and now that the people in the parish of St. Peter have long been crying out for housing development there. There are hundreds of working class mothers who live under conditions which I would not like to have to relate to you here again, Mr. Chairman. Their condition is sub-human; that is the best way I can put it.

You will find as well, Mr. Chairman, that many of these working class mothers have nowhere of their own to live where they can house their children properly, and in addition to this when they find a little job somewhere there is no proper place in the parish where they can have their children left and cared for until they return from working. The little provision which the parish can afford is what a few well-meaning people have themselves put

together and made, but it is not sufficient. What we would like to see Government embark upon with this \$1.8 million is to acquire some land and set up low cost housing which could be tenanted for a decent rental to these poor working class people, men and women, and let them have the feeling that they too are part of this society. It cannot be considered that Government is setting its priorities right at a time such as this when we have so many young people throughout the country knocking their heads hither, thither and yon searching for jobs that this Government has failed to produce up to the present.

We would urge, Mr. Chairman, not that Government abandon this project of caves development as such, but that they give consideration to the things that are more meaningful to the working class people of this country at this particular time in their lives. We ask the Government to use this \$1.8 million that might be available to the Government now in a manner which would arrest some of this inflation that is crippling the poor people of this country. We would ask the Government to find ways and means of reaching out to the poor people of this country first with this \$1.8 million rather than invest it to hold out its hands to tourists and others. We welcome the tourists; we welcome any entertainment. We would seek to provide any entertainment for them when we can afford it and at the appropriate time, but there are much more pressing needs to be met for our people in this country at this present time, Mr. Chairman, than the Government seems really to address its mind to.

If I might come nearer home, here in the Farm Housing Scheme there is a lavatory situation where the system is something intolerable. If the Government were to take part of this \$1.8 million and try to make those people in the Farm Housing Scheme to feel comfortable when they use their lavatory and not have the thing flooding back on them and making them experience what they do experience from time to time, we would feel happier. We would find that we could lend support to the Government if it took this \$1.8 million and added some wings to some of the schools in the country districts if it would mean saving these children from having to be subjected to these long distances of busing to which they are subjected day in and day out. We would urge upon the Government that if it embarked right now on any scheme to help the poor workers who have been waiting long, looking long and suffering long, if this \$1.8

million could go any part of the journey in helping to clothe and feed and in some cases save these people from themselves, we would be happy under those circumstances to support the Government.

We have nothing whatsoever against this project except that Government's timing of the spending of this money in our view is bad. We are asking the Government to give consideration to the numerous projects. We are asking the Government to look at Speightstown on a Friday and Saturday morning. Can the Government take this \$1.8 million and make Speightstown look worthy of being a second town in Barbados? It would provide attraction, it would provide commerce and trade, and it would encourage other people who now do business in Bridgetown to expand their business to reach out to Speightstown and cater to the people who now have to journey to Bridgetown and pay high bus fares to do their shopping. There are other areas where Government can give consideration to spending this \$1.8 million and bring in a similar return to what they expect to reap from this tourist venture.

3.55 p.m.

But I say, Mr. Chairman, surely the time will come when we might be able to say that oil rich Barbados can afford this and can afford that. We will spend some of the money from oil, the overthrow from all this is that we should embark upon projects such as this Harrison's Cave and like, but when ever the Government gets its hands on a penny what we want to see it doing is spending the penny so that it reaches down into the pockets of the poor working class people who have been denied all of this for all the time. I need say no more on this, Mr. Chairman, but we on this side of the House cannot support this at this time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a fundamental error creeping into the discussion, and the fundamental error is that this vote under Capital Estimates is a substitute for something else that the Government should be doing somewhere that the Government is not doing. First I want to make the position absolutely clear. We come here sometimes during the month of February or early March in each and every year with the Estimates of Expenditure both on Current Account and on Capital Account, after looking at the whole framework of our Development Plan which includes roads, water and even sewage, all the different Departments of Government, schools, extensions to schools, new schools, prisons, Social Welfare Department and the whole gamut of

Government activity from A down to Z. During the course of the year we come with Supplementary Estimates either for those things which have arisen *ex improviso* which human ingenuity at the time of the formulation of the Development Plan could not foresee, or alternatively as the Minister of Lands and Housing today has done, where the cost have risen on projects which have already been approved by the Legislature, and supplementary sums are needed for their completion. One would have thought that before people even offered themselves as candidates for the Legislator that these fundamental concepts would have been grasped and understood so that when they get on political platforms and pontificate on what the Government is doing or what the Government is not doing, at least they would understand the underlying concepts. *A fortiori*, all the more reason therefore, when a person has been in here for a certain period of time one is astounded to hear an accusation made that the Government, instead of developing the infrastructure of an industry that brought in last year over \$150 — not thousand — but \$150 million into the economy, and I am not a mathematician but this reflects probably less than .00 of 1% of that amount of money which was brought into the economy, to hear that we should be cleaning out the sewage well in the Farm housing district instead of spending the money in this.

When I was a little boy — I want to make no personal references here — but when I hear sewage as against development of one of the few natural resources of Barbados it reminds me of a poem I used to hear at school, that —

Two men looked through prison bars,
one saw mud and the other saw stars
and this is probably the difference between the concepts and the philosophies of the Government and the philosophies of the Opposition parties, whoever they are in this island, because whereas we have some kind of image for Barbados they can only think of cleaning out sewage lines down at the Farm that human excreta flows through, and that is the level of the debate that this country has come to after nearly 10 years of independence and after 350 years of colonisation. I want to say this, that if this is really what is happening in Barbados we as a Government have failed in our duty because we have not uplifted even the legislators far less the man, the humble and meek. That is all I want to say. This is not a question of a substitute activity, instead of building schools we are going to Harrison's, this is a new infrastructural investment in the one gross sector of the economy of the country, both of these things which are needed to further accelerate and generate more income so that we do not have the

poor people any more, for poor people appear to be the power of grace of the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must take issue with the hon. member for St. John on some of the things he has said. I know it is nice economic jargon to talk about the lot of money coming in, the contribution made by tourism and the amount of money that that this is costing, etc., but I think that beyond all of that what the hon. member has said has some truth in it, because we must look in terms of what the man in the street — the Prime Minister does not seem to like the poor man — the man in the street is being deprived of.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member referring to me said I do not like the poor man. I do not like having poor people in Barbados, we are trying to make everybody have a reasonable, comfortable standard of living, therefore we do not want this concept. Everything is poor man, poor man, and renovating the man who is trying to uplift himself, always the poor man, and somebody trying to break in a poor man's house. I heard that in the debate today, Sir. Who breaks in a poor man's house? There is nothing in a poor man's house to steal. They were talking about this when they they were talking about lights in St. Peter. I have never heard of poor people's houses being broken into, maybe we do not have any more poor people. I hope that before I resign from this place we will not have the poor people that appear to be his power of grace, that everybody will be not perhaps affluent, but at least we will have a society where people can walk the streets with self-respect.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Prime Minister does not like the term "poor man", let us call that person the economically deprived person or the dispossessed person of Barbados. When I look at the resolution I must of necessity agree with the member for St. Peter, because whether he talks about spending money under Capital Expenditure or talks about spending money under Current Expenditure, the fact remains that this is money being spent in an area where one would have thought it could be spent in another area where there is greater priority. One must question here the priority of the Government. It is all right to say that tourism is bringing in so much money but nobody knows how much of that money is going back outside. It is not enough merely to say that so many millions of dollars are coming into the country by way of tourism, but how much of it remains in Barbados? I find we are becoming too prone to be tourist oriented, we

think of everything for the tourist and neglect the Barbadian. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I was looking through the Question Book here and I see that on the 4th July, 1972 I had asked the appropriate Minister whether he was mindful of the fact that in the last Session of Parliament a resolution was passed asking for the establishment of a pavilion and social centre within the area of New Orleans, and the answer given at that stage was that the Minister was aware a resolution was passed. This was before the 1971 election. The resolution asked that immediate steps be taken to erect a social centre and pavilion for the use of the residents of the New Orleans area. This is the point, the answer goes on to say "competing demands upon the resources and the time of Government have so far prevented the erection of the facilities referred to." This is where we question Government's priorities, because at one stage they are saying because of completing demands they have no money to build certain things for the benefit, not of the tourists, but of the residents of this country, poor or rich, and we find now that the Government is giving priority to this purely because it is in the nature of a tourist attraction or something like that.

4.05 p.m.

I thought we had passed the stage where we should stop being tourist oriented in the sense that we are doing things for the tourist at the expense of the Barbadian. For this reason I cannot support this Resolution. (*Asides.*) I hear the former Minister of Communications and Works' *sotto voce* remark. Last year when we were asking for lights for certain areas, he was the first person to say that he could not give us the lights because his Ministry did not have the money to provide them. He was always quarrelling when the Prime Minister was not in the House. He is very careful not to make such statements when the Prime Minister is here. He always quarrelled and said that his Ministry could not do this and that because they had no money. He would say: "Look how much money they have given me? They have cut down on my vote!"

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks that I do not speak when the Prime Minister is here. It is insulting, and I am calling on him to withdraw those words.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say that he does not talk when the Prime Minister is here. I said that he makes remarks that he does not have money in his Ministry to do certain things when the Prime Minister is not in the House. I would know better than to say he does not talk when

the Prime Minister is in the House. I have witnessed the hon. member attacking the Prime Minister more violently than any member on this side of the House. The former Minister of Communications and Works would say: "I do not have the money to do this. I would like to do it, but there is no money in the Ministry." Today we are voting money for this sort of thing.

I agree with the hon. member for St. Peter. We are not economic geniuses, but it is a simple matter that if you have a little bit of money to spend you will have to decide how best you are going to spend the money for the benefit of the people of Barbados. For this reason I cannot support this Resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had said that he would support this Resolution, he would have surprised himself and all of us. When one looks at the expenditure of the Government, two things have to be taken into consideration. There are two types of expenditure which a Government must be involved in: one is revenue producing, and the other one is a flat expenditure which incurs recurrent expenditure as you go on. Obviously, if you are spending \$1.2 million on the construction of roads there would be recurrent expenditure and initial expenditure, so that in relating your priorities to the money which you have to spend, you would have to spend the money in avenues which would in themselves create revenue. In the circumstances, you would have money in succeeding years to spend on things like roads, sewage, and other things that the hon. member has been talking about. The type of expenditure at the beginning will encourage you to build up your expenses as time goes on.

Mr. Chairman, members on the opposite side seem to think that being in the Opposition means that you must oppose without having a different view. If we said we were going down the road, they would say that we should not go down we should go up because that would be the opposite direction. It is stupid to come in here and say that we are doing things for the tourists, if we are developing a cave in St. Thomas. What can prevent the local people from enjoying it, too?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member probably did not hear when the Minister was introducing the Resolution, when he said that it would be most sophisticated for the tourists. The Minister who introduced the motion belaboured the point that it would be an attraction for the tourists.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman, visiting caves and places like Welchman Hall, the Flower

Garden in St. Lucy, etc., will not give us fun. There are a few Barbadians like Dr. Gooding who can appreciate the niceties of looking at a flower and telling you that it belongs to a certain species and you should not kill it even if you found it growing on your lawn, but that is not our type of fun. Visitors would come here: pay \$5 to go in Welchman Hall gully; tear off a piece of bark from a tree and put it in their wallets, and feel that they are doing something wonderful. We get our fun on Saturday nights going at Edmonton or somewhere else in order to enjoy ourselves.

After visitors have spent two days in Barbados, seen the limbo, got two or three sea baths, seen the fire-eating, done a little waterskiing, and made a trip on the *Jolly Roger*, they have had it. There is nothing more in entertainment in Barbados. The people who come here from year to year do so because the weather is always good. They get good sea bathing. The political climate is such that they do not have to fear rock-pelting. There is nothing for the visitor to Barbados to enjoy or admire after three days. That is a statement of fact. You go to the Pepperpot on Friday night and see the limbo. If you go to Paradise on Saturday night you will see the same people doing the same thing. Every visitor that has been coming to Barbados for the last 10 years will tell you that he and the limbo dancer are getting old together.

Mr. Chairman, if we need to attract people, we have to create something new, whether it is a Botanical Garden or something else. I am wondering if we will not reach the stage where we will have to talk with the Church, or probably one of the established places in England regarding gambling so long as we can keep the Mafia out of Barbados. There is nothing in Barbados after three days to hold a visitor in this country. If Liat, Calyspo and other airlines could get together, there is sufficient boredom after three days in Barbados for a visitor to want to go somewhere else. Let us say that two North Americans land at Seawell at ten o'clock on Friday night and checked in at a hotel. They go to the Pepperpot on Friday night. What will they do on Saturday? They go to Paradise to see the same limbo dancer, the same belly dancer, the same fire-eater and, probably, the same M.C. They go to the Island Inn on Monday night and see the same thing. They go to the Pepperpot on Tuesday night and see the Merry-men. On Wednesday night they decide to take a rest because they are tired. There is nothing else to do.

4.15 p.m.

So we have got to create an atmosphere to keep them here for their time here. (*Aside:* How

about Baxters Road?) That is after 2 o'clock in the morning. It is all right to talk about priorities. I accept that a sewerage plant in Barbados, and more tenantry roads will be a good thing; but will that hold visitors? You get hotel rooms at \$150 a day. You have to be looking up to pay \$150 a day and by Ash Wednesday the price is \$10 a day.

If you are to bring visitors to the country you have to create the type of activity that will keep them here. It is useless for a man to leave North America with \$500 in his pocket and next day he finds himself with \$400 and he confirms his flight back out. There is a lot of money going back out because there is nothing to spend money on. The visitor drives around the island and that is the end of it. He goes to hotels and night clubs for two nights. He spends some time at the beach. What is there in Barbados after 72 hours for anybody to do or see except, Mr. Chairman, for some young Canadians who come down for the three Ss? They come for sun, sea and sex, not necessarily in that order, but they may get it in that order.

When you get respectable married families coming to Barbados, after three days they can shut up shop. In some of the hotels it is disgraceful that they do not even put television in the rooms to entertain guests at night. If they want entertainment they have to sit around in the Bar or watch belly dancers and drink rum and cokes. They drop to sleep and the barman wakes them up and asks them if they would like another drink. They say no.

A lot of the money that is coming in will go out unless the Government takes a positive stand in keeping visitors entertained when they come to Barbados. Otherwise the money that is spent in promoting tourism is a big joke.

If they can get something in Spain they will go to Spain. Air International have cut fares drastically trying to promote tourism within the whole country. In the USA they are trying to encourage travel within the USA; and if the islands of the Caribbean, including Trinidad and Barbados do not do something to attract visitors, which North Americans do not have they will not be coming to Barbados, and it is as simple as that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the speech of the hon. member to me would have been more worthy if the subject matter was something which one could safely say would be enjoyed by at least 90 per cent of those people who get tourist brochures. I think that you are well aware

that there are many people who travel around the world with certain fears. Some people do not like the dark and some people do not like to go into caves. Some of these are things which tourists do not enjoy.

I would have thought that the Government would have taken a census of the number of tourists who visit the Animal Flower Cave now, and that would give them a fairly good indication of the probable number of people who might go to this Cave. If what I read in the newspaper is right you will know that this is the sort of thing which only people who are interested in stalactites, stalagmites and underground flowers are going to visit. How many Barbadians living in Barbados today have ever visited the Animal Flower Cave?

I am opposed to spending \$1.8 million at this time for a limited number of people; for as long as it comes out of the Ministry of Tourism, it will be something special for special people. It will not be beneficial for 5 per cent of the Barbadians living in this country.

The hon. member who has just sat down made a startling remark. He said that you had better talk to the church people. I wonder if the member is canvassing the development of casinos of the type of those on 47th Street, New York, because it is the church which opposed most violently in the development of 47th Street in New York.

Mr. SPRINGER: I believe that the hon. member would like a little information. One of the foremost countries in the world against any form of gambling was Gibraltar, and one of the most successful casinos in the world is one in Gibraltar; and strangely enough the person in Gibraltar who was most against the casino was willing to admit that run as it is run, it did more for Gibraltar in two years than the church in Gibraltar did.

Mr. BOLDEN: I do not go into casinos. I do not know how to play poker or any of the games. All I would like to say is that this is a very serious matter which I believe would have to be thrown out to the public before the Government embarks on such a project. Let us hope that it will not be like the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake which they say was to do all these things for Barbados and we have never seen any report of what has been done.

To me \$1.8 million would be better spent on the development of roads for the rural areas. The Government Party in its Manifesto of 1966 talked about the development of rural roads. I

would like to see something done in the Scotland area where we have the Soil Conservation Scheme. I do not believe that we at this time are on good ground if we begin to spend \$1.8 million on the development of caves which will be only of interest to a limited number of persons.

4.25 p.m.

I am not going to say that Barbados should not develop its infrastructure. I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down that if you are bringing tourists to Barbados you have to find something to keep them engaged for the fourteen days they are here in order to extract from them as much money as possible, but in that light you should let it be something where you can be sure that at least 60%, 70% or 80% of the tourists will be involved and not a limited few going to look at caves, where the money which will be spent in looking at the caves would hardly pay the interest if one had to compound the interest on the same money which has been spent to develop it. That is how I look at it at this stage. Let us do something which the general public can enjoy; let us do something where everybody will be able to say that this is a worthwhile attraction, because when it comes to specialty projects I do not believe in these at all.

I believe the Government is embarking certainly on an area which is not going to be for the benefit of the entire community. We have already got the underwater park which has been opened in St. James. How many people have enjoyed the underwater park? I will tell you something now. If my people go down there to get on the glass bottomed boat to go out there, they do not want them. It is something which is specially developed for the tourists; so if you are going to spend \$1.8 million, let it be on something which not only the tourists but the natives can enjoy. I would say now that I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South East that if you were going to put down a casino which is Government run and Government controlled where the benefits of it would be coming back into the community, then you could develop it, but.....

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of order, I never said that and I do not want him to be confused that I said that. I never said a casino should be Government run and Government controlled. He said it.

Mr. BOLDEN: The hon. member did not say that. He talked about looking at a casino.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not see anything in the Resolution

about casinos. I did not know there was any proposal to establish a casino, so I do not see how the question of whether it should be Government run or Government controlled or privately run or controlled by the Mafia could ever arise, and I would ask you to ask the hon. member to obey the rules of the House during debate.

Mr. BOLDEN: Nobody is talking about any Resolution for casinos at all. What the hon. member said is that we should have to look at this as something for the tourists, but I said this is something which the public has got to be heard on before it is done. I made the comparison that even if this is what you want to do, it must be so done that the money which you are trying to get out of the pockets of the tourists could be so taken out and controlled that the benefits may be seen in the community, and I compared that with the limited benefits which the development of caves at this time would have in Barbados and the number of persons who would enjoy those benefits. I believe that the \$1.8 million is not being well spent at this stage if you are putting it into tourism. There are old people in this community who would feel better off if they knew they had a little something more. Let us do the roads in your constituency; let us look at some of the tenancies where some of the people live and where it is Government's policy to take over the tenancy roads and give them proper roads and proper lighting. That is what we must show to the tourists so that they can travel all over the place.

Now the Prime Minister himself came in here and read a report about the number of persons using baths, and he said that either 4.3 or 3.4 persons per hour or per day use the baths or something like that. In my opinion it is money badly spent and could have been spent better than in putting up a bath worth \$70,000 for a couple of men to use and no women at all. Whatever you do must be beneficial to the masses of the population and not a few, but once the Minister of Tourism is involved in it, it is going to be something special and not for the benefit of Barbadians.

The Question that Head 126 – Ministry of Tourism – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr.

WEEKES; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. SPRINGER and Hon. A. MORRISON - 9.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN - 3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$3,180,293 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 9

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$83,300 do now pass.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1975

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The purpose of this Order, Sir, is to tidy up certain Establishment matters, without my going into any great deal of detail, and to regularise the position of certain temporary posts which have been temporary for a very long time and place them on the permanent Establishment. The Addendum sets out in fairly great detail, the

posts which are affected, and I do not intend to go through them in any detail, but I should like to point out that in respect of the temporary posts which are now being placed on the Establishment, at a cost of approximately \$936,562, that this money is being spent on an annual basis already and it is a mere formality for the transfer of the persons who are so acting in these temporary posts which have been set out in the Addendum, on a permanent basis.

I therefore beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was with some interest that I read that the new Minister of Health had visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and had made certain comments in relation to the Casualty Department and also in relation to the Dispensary. His comments in relation to the Dispensary coincided with what the Opposition has been saying in here for quite some time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, I would like to know what the personal observations of a member of the House on something he reads in the newspaper has to do with a Civil Establishment Order. This is a serious Ministry that I have to deal with, the establishment of the public sector of this island, it has nothing to do with what he read or whether he feels that a Minister corroborates what he has been feeling and that kind of thing, they can form a mutual admiration society outside quite separate and distinct from their political affiliations if he can get the Minister to agree with him that he should scratch his back and pat him and give him a medal. They could have medals printed or counterfeited like I hear in Trinidad now and give one another medals. This has nothing to do with the Civil Establishment Order. There is too much of this nonsense when serious business has got to be done somebody getting up and saying the Opposition said this and we read that somebody said so and so. What has that got to do with this debate? If you all are not serious let me leave now. I have come in here to transact the people's business, not to get on with any kind of low primer foolishness, I am a very serious person and I have a pile of work of a very serious nature in about 115 files to do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a point of order, Sir, the fact that he has work to do.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has a lot to do with the people's work, the hon. member has no right on his feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members take their seats? The member for the City got up and started to speak; I started to look through the Civil Establishment Order, but I would like him to speak on this Establishment Order, not to break it up into pieces about some Minister, or about the hospital or anything like that, please. May I hear you?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I am to wonder how serious all of us are really now trying to become, because the Prime Minister says he is being serious and what not. You will agree with me that the hon. member for the City has not done anything that is wrong, he is making his contribution to the debate and I will just invite you not to be led astray by the Prime Minister, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member ready to continue? May I hear what he has to say?

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Sir, the Opposition has said quite a long time ago that there was need to look at the system operating at the hospital in relation to the Dispensary, that it could not operate effectively on an 8.00 to 4.00 basis, and therefore there was a need to look at the whole system and to have it revamped. At the time the then Minister did not seem to appreciate what we were saying, but it was heartening to see that as soon as there was a Cabinet reshuffle the new Minister on his visit to the hospital appreciated all that the Opposition has said in relation to this. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Write him a letter and tell him so). If you do not like what I am saying you can put me out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why do you not stop the hon. member from talking to me, Sir? He is interrupting my speech. We have been saying for a long time, Sir, that the.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I cannot take him seriously. If the hon. member was saying that he had been asking the Minister in charge of Establishments to get these temporary people established for a long time and that he is glad to see that I am now doing it he would be in order, but what he read in a newspaper about what the Minister was saying about the

Dispensary does not appear in here at all. That is the point I am making, and he is scrambling around looking for something to say because he feels that in every debate you have to jump up and say something to get a play, to make people understand that you attended the House of Assembly. I will tell the people that you came in here today for a change.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You would have to let the people know that you came for a change, that is why you would want to tell them that I came. The point that I am making, Sir, which relates to the whole Civil Establishment Order, and which I have been saying for a long time, is that the hospital is not going to be run effectively so long as you continue a system whereby the hospital is being run as a Civil Service Department of Government. The time has come when the whole attitude has to change, and for the hospital to function properly it must be removed from being a Department of Government.

4.45 p.m.

That is the point I was making. One of the things the new Minister found when he went there was that because of the 8 to 4 or the 8 to 5 system which operates in the Civil Service it was hampering the effective operation of the dispensary in the hospital.

With regard to Schedule D, I would like to find out from the Prime Minister the position in relation to the Senior Consultants and the Consultants at the Hospital. Is this a new arrangement arrived at between the Government and the Consultants? So far as the Ministry of Education is concerned, for a number of years we have been asking that a Barbadian be sent abroad to be trained as a Football Coach in order to assist the present Football Coach who is partly paid out of the establishment at the moment. I understand that his contract has been extended for a while. He is doing a reasonably good job, but I think we are going to be placed in a position where we have no one suitably trained to carry on his job. We have suggested to the Government that somebody be sent off for training during the interval to take over from the Football Coach when he is ready to leave.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, that is being done, but I do not have to talk for five hours to make a point like that.

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

Order No. 3 was called.

HIRE-PURCHASE, CREDIT-SALE AND HIRE-CONTROL ACT, 1975

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 3 stands in my name. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to confer on the Central Bank of Barbados power to control credit. This Bill does not repeal the hire-purchase legislation. The hire-purchase legislation as it stands, Sir, does not give power to regulate, from time to time, in the way that this present Bill will do. It is in the Revised Laws Chapter 328, and I think I ought to refer to it in amending the law as it then stood in 1959. That Act laid down certain requirements on the purchaser, or buyer, and on the vendor, or seller, which, in our opinion, did not have the kind of regulatory power as the Bill which will now be given its Second Reading contemplates. That one was modelled on the hire-purchase legislation in England, and one of the major provisions of that Act was to stipulate that where goods have been let under a hire-purchase agreement and less than sixty-six and two-thirds of the hire-purchase has been paid, whether in pursuance of a judgement or otherwise, the owner shall not enforce any right to recover possession of the goods unless he had given 21 days' notice. That is the most important aspect, I believe, of the whole legislation.

In this Bill, which is reasonably short, the Central Bank is going to be given power to make an Order with the approval of the Minister to impose such prohibitions and restrictions on consumer-credit as the Central Bank thinks fit. It will also be given power to require information by order, to issue licences, and you will have the usual Sections in relation to offences and what penalties should be recovered. It does not need a long introduction. I will merely say that for a long time we have not been satisfied with the various charges and other impositions which have been introduced into hire-purchase arrangements, either by the discount houses, or what is called traders credit, or by the merchandising houses themselves. The main purpose of this legislation will be to give the Bank power to more clearly specify precisely what interest rates are being paid on the overall; what charges are made, and so on.

If there is a limitation, for instance, of charging interest at, say, 10% or 12% that the merchandising houses or the discount houses do not build it up to 18%, 19%, or 20%, as we feel sometimes is the case in these hire-purchase agreements. They are usually conducted in such an atmosphere that the purchaser is at a disadvantage because he wants the goods and he

does not have the cash money to pay and carry the goods out of the store. The purchasers are usually gullible and willing to enter any kind of arrangement provided that the monthly instalments or periodic payments which they have to make do not appear to be beyond their competence. You start off with a dinette set, the next thing is a television set, and all of these things are running concurrently. They go on for such a long period of time that they may pay two or three or four times the real value of the goods. (*Asides.*)

We do not have to elaborate on that because we know what happens. We know what happens despite the fact that there are provisions which prevent the seller, to use a more accurate term rather than hirer because these terms may become interchangeable, from recovering the goods without giving notice. That still does not protect the person who is buying the goods from being overcharged, or being made to pay exorbitant sums by either the length of the repayment period, or by the actual incidence of the rates which are being charged.

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

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Hon. Prime Minister has forgotten most of the hire-purchase laws, because despite the Act...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, neither when I took my Bar Examination, nor the time when the hon. member took his Bar Examination was there such a subject as hire-purchase law. This was introduced in this Legislature after I was qualified and only a little before he was qualified, but I am positive that he never took any examination in hire-purchase law. You cannot forget what you have never learned.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am glad that the Hon. Prime Minister confesses that he has never studied the Hire Purchase Act.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say that I did not study the Hire Purchase Act because having passed it in this place during the time that I was a member of this place, I had to study it. I said that I never learned Hire Purchase law to become a lawyer.

Mr. BOLDEN: I suppose that he has never studied the Drugs Act either. He is so

inconsistent. He talked about Section 13, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but this Bill cannot touch Section 13 at all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know why the hon. member is talking about Section 13. He is the only member that talks about Section 13. I never said anything about any section in introducing the Bill. I am on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN: What has the hon. member for St. John risen on?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe that it is a point of order. Will you give way?

Mr. BOLDEN: I will give way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not one of those people, Sir, who in order to pursue my profession have to prove that I know more law than anybody else. My results proved it.

Mr. BOLDEN: That is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is introductory. All I am saying is that I never mentioned any Section 13 of the Act in dealing with the existing Hire Purchase legislation. I said that one of the main provisions of that amendment in 1969 was to prevent the repossession of goods without serving notice by the person who was selling the goods. I never mentioned any section at all.

I was in this Chamber, a member of this Chamber when all of the Hire Purchase legislation that has ever been passed in Barbados was introduced, had first, second and third reading, passed this place and the Other Place, was assented to by the Governor and put on the Statute Book. I was here, and I am saying that what we are introducing today is a Bill making provision for the Central Bank to impose terms and conditions on Hire Purchase agreements so that those agreements are not abused, particularly by the people who are selling the goods.

Now what the hon. member finds to take exception to in that I do not understand, because it is a statement of fact. I am not concerned with the old Hire Purchase Act, and I said that this is not replacing the old Act. It is to enable the Central Bank by order published with the approval of the Minister (*Aside*) — the hon. member does not seem to understand what I am saying.

Mr. BOLDEN: The hon. member is making a speech. I hope that when I get up on a point of order I would be able to make a speech during my point of order. What the Prime Minister should tell everybody loud and clear is that what he is seeking to introduce today is what is done by the Board of Trade in England. Wherever you have a Hire Purchase Act which deals with credit sales etc. you give some over-riding authority the right to control the stores in the country as to selling, particularly consumer goods. I know that when this is introduced, the Central Bank will come down...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. If the hon. member does not like the way that I introduced it let him come over here and move the second reading; but until he comes over here he cannot make any introduction on a second reading on a Government Bill. He is only concerned that when I supported the Hire Purchase Act I was protecting the purchasers; and he has spent his whole legal career protecting the vendors and the people who are levying on people's goods and repossessing them.

Mr. BOLDEN: His whole concern is that he does not know where he stands; and his whole concern is that I am not over there because if I was over there I could not say what I am saying now. He would say like he says to the Minister of Communications and Works and all of them "sit down" and I would have to sit down; otherwise I would not be there. That is his whole concern, but he cannot tell me to sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Anyhow, let us get on with the Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am getting on. What will happen under this Bill? As it is done in England and all over the place where you have a Board of Trade, the Board of Trade is able to control credit. You will find here that, come December when the stores advertise no down payment on goods the Central Bank will come in and say that you cannot sell goods on hire purchase or on credit unless one-third or 50 per cent is paid down. This is a method of controlling consumer credit and that is what this Bill is about. Do not let us look into Section 13 and Section 14. If the Government feels that you should not sell motor cars or so many motor cars the Central Bank will make an order that you cannot buy a motor car on hire purchase unless you are able to pay down 30 per cent or 40 per cent or whatever the Governor of the Central Bank deems is a reasonable figure to deter consumers from buying.

It does not affect Section 13(1) or Section 14(1) because these are provisions which have been passed in the law that nobody can recover goods after you have paid two-thirds of the cost unless you go before a Magistrate's Court; and the magistrate has a right to decide whether you take back the goods, whether you take back part of the goods or whether you change the method of payment.

The Prime Minister should not try to produce all of this long lot of talk about when the Hire Purchase Act was passed. I was not here, but anyone who has dealt with Hire Purchase Law would know as well as the world that this was coming when you saw certain indications. I will guarantee you that two months do not pass before the Governor of the Central Bank will not send down an order that you cannot buy your dinette set at Christmas time on one monthly down payment or no down payment because they are going to say that you have to pay 33 1/3 per cent down. This is done in England. They will tell you that you have to pay probably 50 per cent within a certain time. What is going to happen now? You will hear in December that you cannot buy goods on Hire Purchase, and the week before elections the Governor of the Central Bank will say that you can have hire purchase on no down payment. This is usually the priming of the pump before elections. That is what the Prime Minister does not want anybody to say today.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.
5.05 p.m.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in

Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE POLICE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1975.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill state that the Bill would amend the Police Act, Cap. 167 to provide —

(a) for increased penalties;

(b) against the making of false alarms which cause a wasteful use of the time of members of the Police Force; and

(c) for the disposal of articles coming into the possession of the Force in connection with the investigation of a suspected offence.

The position is that the Cabinet has been considering these matters and concluded that legislation should be enacted with provisions similar to Section 5(2) and (3) of the United Kingdom Criminal Law Act, 1967, relating to the offence of public mischief. This draft Bill was accordingly prepared and the provisions with respect to the offence of public mischief is included at Section 12. The penalty for the offence is a fine not exceeding \$2,000 or a term of imprisonment not exceeding 12 months.

Opportunity was also taken to make certain other amendments and to increase certain fines, and provision is made in this regard for a range of fines which would go from \$200 to \$2,000 instead of the current \$10 to \$120. The offences are quite clear. In Section 23(1)(a) for example, for disobeying orders to disperse the present fine is \$25 or one month, and this is increased under this new Act to \$500 or six months. Section 23(2), for disobeying orders to move and keep moving, at present it is \$10 or one month, and under the proposed amendment it will be \$500 or six months. Section 64, for assaulting, obstructing etc. members of the Police in the execution of their duty, it is \$50 at present or six months, and this will now be \$1,000 or twelve months.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, except perhaps in the clause which deals with Section 62A which concerns the question of public mischief, I think this Bill is completely uncalled for. It is repressive in the sense that it has increased fines without any sort of rationale for doing so. When one looks at Section 3, failing to deliver up articles by a policeman in the force, the penalty is increased from \$50 to \$500. I would like to find out from the Minister introducing this Bill how many prosecutions he knows about under this particular section that would cause the Government to increase this penalty. If one could say that this is a section that is constantly being abused by members of the Police Force, then one could see there is need to increase the penalty. Likewise Section 4 which deals with Station Sergeants down absenting themselves from duty, the fine is increased from \$100 to \$1,000. I have never known in the fourteen years I have been practising law of any one case brought against any policeman in the Magistrate's Court for absenting himself from duty. What is the purpose of bringing this legislation at the moment? You may feel that people assault police officers and that may justify a prosecution, but in relation to Clause 2(b), what justification can there be for moving the fine from \$10 to \$500 for failing to move and keep moving? This has nothing to do with a mob or anything like this. If you are standing on a sidewalk and a policeman tells you to move and you do not move, under this you can be fined \$500. I do not see the need for this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can see the reason behind the other clauses and I will tell you the reason now. It is rather clear to anyone who has to deal with the police force at the moment that the morale among the senior police officers is very low. I am not one of those persons who like to get in here and attack people, but I would say that the reason for this is directly attributed to the present Commissioner of Police who is using his position as Commissioner of Police to carry out a vendetta against certain senior police officers because of differences they may have had in the past with him. I think this is wrong and the Government should investigate this position, if not the whole morale of the force is going to break up. It is very low at the moment among the senior police officers and it is entirely due to the attitude of the present Commissioner to these senior officers.

He does not treat them as if they are senior police officers; he is treating them like little school boys, and the Government should take a serious look at the situation at present obtaining in the police force as regards the relationship between the senior officers and the Commissioner of Police. I would not come in here with any brief for senior police officers, but then I happen to operate in the area where I observe police daily and I can see that this is happening because of the attitude of the present Commissioner to his senior police officers. If this continues and if the Government does not do anything at all about it, it is going to permeate right down to the lower ranks of the Police Force, and the whole morale of the police force of this country will be destroyed.

The police in this country have a difficult task to perform; it is no easy task, and it should not be made more difficult by a person from within the very police force and at the top. It is wrong and the Government should seriously look at it.

I should like to take up the Minister also on the question of amending the Police Act further to allow the Police Association to be able to deduct or to keep funds for the legal representation of their own members.
5.15 p.m.

From time to time police are charged before the courts with criminal offences. If it is a matter which can be tried by the Magistrate they can have the services of the Crown Law Office, or if not they can get their own legal representation, in which event they will have to pay for it themselves. In the case of a matter which goes before the Assizes then they have no representation and they have to fend for themselves and the Government will pay perhaps for the representation, but I think that this is a duty which should be removed from the Government. I think the Police Act should be amended to allow the police to hold funds for the purpose of legal representation. People are not afraid to bring cases against Police Officers, some may be justified and some may not be justified, but the point is that the officer should have the right to have counsel of his own choice and should not have to depend on the Crown Law Office for representation, and the only way this could be done is if the Act is amended so that the Police Association would be able to

deduct funds from the members of the Police Force and to hold such funds in trust at a bank so that the funds could be used to pay for legal representation.

On the other aspect of it, I seriously urge upon the Government to take a serious look at what is happening in the Police Force in this country. A lot of senior police officers are afraid to come out and talk because of fear of victimisation. I am not afraid to talk but I know it is happening. I see it happening, I listen to members of the Force, I hear people discussing various things, and I can tell that the morale is low purely because of the attitude of the present Commissioner of Police in this country, and no one man should be allowed to destroy the Police Force in this country. I ask the Government to investigate the relationship existing between the Commissioner of Police and the senior police officers.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Act, like my colleague has said, raises serious doubts about the present state of the Royal Barbados Police Force. If we look at Section 3 of the new Bill which relates to Section 27 of Cap. 167, it raises a serious thought in my mind because Section 27 states that any member of the Force who is dismissed or who resigns or otherwise leaves the Force shall immediately deliver to the Commissioner or the person authorised by regulation for that purpose all articles which have been supplied to him at public expense and which he has not been expressly authorised to keep or use for his private benefit. Why this big fine? Are members of the Police Force leaving and carrying away regulation revolvers? That is what I am asking. Again, a member of the Police Force who absents himself, this heavy fine; a member who assists another one in absenting or resigning from the Force, \$1,000; a member who creates mutiny, etc. \$2,000. All I would say to the Government is this, they never believe anything which comes from this side of the House, but I join with the member for the City in saying there is a serious rift in the Royal Barbados Police Force today. It used to be said that there were two factions, the Bourne faction and the Reid faction, I hear now there is a third faction which has not got a name, and you cannot even discipline members of the Police Force today. This is coming out of the Police Force, it is not good for the country as a whole if the Police Force is divided up into sections.

You hear complaints. If you report P.C. so-and-so he is a Bourne man and the charges cannot get any higher than this place. If you

report P.C. so-and-so he is a Reid man and you will hear if you go any further you will be on disciplinary charges. I am not a Bourne man, a Reid man, or a third faction man, because everybody knows full well that Bolden and the Police Force always operate from opposite ends, but what I am saying for the good of the Police Force as a whole, is the Government should forthwith look into the administration from top to bottom.

Let me tell you of the most recent rumours going around Barbados. A certain high ranking police officer has just gone on pre-retirement leave, and I understand he was called by the senior man and told they were having a party for him. You must have heard of it because you have begun to laugh. The man said he came into the Force without a party and he was going out without a party and that he wanted to tell the senior officer that for the longest time, and if you used to charge policemen for certain statements I am sure it would have made headline reading what the man told the boss man about the party. I was not there, I heard it from another policeman. I understand that he turned up at the party and said "Ladies and Gentlemen, they say they are having a party for me. I do not want to be rude, I came into the Force without a party, I am going out without a party. Goodnight, goodbye, and Mr. So-and-So, you know where to stick your party," and left. I want the Government to go and check the story and tell me if it is right or wrong, because if it is wrong another senior police officer has told a lie. Everybody in Bridgetown knows about it.

There was just a case in court last week involving a Police Inspector and you should hear who forced the case and who did what. Policemen were crucifying policemen, and as I said, the relationship is going to get worse and worse till one morning you will have civil war in Coleridge Street, because one faction will be fighting another faction. That is exactly how it operates today and the Government should take warning at this time. They have held an enquiry into the operation of the Police Force before, it is time they hold another enquiry. You have policemen complaining that they apply for leave and their immediate superiors approve the leave, but the man at the top says "you did not support me when I was down there, no leave." How can you expect to keep the morale of the Force up? Is this the reason why you are amending certain sections which say that if a member of the Royal Barbados Force resigns and leaves before the three month period is up he has to pay a fine of \$1,000? Have you gone back to the days of shanghaing people to work in the

Police Force? There was a time when you used to shanghai people on ships. Is it that the resignations from the Force are so many that you have to increase the penalty to make them stay over the three months or the time when the notice has expired? Have you done this at the hospital or at any other Government Department? Have you done it at the Town Planning Department where members put in their resignations today and get up next morning and tell you they are gone? The Bill stinks from top to bottom, and instead of the Government doing what is right, investigating the Police Force, they are increasing the penalties. Tell me which policeman today will regard himself as a normal human being when he sees something like this which says if he does something and is reported he has to pay a fine of \$1,000 or face 12 months imprisonment or something like that. Every section is punitive.

I am sure this will further drive the morale of the Police Force into the ground, and do not believe that by keeping one man at the top who is in dispute with the others that you will have the others toeing the line, because I have often heard that as long as there is democracy the majority is always right.
5.25 p.m.

You will get prosecutions, you will get witnesses giving all kinds of contrary evidence, and when the man leaves the dock he will be a very bitter man. The Government had better go and look into the Police Force now. With regard to the question of assaulting and obstructing a police officer, how many policemen charge anybody they arrest with assaulting and obstructing a police in the execution of his duty? Do you know what is going to happen? You have young policemen in the Force and when they make an arrest that they cannot justify, the moment they get in the Charge Office the senior police will say: "You really arrested this man for that?" He will then be charged with obstructing, assaulting, and failing to give his name and address. You are going to increase the charges of unlawful arrest and put the public against the police. If a man finds himself charged with an offence in which he is liable to pay \$1,000 and he gets off, then he is going to take revenge. You are not protecting the Police Force in this way. I will say that any magistrate or judge will have to consider carefully and weigh well the evidence before he convicts anybody on charges like these with these penalties.

I say you are not doing any good to the Police Force by this method unless you are thinking of bringing about a Police State and you

do not care who you offend. You will do things because you have the majority. If you still believe in democracy; if you still believe that the Police Force should be a unified body and not a body divided up by the factions: the Reids, the Bournes, the white factions and so on, you should look into what is taking place in the Police Force today instead of amending the law in this manner.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret very much I was not in my seat when this Bill was introduced. I would really have wanted to hear the justification for certain provisions in the Bill, and particularly I would like to speak about the principle of the new Section 62A of this Bill. The new Section 62A seeks to make it an offence for anyone to cause the wasteful employment of any member of the Force by knowingly making to any person a false report tending to—

- (a) show that an offence has been committed; or
- (b) give rise to apprehension for the safety of person or property; or
- (c) show that he has information material to any police inquiry.

It is very unfortunate that it should have been thought necessary to put into the Act a Section such as 62A. Certainly I think the Minister should make available to this House the statistics which show that the Force's time is being wasted by reports that have no foundation in them. I think that what is necessary is that the public should be encouraged to support the Police by giving various vital information which would assist in the early and prompt detection of crime in the Island.

Speaking for myself, in the absence of the statistics to show that there has been an abuse by the public of its duty, I am not satisfied that this provision is necessary. I think that it is apt to have the opposite effect to what is intended. It will cause people to be more than hesitant in calling the police on any matters, or in offering information to the police on any matters of a confidential basis, because they may well be afraid that if the information appears to the police not to have much of a foundation they may be charged under Section 62A.

It is an unfortunate provision to introduce into the law. Parliament, on the other hand, should be educating the public into its duties towards maintaining law and order. I do not believe that this is a sphere in which a penal

section will achieve its object. I was astounded to see it when I read the papers, and I still wait to hear some justification for this provision. I think that the Force has made some progress in breaking down the attitude of the public towards being all Ministers of silence. The members of the Force have gone so far as to set up a Public Relations Section although there is not yet a Public Relations Officer in the Force.

You will remember, Sir, that we appointed the Date Commission in this Island to inquire into the terms and conditions affecting policemen. This occurred some time in the 1960s. One of the recommendations of the Date Commission was that the Police Force should have its own Public Relations Section and an officer responsible directly for Public Relations, because it was necessary that the image of the policeman towards the public should be one of the helpful policeman involved in a very serious duty.

Last year, or earlier this year, the policemen on their own accord had a Police Week, and organised all of the activities in connection with that week in their anxiety to win sympathy from the public. Section 62A will spoil all of that. I am asking the Minister to delete it from this Bill because it is really unnecessary. I will grant to the Government that there are a few sportsmen who will telephone, sometimes even the Fire Service, and make a false report. We have to be satisfied that there will always be a few crackpots. This House has experience the spectacle of some members of the House running from the precincts of the House, having been told that there was a bomb scare. Some other persons like myself, who were silently courageous, remained seated here.

Although I would grant that police time is being wasted, it is a normal run-of-the-mill risk for law-enforcement agencies. In a country like ours where we have so many psychiatric cases walking around the place, it is expected that these things will occur. But some of these people need treatment. Are you going to put them in prison and fine them \$2,000 in circumstances like this? I am happy to say that these incidences are very few. There are not really many incidences of this nature. I think in our anxiety to stamp out an incidence like that — let me state quite clearly that I do not condone that sort of conduct at all by any member of the public — we are going too far, and we are using a sledge-hammer in order to kill a tiny fly. It is completely unnecessary.

When it comes to the other Sections of the Bill, particularly those Sections which increase

penalties against policemen in some instances, I must ask the Minister to give an assurance that the Police Association have been consulted in relation to these Sections of the Bill which affect them as an Association. I say this because I have had the privilege of advising the Police Association for several years, and I am deeply conscious of the fact that if it is one thing they do it is to stick rather rigidly to the rules and principles of law which govern the operation of that body.

The Police Association have never tried to be a trade union as such. Their rights of association are limited in this respect. They cannot strike; they cannot agitate in that way. When I say they cannot strike, they can do so physically but legally they cannot. Therefore, I think it is incumbent on the Government whenever it is amending the laws affecting the rights of the policemen as such as an individual that there should be a maximum of consultation with this organisation before legislation of this nature is brought to the House.

5.35 p.m.

The House should be given the assurance that the Association has seen this amendment and has no objections to it, or has expressed its objections and that its representations have been taken into account. I would hate to think that the purpose behind this is to increase fines because we are talking simply about the falling value of money and we have to pick the Police Act of 1961 as the first Act in which to make this change.

I can understand the Government wanting to update the monetary value of the unit of fines for all of the legislation. I think that when it is doing so it should look at the implications of doing this, and in the case of this legislation the Police do deserve the maximum of consultation on matters such as these, particularly the penalties which affect policemen in the discharge of their duties, if he is charged with an offence as a policeman, or if he is leaving the Force or if he has left the Force and has in his possession matters belonging to the Force. Those are two sections of the Act on which the Association should be consulted.

I hope that the Minister will give us an assurance. If the Government has not consulted the Association then I will suggest that at some stage the Leader of the House invites the House to report progress and ask for leave to sit again on this Bill some time in the future when we have satisfied ourselves that we have heard the views of that Association on this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. FORDE: I wonder if the Minister would pay us the courtesy of enlightening us on a point of order or a point of explanation, if he likes, on these matters, unless he wants me to talk on every Clause of the Bill in Committee this evening.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I agree with the hon. member that consultation should be made with the Police Association. On that score, as I am not too certain — I have not seen it on the file here — I would agree that further consideration of this Bill be postponed; because I too feel that the Police Association should be consulted on a matter which directly affects their day to day operations.

I beg to move that further consideration be postponed at this stage.

Mr. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FREE HILL, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 5. This stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands, and it is a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Free Hill, St. Michael for Housing Development.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to acquire approximately 600,000 square foot of land in Free Hill, St. Michael. The purpose of the acquisition is to provide house spots for people, house spots using the Town Planner's standards for spots, that is roughly 2,400 square feet. The old Board of Health standard was 1,800 square feet.

The National Housing Corporation has been flooded over a period of time with applications for house spots. There is not much available land in and around the St. Michael areas for the purpose of the resiting of houses. This area at Free Hill is one of the areas identified by the Town Planner at the time, Mr. Peter Stevens and an advisor from the United Nations as a suitable area for the resiting of houses.

We have not concluded negotiations with the owners because there are several owners and it

will be easily understood that when lands are in small parcels negotiations are much more difficult. So we have not been able to conclude the negotiations; and relative to some of the lands of course the title is defective. So the intention of course is to cure this and give the Government a proper title to the lands. We are therefore seeking the approval of Parliament by using the compulsory provisions of the Land Acquisition Act. This does not mean that we are not going to negotiate with the owners of the property. We will still have to do it even when we successfully conclude our negotiations, because as I said just now, this is for the purpose of giving the Government a good and marketable title.

We have done a layout of the area. We have been able to sub-divide the lands that we are acquiring and one will provide 67 house spots. We will provide those house spots there and we will also provide an area for a small playing field as well as a small bit for terraced housing on the University Drive. This is part of what we are doing for Housing in St. Michael and Barbados. Another area on which we are working is Clapham, and as soon as we get outline plans from the Land Surveyor we will have to come to this Chamber again with a Resolution for this acquisition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I am right in saying that there are some houses presently on some of these spots. I would like to know from the Minister what plans have they got in respect of these people who are presently tenants. There is also the question of some people doing a considerable amount of cultivation of kitchen gardens. A lot of kitchen gardening has been going on in this area as well.
5.45 p.m.

I should mention that there is considerable development on the lands of Mary Jackman who has been planting cotton, and I would like to hear what plans the Minister has for getting over all this.

Now the Minister tells us that negotiations have not been altogether completed with the various owners, and this he says is due to the fact that there are numerous owners and consequently the difficulty in concluding this matter. I made mention of the Jackman family

and I would like to hear from the Minister if Government has been able up to the point to get the feeling of all these owners as to their readiness or willingness to dispose of these lands. You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is quite all right for Government's plans to be put into effect, that is, they decide that this is wanted for housing development or whatever one may decide, but nevertheless there is still resting within the bosoms of the present owners a certain feeling in respect of this property that the Government wants to take over, and we would like to satisfy ourselves that this is the case where all the people, or, perhaps we might even say, a majority of the people have decided that they would willingly dispose of this land to the Government. We might even ask the Minister to tell us exactly what attracted Government's attention to this particular area for development, not necessarily the survey by Mr. Stevens and others. Is it a case where these lands were undeveloped or underdeveloped, or is it a case where the owners were not able to put them into use or do something about them on their own behalf, and Government is trying to point out to these owners how best these lands can be developed or something of the sort, and acquire the same for housing as the Minister tried to tell us?

We understood the Minister to say that there is going to be some terrace housing along the University Drive. We believe this would cover some specific area along this Drive and not perhaps what we might refer to as the innermost or backlands in respect thereof. I do not know if the Minister would have a plot to show us the whole area, and he ought to be in a position to tell us in the case of Brandford Bynoe's 23,950 square feet where it is located, and we can learn from the Minister the kind of price he is offering these people for their land, because we on this side, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would not want to sit here and agree, and we do not believe the Government would want to take over these lands from these people without having decided on adequate compensation for the land. We hope that it will be adequate but we would still like to hear what per square foot has been agreed upon, because some of the persons must have agreed and ought to know by now what to expect in respect of their land that these people have decided should be acquired for Government use.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to say for the second time that I have to declare my interest to the House, because I am working for the family of one of the persons involved in this exercise, I think of the 600,000

square feet of land being acquired almost 290,000 odd square feet belong to one person, and therefore I am going to ask your permission to note my abstention on this Resolution. I do not believe when I have an interest in a matter that I should seek to influence in one way or another the vote of the House on the matter, and I will ask leave at the appropriate time for the Clerk to note specifically that I am abstaining from the vote for this Resolution.

I would just like to talk on the principle of acquisition. Your Honour would have been aware that I have previously in speaking on such Resolutions urged the Government to give serious consideration to exchanging areas of land with small land owners whose small bits of land are being compulsorily acquired. Many land owners do not wish compensation for a particular piece of land; they would prefer that they be given an alternative lot with as good facilities as they have on their land or in many instances better facilities if possible. Some people are not able to purchase alternative lands and in these instances where we are dealing with the small land owner, I think Government should be chary to follow the advice even of a town planner such as Mr. Stevens or Mr. Dyer without taking into consideration the over-all position of those persons who are losing their areas of land.

The Jackman family are not a rich family by any means and this area of land that they are giving up is not the first area of land that Government has acquired compulsorily from them. They have been most unfortunate in losing some of their best hillside land in this same area by means of compulsory acquisition. They were paid what I considered at the time a very scandalous price for it, and later some of their lands was passed over to a private company who developed Paradise Heights and made substantial profits on it. Now I am very disturbed. Although in this instance the Minister says he intends to use this for the National Housing Corporation, I am very disturbed with the principle of acquisition of lands from one person for a public purpose and private developers intercede in between and get the benefit of any increase in the value of that land.

Now this acquisition of the Paradise Heights area was not done originally by the Democratic Labour Party Government. I believe the acquisition was done during the period with Mr. Mapp who was in charge of Ministry of Housing, but he did not last out any longer in this House to see the thing through, and it was

taken over by another Minister, and subsequently a company formed a local shareholding interest, but essentially Jamaican did the Paradise Heights for Government, and the Morris family, the Jackman family and various persons found this area of land was subsequently passed over, and it is a beautiful development. I am not saying it is not a good development, but the value of the land, the sweets in it have been, shared not by the original land owners, but by other persons; and I am counselling Government very seriously if it has done an acquisition in good faith for public purposes but finds later that a private developer must come in who is making a profit in such instances, that it does one of two things: that it either offers the original owners a return of the land and allow the two private parties to negotiate a price, or alternatively, it insists that any portion of the profit must be passed on to the private owner who has had the land for a long period of time.

5.55 p.m.

This should be so particularly when we are dealing with small holders. I am sorry to hear that the Minister thinks that there are no more large areas of land suitable for this type of development in the Free Hill area. I would have thought that we could have done the same thing with house spots by way of an extension of the Husbands development which is not too far from Free Hill, and Government owns considerable areas at Husbands. There is still a lot of land at Husbands which is completely undeveloped, and it seems a pity that they must resort to taking away the odd thousands of square feet from A, B and C in order to accomplish this purpose, and I am wondering whether it is too late for the Minister to ask his advisers — he is obviously relying on his advisers on this point — to look around and see what he can do in order to answer this need. The area is within the Minister's constituency and he is sagacious enough to know that a vote lost in that area is one of his votes. I know what I am talking about. He is sagacious enough to know that in this instance he may be cutting off his nose to spoil his face.

The other thing I would like to say to him is that we are not afraid of a substandard development in this area because it is the Minister's constituency and I am quite sure that there would be proper roads and water facilities put in, so I am not making any speech on this but I am seriously drawing to his attention the difficulty which the man with 5,000 sq.ft. 7,000 sq.ft., or 8,000 sq.ft. experiences when he has to give up areas of land, and it is unfortunate that with this particular family almost all of the land

that has come down to them from their great-grandparents has been taken over by the Government. Recently in the very Black Rock area, an area was taken over for the new housing development. They lost part of the Free Hill area and now they have had only this. It is very unfortunate, I think they have a strong case against compulsory acquisition. They do not even have any of the paternal lands left down through the centuries to the family and I am asking the Minister to really think of this, Sir, and try to see whether he could give some consideration to that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not so sure the hon. member for Christ Church West is right, because under the Land Acquisition Act if the Government acquires a certain portion of land and fails to use it for Government purposes it is supposed to hand over to the former owner or offer it back first to the former owner rather than negotiate any price for it or allow anybody to make any extra money on it, so I am not sure that he is right on that, especially with Paradise Heights. I do not think Government did have any hand in Paradise Heights, but if they did and were not using it automatically they would have under the Act to offer back to the former owners the first option of purchase. I am pretty sure about that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, certain questions were asked of me and I believe that answers are expected to those questions. I would like to pick up from where the hon. member for St. Michael South West has just left off. He has drawn attention to the provision of the Land Acquisition Act which requires the return to the previous owners of land which was acquired for Government purposes and no longer wanted for such purposes. This is certainly so in the case with Paradise Heights, because Paradise Heights was always wanted for the purpose it was acquired, not only wanted but had been used and is still being used for the purpose for which it was acquired.

This Government did not acquire, as far as I know, any lands from the Jackmans to construct Paradise Heights, except a small area of land to build the road called University Drive. We acquired Clarendon from the Morrisises and we also acquired some land from the Morrisises to build University Drive, so this acquisition from the Jackmans may have been done by a previous Government. It may have been done in the time of the Government which all the hon. members on the other side belong to, I do not know, but if it had been done by them, in any event it was done for the purpose of providing a housing development, and Paradise Heights is part of the

Cave Hill development, it forms part of the Cave Hill Master Plan, and the purpose of it was to provide housing, which purpose it now serves. It is not a question that it was no longer being used for the purpose for which it was acquired, and the Government entered into an agreement with the Jamaica Company in order to facilitate the purpose for which it was acquired in the first place, which is for housing development, and the Government only entered into an arrangement with that company and controlled the price of the houses.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, will the Minister let us know whether the land was first vested in the Jamaica Company? That is what I want to know.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is being called a Jamaica Company, I would not be surprised if the hon. member has shares in the company.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, I do not have any shares in the company, there is no company in which I have shares that I would not make a declaration on.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: To be very serious, I want to make this clear because I believe the hon. member has some kind of association with that Barbadian now resident in Jamaica. I do not intend it to be in any way derisory of the hon. member, but the point is that it was passed over to the company and controlled by the Urban Development Corporation at all times.

This is the chain of events as they occurred. I believe the Government acquired the land some time ago, from whom I do not know, but as I said earlier this Government did not acquire these lands from any Jackmans; the Government then took those lands and vested them in the Urban Development Corporation for housing and related purposes. That was the purpose for which the land was acquired. We found that it was easier for the Urban Development Corporation, which operates under an Act of Parliament and at that time was controlled by that Act of Parliament, and under the terms of the Act the UDC passed the land over to this particular company to develop, and controlled the development known as Paradise Heights, so in point of fact this was part of the UDC development.

The same thing was done, Sir, with the Husbands development. The Government acquired the land in the Husbands area as part of the total area for the Urban development of Cave Hill, passed some of the lands over to the Commonwealth Development Corporation, which

again is a private company, about 32 acres of land and on which over 200 houses have been built in the Husbands area, and for that very purpose, and it controlled the development, it controlled the selling price of the houses.

That is the history of the acquisition of the lands at Paradise Heights or at Husbands to which reference has been made.

I have been asked by the hon. member for St. Peter what is the position of the persons living on the area.
6.05 p.m.

There are tenants on the area. Some of the lands in Free Hill are owner-occupied, and some of the lands are tenanted to others. Those lands, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that are owner-occupied, it is not Government's intention to acquire. Now, this answers that question. It is not Government's intention to acquire those lands that are occupied by the owners.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is reason we are asking if the Minister has a plot, he should let us see it. In the case of the Jackman's lands those lands are owner-occupied. We would like to see the plot so that we can follow what the Minister is trying to tell us. He is trying; he is not succeeding.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The hon. member can believe what he cares to believe. It is a matter for him. I have no intention of convincing him or anybody else what to believe. I do not want to control anybody's mind. What I am saying is that we are not acquiring any lands that are owner-occupied.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of information. I am very stupid. What is the meaning of owner-occupied? I would like the Minister to explain in Barbadian language what that means. I cannot think of it from the point of view of legal terminology.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you protect me from the interruptions of hon. members on the other side!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Every hon. member has the right to rise on a point of order. (*Asides.*) I am to determine that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not lose your temper.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I owned 500 acres of land and my house is place on the extreme north-east corner of the land, am I not the owner occupying the whole 500 acres? I want to know the meaning of owner-occupied.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have made your point.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Minister have the map or plot that he can show us? We would like to follow him when we have the map.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that.....

Mr. HINDS: There will be no question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have asked the Minister to let us see a plan of the area.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have asked. Has the Minister produced one? Can I make him produce one? I have looked around, and the Minister is not on his feet.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am finished with that because you have allowed all sorts of foolish questions from the other side.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had no intention of getting involved in this matter because I do not know anything about the area. I am a country boy.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I do not know what he is speaking on!

Mr. BOLDEN: The hon. member said that he was finished with that. If he is finished, why can't I say what I have to say?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I introduced the motion; it was seconded; the hon. member for St. Peter spoke; the hon. member for Christ Church West spoke; the hon. member for St. Michael South spoke; I waited until you were going to put the question, and I rose and made my final reply. According to the Orders of this Chamber, nobody else can speak after I have made my final reply, and I am finished.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister knows that I am aware of that, but the members rose on a point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can I rise?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What are you rising on?

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I hear your point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We on this side always like to co-operate with the Government when it comes to.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make the point of order, please.

Mr. BOLDEN: This is an introduction. Are you telling me that I cannot make an introduction now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to speak in a proper tone, and do not shout at the Chair!

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is an introductory. (*Asides.*) You could not hear the Prime Minister earlier today. We on this side like to co-operate with the Government particularly when it comes to housing. I remember very well that, when we were dealing with the lease of some land next to the National Stadium, we asked for the production of the plans and full details of the land involved. We did not get the plans. It was discovered later that the Government, led by the same Minister, had no authority whatsoever to create a lease on the land. The land had already been vested in the Stadium Authority. Today we are faced with the same problem. We have another problem with land at Silver Hill and along the Maxwell Coast Road.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not finished yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am still on the introduction.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no introduction!

Mr. BOLDEN: There was an introduction for the hon. member for St. John, and there should be one for everybody else. I do not believe in the policy that the member for St. John is different from me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take your seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: I will take my seat. That is why they put Speakers like you in the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member is questioning the authority of the Chair, I am quite willing to test it out with him, right now!

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not test out anything with the hon. member. If you made one ruling in respect of the Prime Minister, and another ruling in respect of the hon. member for St. Joseph, then.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member questioning a ruling I have made?

Mr. HINDS: I will never do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that my abstention be noted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That was noted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item is Item No. 6, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Litchfield, Station Hill, St. Peter.

PROPOSED COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LITCHFIELD, ST. PETER

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the intention of Government to set up a Health Centre complex at Litchfield in the parish of St. Peter. Litchfield is comprised of over 100,000 square feet of land. It is situated, let us say, at the foot of Station Hill occupying an area which was formerly the resident of the Parochial Medical Officer for that parish. As I have said, the medical complex will be set up there, including the removal of the Sanitation Authority for the northern area to Litchfield.
6.15 p.m.

So, here again this land is being acquired, and I move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we welcome in St. Peter if at any time the Government intends to carry out any sort of development for the benefit of the people of the parish and the island generally and we on this side of the House would welcome the Government with open arms.

We are not objecting to Free Hill as such, but there is something wrong with the Free Hill business. It is being too free.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Hon. Minister has the right of reply.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are sincerely hoping that the provisions of the Order for the Housing and Health development of the area will be put into operation as soon as possible. We do hope that this land will not be acquired and just allowed to lay fallow, so to speak, for any length of time. We would like to know when something will be done about it. (*Aside: What about survey plans? You want the plans for this too?*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members of the Government Bench will please.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as the lands that are now being acquired are concerned, the owners can be numbered on almost all of the fingers of one hand. I have travelled through this area back and forth and there is no necessity in a case like this to ask for a plan of the area. If the Minister had any architectural drawings of the type of development to be carried out at the site we would welcome them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have said that members of the Government Bench should not make so much noise.

Mr. HINDS: Members of the Government are making fun. For many years we have been asking the Government to do something, and we are glad to see that at last the Government is carrying out some sort of development for the benefit of the parish of St. Peter.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE VESTING OF LANDS IN THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the vesting of land in the Industrial Development Corporation at the Harbour Industrial Park, at Newton and at Seawell, which the IDC will in turn lease to industrialists. We have found a better arrangement by which if we were to vest this property in the IDC, the IDC could have a clear hand in determining what kind of lease should be granted to industrialists and on what terms.

Now, there are several industrialists who want to lease lands, but the IDC itself is a lessee which cannot give a lease for what it does not possess. We feel that it would be better if these lands were vested in the corporation itself — they are already under the control of the IDC — so that the IDC can lease these lands to the industrialists who have filed applications for the purpose.

I move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to talk about principles which I believe should be added to this type of Resolution. I am not satisfied that when we are vesting lands in some of the public corporations such as the Agricultural Development Corporation and the Industrial Development Corporation that Parliament is placing sufficient safeguards on these corporations so that the public interest is well protected.

I have in this House already made mention of the fact that if the Crown wishes to effect a lease of any lands vested in the Crown, the Crown has to come back to this House for the House's approval. If the Crown wishes to sell one square foot of the land belonging to the people of Barbados the Cabinet has to bring a Resolution before this House seeking the approval of the Legislature before the sale can take place or a lease.

On the other hand, the law is such that quasi public bodies which derived their authority from this House, and this House only can take public property which we have entrusted to them by Resolution of this House and sell it without even giving notice to

anybody in this House. I want it to be noted carefully because the principle is wrong and I cannot see how a body which is subordinate to this House and to the Cabinet of Barbados should have more power in relation to public property than the Government has. I want the Minister's assurance on this matter that every lease granted by the IDC is going to be laid on the Table of this House at least for the information of this House and be subject to at least a negative Resolution of this House.

6.25 p.m.

I want a further undertaking from them. I want an undertaking that the Minister as Minister in charge of lands will ensure that in future the Agricultural Development Corporation will not sell off a piece of public property without getting approval of the elected representatives in this House. I feel very strongly about the selling off of land at Graeme Hall to a private company of developers, and it is one of those issues I have raised on a matter of principle. How could the Agricultural Development Corporation without getting parliamentary approval dispose of public property by private treaty to a company owned by various people? I mentioned two of the names, Mr. Moses from Swan Street and Mr. Bernstein, top officers in the Democratic Labour Party. I understand that the other day Mr. Moses and Mr. Bernstein contributed \$135,000 easily at Culloden Farm in the interest of the coming elections. I can understand that. I do not mind them doing this because they must support somebody, but what bothers me is where a subordinate body can dispose of public property and the Government cannot find time to put controls on that. I have already said things must not only be right, they must appear to the people to be right. Unless I get an assurance from the Minister that there will be no disposal of public property by public corporations without parliamentary consent, I am voting against this Resolution on principle just as I abstained from the other one on principle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these statutory boards must understand they are not masters. I was elected in here like the hon. member for St. John, the hon. member for St. Michael North West or any other hon. member, and I believe that my view represents as many votes in the country as any of the other hon. members on issues of this sort. I happen to be among the biggest taxpayers in the country, and I am not satisfied to be paying taxes to have junior corporations do as they like and use some hiatus in the law as a means of getting around public property. Public property is trust property and I do not mind if the price is fair value, members

should have a say in Parliament about it, and the Minister must give me an assurance today or he has my vote against him on this point. I give the undertaking to the House that I am going seriously to formulate a private Bill which I hope the Government will join in to put a limitation on the powers of Statutory Boards to dispose of land as they feel like. It does not matter how much you belong to any political party, even if it was somebody belonging to the Labour Party, because we always will have in each political party people who see the party as a way of feathering their own nest, and a lot of them who are today with the Government will jump over to this side and be tomorrow with us saying they are supporting the public interest; but all of them have some very narrow interests, and it is those I am scared of because they can worm their way in and subvert the true national interest. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying that the transaction was not done above board. There was an advertisement. It is the principle of the thing I am against, because it leads to malicious thought, and I am not impugning the integrity of the two men in doing the transaction in their company. I want to make this straight. I am not alleging that any Minister got any money out of any transaction or anything of the sort. If I knew of that I would say so in the House; so I do not want anybody to think I am touching on this. I think it is wrong that private corporations can by-pass the Minister. The Industrial Development Corporation can sell piece of the 26 acres at Seawell and need not get the Minister's approval. How can that be right? They are bigger than the Minister, they are bigger than the Cabinet, they are bigger than Parliament. We must change that law; it is wrong.

When I am dealing with public property I am very anxious to make sure that nobody can even look at me and tell me that I took a cent belonging to the Government.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to reply but I am waiting for other members to make their contribution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It does not seem as if any other hon. member wishes to speak; so you have the right to do so.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot and I will not give the assurances the hon. member has asked for, for the simple reason that there is only one Government Corporation that I control. I have no control over the Agricultural Development Corporation, the

Industrial Development Corporation or any other Corporation except the National Housing Corporation, and that corporation has been set up to sell land and houses to people; and I have absolutely no intention — and I want to make this quite clear now — of coming to this House whenever the National Housing Corporation, the only corporation which has been set up by law and which has the power to dispose of land, has land to sell. Any other corporation that sells land in Barbados is doing it because it has been given that power by this Legislature. They are not doing it outside of the powers vested in them by Parliament.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, I wish the Minister would argue on the point. The point I have asked the Minister to deal with is whether it is the Government's policy to continue to have on the Statute Book legislation which permits statutory bodies to have the right to dispose of land without seeking parliamentary approval.

I should make quite clear to the Minister two small points — and I am not making a speech. I am not talking about the National Housing Corporation which has that specific duty, because that is the purpose for which it was set up. The other statutory boards are not set up for the purpose of disposing of lands. The other point I will ask the Minister to bear in mind is that he is Minister responsible for lands, and that is why I am directing the questions to him.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am Minister responsible for lands, but I am only responsible for Government lands. When lands are vested in other corporations, they pass completely out of my control. The lands the Agricultural Development Corporation passed are vested in that corporation. The lands of the National Housing Corporation are vested in that corporation as a corporation. Happily, and I believe this is also the case with the other corporations, the lands cannot be disposed of without permission or consent of the Minister.

As far as I am concerned I can only speak for myself in this respect as Minister for Housing, and I am glad the hon. member has made a distinction between the National Housing Corporation and other corporations, because that is the very purpose of the National Housing Corporation. So to come now to saddle the National Housing Corporation with some responsibility or with the inability to dispose of lands would of course be in effect choking the corporation. He has acknowledged this and I grant that.

As far as the A.D.C. is concerned I want to make this statement. In 1969-70 the Agricultural Development Corporation offered 58 acres of land at Graeme Hall that were eventually disposed of to the two gentlemen, among others I do not know, because I am Minister for lands, but I was not concerned because it was vested as of right in the Agricultural Development Corporation, and they had the power to sell this land without reference to me. I know it did come to Cabinet and Cabinet gave approval from that time for the sale of this land. It was offered to the Urban Development Corporation to develop, but the then project manager looked at the lands and felt it was uneconomic for the Corporation to develop those lands. I certainly said it in the Senate when I was a member of the Senate and I believe I said it in here before that the project manager of the Urban Development Corporation decided that these lands would be uneconomic for the Corporation to develop.

6.35 p.m.

These lands were advertised for sale. There were two persons, as far as I understand, who were interested in these lands, (1) some people in the United States of America and (2) other persons, Moses and Bernstein, as mentioned by the hon. member. They were advertised in the newspaper. I do not know if the ADC should have sold them to the people in the United States of America in preference to those persons living in Barbados, and to all intents and purposes Barbadians, and then you would have heard very probably all sorts of things, and possibly you know more about these lands at ADC, but because one of the persons happened to be closely associated with the Government in power then that should have been a disqualification for selling them land.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, the Minister must not misunderstand what I am saying. The point I am making here is that this is an area in which the ADC, say they were short of funds, but the land was sold at 36 cents a square foot, the development cost was 30 cents a square foot, and they sold it back at \$2.00 a square foot and made a profit of \$1.34 a square foot. Why could not the ADC have made that profit?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The development of land calls for money. That is one of the reasons why the Urban Development Corporation had to enter into an agreement with the company, referred to as the Jamaica Company, to develop Paradise Heights, because UDC did not have the money to develop it. Development calls for initial capital, where would it get that kind of money from? The ADC was selling off those lands in

order to get itself out of a difficult situation, how is it now going to put itself in a more difficult situation and sell lands and not know how it is going to collect the money from the sale of those lands? That would be extreme folly on the part of the ADC. If the hon. member has an aversion, or if when he sees a man called Bernstein he sees red, I do not think it should be brought into this debate, I think it is irrelevant to this debate. I have said it in the Senate, I have said it on radio and on television, I may have said it in here before, I am not sure, but the ADC was in financial difficulties and the land was the kind of land that should be developed for that very purpose. I do not know what more it could have done, held on to it and be further in the red with the commercial bank? Because UDC was not taking it over. I do not know what they should have done with it, perhaps leave it lying down there doing nothing.

The question that the resolution do now pass was put.

A VOICE: *Divide!*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour please say Aye,.....

Mr. BOLDEN: A Division has been called for.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not a question of your not having heard because I believe the practice of the House is that when a vote is called for the person in the Chair declares how the vote went. Up to now you have not said how the vote went.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I put the question that the resolution do now pass and immediately I heard you complaining. Anyhow, a Division has been called for and you will have your Division.

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

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE and Mr. WEEKES - 8.

NOES: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS, Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 4.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Item I propose dealing with, Sir, is Item No. 10 which

stands in the name of the Minister of Agriculture.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL
BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, and the purpose is to empower the Minister to appoint an Auditor and also to fix the fee for such audit in the future. It is a very simple amendment in order to give the Minister the right to do this as from time to time we have to come back here as soon as fees are changed in order to have another amendment. This gives us the power to have these amendments done from time to time as far as the fees are concerned.

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

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very worried about why the Government wants to take this duty in hand to appoint some person to audit the books and regulate the fees. I thought the Government would come down with a Bill expanding the scope of the Bank itself and also take into account certain recommendations which have been made to Government for the past four or five years. One has to think carefully now whether or not the Government trusts the Bank officials or the members of the Bank because one would only think that Government has some doubt as to the authenticity of the accounts that they have to appoint their own auditor and pay him a special fee.

I was hoping the Minister would tell us a little bit more about the plans for the institution rather than placing a further hand upon the operation of the Bank. It seems to me that although you are creating statutory board — and this is what worries me in this whole exercise of these statutory boards — the general public do not seem to understand that we are somewhere between the Devil and the deep blue sea in Parliament today. Where statutory boards are concerned we can never get the opportunity to ask questions about them other than on the occasions when you come down with a substantive vote or during the Estimates, because we refer to Mays which says that we cannot ask questions on statutory boards.

6.45 p.m.

There are branches of the Government, and daily the Statutory Boards are taking over the function of the Central Government which is the business of the people. At the same time the Government is, from time to time, controlling the Statutory Boards. You cannot appoint persons over and above a certain salary on Statutory Boards unless such appointment is approved by the Minister. You cannot dismiss certain people unless the Minister approves. Now Government appoints an auditor. How are we operating when Government has such a hand in the Statutory Boards? They control them from outside. Cabinet members sit on the Boards, but we cannot inquire into Statutory Boards. This is the same thing the Hon. Minister of Housing has said only a moment ago. He is responsible for a Statutory Board for Housing, but nobody on this side can ask a question about a Statutory Board. I am very worried about this long hand of Government reaching over into the Statutory Boards, and yet the representatives of the people cannot ask questions regarding these Statutory Boards because we will be told that it infringes the rules of Parliament.

Here it is that the Government will appoint an Auditor, fix his salary, etc., for a Statutory Board, but at the same time we cannot ask a question whereas the Government can operate and manipulate as it feels like. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, when he was the Minister of Health, came in here and said that he was hamstrung by a Statutory Board. We could not ask a question from this side. He came back here, dissolved the Statutory Board, and created a new one. Where do we stand? We are in the twilight zone; we are between darkness and light, and we are floating. Somebody controls things, but the people themselves know nothing about what is taking place. The Minister of Housing said that when land was passed out of his hands and when the Cabinet agreed to sell land, he knew nothing about it. The Government is also controlling that. Where do we stand? I am at a loss. I do not know what is taking place. I suppose time will tell us what is taking place.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not trying to be able to appoint an Auditor. Previously the Bank used to be given an Auditor by this House. The problem has arisen because the audit fee of \$600, which has been on the Statute Books, has been there from 1968. The present Auditor has asked for a fee of \$720, and we have to amend the Act to accommodate that new fee. All we are trying to do is to be able to pay the Auditor his fee. We do not want to appoint the Auditor. It was

formerly done by the House of Assembly, but as a matter of regularity we would give the Minister power to appoint an Auditor on the recommendation of the Bank and also to fix the fee charged by the Auditor. The problem arose because the present Auditor cannot be paid since the amount exceeds \$600 and he has charged \$720. We do not want to amend the Act every year to suit the fee that is being charged.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it did not call for this legislation to do that. It is a simple matter. If the House appoints the Auditor, then you could say "such fees as have been determined by the Manager or the Board of the said Bank."

Hon. A. MORRISON: We have decided to do a comprehensive thing. The Auditor General recommended that we make a proper amendment once and for all.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: No. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank (Amendment) Act, 1975.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item we propose to deal with stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Education, etc. It is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1969, Cap. 375.

ANGLICAN CHURCH (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter is not controversial. Somehow or other the Minister of Education is presumed to have some responsibility for ecclesiastical matters.
6.55 p.m.

Be that as it may, the number of Canons in the Anglican Church is limited; and at the request of the Anglican Church we are asked to remove the limit to the maximum number of Canons in the Chapter of the Cathedral of St. Michael because there are some Canons who cannot be installed because this legal restriction is still in force, and which this Bill seeks to remove.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE HOTEL PROPRIETORS ACT, 1975

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item is Order No. 9, which is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Hotel Proprietors Act, 1975, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Tourism. I am asking for leave to deal with it in the absence of the Hon. Minister.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill would amend the Hotel Proprietors Act, 1975, in order to correct certain errors appearing therein. The proposed amendments are in relation to (1) Section 9(2) of the Act to make provision for the Act to exclude a proprietor from liability arising out of damage to or loss of any motor car or vehicle of any kind or any property left in it. (b) renumbering subparagraphs (c) and (d) of Paragraph (b) thereof as sub-paragraphs (iii) and (iv) respectively.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for this Day's sitting. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th October, 1975, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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