
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th April, 1976.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. (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); His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare); and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M. (Lond.).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes for Tuesday, 2nd March, 1976, 9th March, 1976, 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th March, 1976, 23rd March, 1976 and 26th March, 1976, have been circulated for your confirmation. (*Pause*). There being no amendments, these Minutes are duly confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Accounts and

Statements for the month of February, 1976 prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance I beg to lay the following Papers:—

The Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourists (Amendment) Regulations, 1975.

The Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the period April 1974 to 31st January, 1976.

The Administration Report of the Comptroller of Customs for the year 1974.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Paper:—

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year ended 31st December, 1974.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the care and treatment of persons of unsound mind and for connected purposes.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mrs. EASTMOND: To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: Is the Minister aware that the bus service provided by the private bus concessionaires, including the service provided for residents in the constituency of St. Michael North East, is far from satisfactory? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state why Government has done nothing so far to remedy this situation? Will the Minister also state

whether Government has any immediate plans to remedy this situation?

To ask the Minister of Finance and Planning: Is the Minister aware (1) of the very low wages which many women who are working in the industrial parks receive? (2) that the low wages received by these women are in marked contrast to the high salaries received by top management in many of the businesses located in the industrial parks? If the answer to each of the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state whether or not his Government has any plans for ensuring that the women working in the industrial parks are more fairly treated?

To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning: Is the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning aware that there is a systematic bias against women, in the employment patterns in the Public Service? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning please state whether Government has any plans to correct this situation?

To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning: Will the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning provide an analysis of the composition of the staff in the public service, which will provide information on a cross-classification basis, regarding positions held by men, positions held by women, the qualifications of men and the qualifications of women?

To ask of the Minister of Health and Welfare: Is the Minister aware of the dire need for an in-service Health Education Programme for Sanitation workers? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state whether Government has any immediate plans for introducing such a programme?

To ask of the Minister of Health and Welfare: Will the Minister state whether Government has initiated plans to form a Management Committee to be responsible for the administration of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? If the answer is in the affirmative, (1) will the Minister please state what will be the composition of the Management Committee? (2) indicate the criteria to be used for deciding on the composition of the Management Committee?

To ask of the Minister of Health and Welfare: Will the Minister please state whether there is an established post of Chief

Nursing Officer in the Ministry of Health? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state (1) when this post was established? and (2) state whether this post has ever been filled, and if not, why not?

To ask of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance: Is the Minister aware of the conditions under which occupants of the houses built by the National Housing Corporation, in the Lodge Hill and Friendship Housing Areas, were allowed to occupy these houses? In particular, is the Minister aware of the undermentioned provision in these conditions, which states that: "On any refusal or inability by you to complete the purchase of the property, all money paid to the Corporation by way of deposit and/or on account of purchase price or otherwise, be forfeited"? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister please indicate whether these conditions reflect Government's view of what is reasonable in this situation? Is the Minister aware of the confusion, embarrassment and dissatisfaction which exist among the occupants of these abovementioned houses?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there are two Resolutions of which I would like to give notice today. I seek Your Honour's leave.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there are two Resolutions of which I would like to give notice.

There being no objection, leave was granted.
12.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been granted for the hon. member to give notice of his Resolutions.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Whereas there is an ever increasing number of young people leaving school annually who are in search of employment;

And Whereas industry is not providing enough new jobs to meet the employment demand of these youths;

And Whereas they are becoming disillusioned, frustrated and concerned about their future;

And Whereas the Minister of Youth Affairs has called upon young unemployed people to register with a view to having them trained;

And Whereas these youths do not only need training but also food, drink, clothing and shelter;

Be It Resolved that this House call on Government to initiate immediately a programme whereby these young people can obtain gainful employment.

Also,

Whereas large sums have been levied on the Sugar Industry in the last two years;

And Whereas it is the declared policy of Government that part of this money is to be used for housing and agricultural development;

And Whereas the sums allocated to agriculture through the Sugar Producers will mainly be used for equipment and machinery;

And Whereas the small farmer will receive little benefit from this exercise;

And Whereas the small farmer has contributed his share to the Sugar Industry;

And Whereas most small farmers keep some kind of livestock;

And Whereas the price of fertilisers has increased considerably in the last four years;

And Whereas the small farmers' fertilisers were subsidised by 25% in 1971;

Be It Resolved that this House call on Government to use some of these funds to subsidise (a) Animal Feeds particularly poultry and swine and (b) all types of fertilisers by at least 25%.

FIRST READING OF THE BILL

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the care and treatment of persons of unsound mind and for connected purposes be read a first time.

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to render a personal explanation which I am

reading, and would like to make it a document of the House:

"I hereby place on record that I, Gertrude Eastmond, Representative for St. Michael, North East, has resigned from the Democratic Labour Party, because I have become convinced that the Party no longer stands for true democracy, for the dictionary says, democracy is, government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them or their agents elected under a free electoral process; a state of society characterised by formal equality of rights and privileges; political or social equality.

My experiences with the D.L.P. have convinced me that the Party is a 'one man show'....."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, I am not questioning.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this time, when she is finished.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rose on a point of personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can reply. According to May's on personal explanations, "in regard to the explanation of a personal matter the House is usually indulgent and will permit a statement of any character to be made without any question being before the House, provided that the Speaker has been informed of what the member proposes to say."

I have been informed. Let the hon. member for St. Michael North East continue.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

"My experiences with the D.L.P. have convinced me that the Party is a 'one man show', and this type of situation gives birth to dictatorship, one-party state or even communism, when freedom and social justice will no longer exist. I have become fully convinced that the D.L.P. has no place...."

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will have to allow the hon. member to complete. (Mr. CRAIG: Send

him out, Sir). Order! I do not have to be told what to do.

Mrs. EASTMOND: ".....I have become fully convinced that the D.L.P. has no place for women, the disadvantaged majority in our society. It is disinclined to preoccupy itself with the problems of the disadvantaged sections of our community. I am further convinced that there is too much fear and victimisation injected into our country.

I have therefore decided to dedicate the rest of my political life to the struggle to bring to this country a Government which will work for the attainment of social justice, freedom of thought, speech and expression, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and freedom of business. A Government which will for ever be focussed on the interest of our community, and committed to the betterment of all our people, regardless of sex, colour, race or creed, and work toward the eradication of all corruption within the Government structure.

With the help of God, this objective will be attained through the instrumentality of the party of which I am leader, the United People's Party."

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am asking for leave to deal with Item No. 1 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister who is absent. It is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation by the Government of the provisions of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the safety of Civil Aviation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been granted. Item No. 1.

THE CIVIL AVIATION (MONTREAL CONVENTION) ACT, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill will provide for the implementation, by the Government, of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation signed at Montreal on 23rd September, 1971 and for connected purposes.

12.30 p.m.

As hon. members will observe, the Montreal Convention is set out as a Schedule to the Bill. You will also observe that the offences are described in Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill, and Clause 7 of the Bill imposes the penalty. It says: "Any person who commits an offence under this Act is liable on conviction on indictment to imprisonment for life." It will also be observed that the offences as set out in Article 1 of the Convention are more or less identical with those as set out in Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill. This is a matter of bringing Barbados in line with what was agreed to in 1971.

Article 1, as hon. members will see, relates to the following:

"Any person commits an offence if he unlawfully and intentionally:

- (a) performs an act of violence against a person on board an aircraft in flight if that act is likely to endanger the safety of that aircraft; or
 - (b) destroys an aircraft in service or causes damage to such an aircraft which renders it incapable of flight or which is likely to endanger its safety in flight; or
 - (c) places or causes to be placed on an aircraft in service, by any means whatsoever, a device or substance which is likely to destroy that aircraft, or to cause damage to it which renders it incapable of flight, or to cause damage to it which is likely to endanger its safety in flight; or
 - (d) destroys or damages air navigation facilities or interferes with their operation, if any such act is likely to endanger the safety of aircraft in flight; or
 - (e) communicates information which he knows to be false, thereby endangering the safety of an aircraft in flight.
2. Any person also commits an offence if he:
- (a) attempts to commit any of the offences mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article; or
 - (b) is an accomplice of a person who commits or attempts to commit any such offence."

The principle of this Bill is merely to bring Barbados in line with what was agreed to in Montreal in September 1971. The offences, as you will see, are very severe and demand a penalty of imprisonment on indictment for life.

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

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the principle and the spirit of this Bill which attempts, as I understand it, to enshrine in the municipal law of Barbados what was agreed at Montreal cannot be denied and will find support from the members of this side of the House — certainly those sitting at this Table — but there are aspects of the Bill and one in particular which I will, in time, deal with. It seems to me that the Bill is designed to protect those persons travelling on civil aircraft throughout the world, and that the Convention was the result of the spate of hijacking which was prevalent throughout the 1970s. Any measure which seeks to make more effective the control that is vested in governmental agencies over civil aviation is in the national interest and for the public good and will find support from me.

All I am concerned about, since this Bill deals with Civil Aviation, is that under Clause 2 of this Bill there are a number of definitions. For example, the words "Barbadian controlled aircraft" are seen on page 3 of the Bill. In terms of the Civil Aviation of this Island, it appears to me that we in Barbados have been making a boast which is, perhaps, idle that we own an aircraft called International Caribbean Airways which is abbreviated I.C.A., but, when the resort is had to the files in the Companies section of the Registration Office of this Island, the whole issue as to whether, in fact, I.C.A. is Barbadian controlled aircraft, or a Barbadian owned aircraft, raises its head.

If I may refer to the Civil Aviation (Tokyo Convention) Act, 1972, No. 1, the nomenclature "Barbadian controlled aircraft" is given specific definition in the interpretation section of the Act of 1972. Section 2 of that Act says:

"Barbados controlled aircraft" means an aircraft which—

- (a) is registered in Barbados,
- (b) is not registered in any country but in the case of which either the operator of

the aircraft or each person entitled as owner to any legal or beneficial interest in it —

- (i) is a person qualified to be the owner of a legal or beneficial interest in an aircraft registered in Barbados, and
- (ii) resides or has his principal place of business in Barbados, or
- (c) being registered in some other country is demised, let or hired out to a person who or to persons each of whom satisfies the requirements mentioned in subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (b);

It would appear from the Act of 1972 that, technically, ICA., since it is registered in Barbados, satisfies the technical definition of "Barbadian controlled aircraft" The Act says: "Barbadian-controlled aircraft" means, and it then goes on to delineate a number of situations including pure registration in Barbados. I think that the public must be made aware that, even though an aircraft is registered in Barbados and may satisfy some International Convention to that extent, it is not, in truth and in fact, necessarily owned by Barbadians.

12.40 p.m.

The mere fact of registration in Barbados, in other words, is not proof of who are the legal — and to quote the words of the section — beneficial owners of the aircraft; so that the mere flying of a flag could very well be just a blind, and that the Barbados flag could be used purely to satisfy the financial arrangements of non-Barbadians. I will show why. In respect of ICA, it is first of all registered in the Companies Register as Caribbean International Airways. If we abbreviate that, we have CIA, and presumably the people who registered it as such did not like the connotation that could possibly be drawn from registering a Barbados aircraft with the designation CIA, and so there has been an interchange of the lettering in the advertisements and so on.

When you examine the files in the Registry, you will find that this is where the real control resides. As at 31st December, 1972, the directors of this company were a Norman Ricketts who lives in England, a Geoffrey Edwards who gave an address in Switzerland, and F. A. Laker who lives in England, Sir Lionel

Alfred Luckhoo who does not reside in Barbados, but in Guyana, and Lady Velda Worrell, a Barbadian. As at 31st December, 1974, the directors were Ian Archer who is a Barbadian to all intents and purposes, the same Geoffrey Edwards, the same Norman Ricketts, Lady Worrell and two other Englishmen, a C. Nunn and a H. I. Allen.

Now as I understand it, Sir, a Board of Directors of a company controls the running of the company, not necessarily the day to day running of the company but the over-all running, the policy and so on, and you find that Barbados is very thinly represented on the Board of Directors as at 31st December, 1974, when a return was made. Now who are the owners of the shares in Caribbean International Airways? As I understand it and anybody who is involved in business or who understands anything about company law knows that the real ownership and control reside with the shareholders of a company. The Directors are there at the bidding of the shareholders who have the residual power ultimately to remove them from office if they are dissatisfied with the way in which the company is being managed. Financial holding in the company is vested in the shareholders. In the case of Caribbean International Airways better known as ICA, the shareholders on the company's files are three. The shares issued and taken up at 31st December, 1974, are as follows: Strathaven Limited, a company registered in Guernsey, \$240,000; International Airholdings Limited, a company registered in Nassau, \$240,000; Laker Airways, a company registered in London, \$240,000. No more shares have been issued or taken up by anyone. A total of \$740,000 shares have been taken up by all foreigners or foreign companies. You can check the Registry's files and see. Where are the Barbadians who own shares in International Caribbean Airways? (*Asides*) I do not want to hear anything from the other side because I checked the files at 11.45 this morning. The only thing that has been filed since then is on the 27th May, 1975, when a document was sent to the Registry stating that there were three additional directors or three new directors. I will tell you who they are: Ian Archer, David Griffith and Maurice Jones. If they intend to put a few more Barbadians on the directorate, all well and good, but it still does not meet the essential point at which I am driving, and that is, that true control must reside in the equity situation in the shareholders, and there are no Barbadians on the register as owners of shares, and we get

and boast. The Hon. Minister of Tourism, C.B.C., the Advocate carries advertisements, and we gloat over the fact that we have a national airline. We boast of having a national airline, but it is only an airline flying a Barbadian flag to satisfy section 2 of the Act of 1972; but no Barbadians own anything in it, and it is time that we in this House expose what is going on in this country, because for too long we have seen the introduction of aliens into the community who have taken over most of the commercial business in this country and who have got themselves entrenched in the real property and realty of this country.

Now we are boasting for the sake of prestige of the ownership of an airline, and when the facts are revealed we find that we do not have any Barbadian owners of this airline. This is something which the Hon. Minister should come and explain to the House. Why is it that no effort has been made to get equity share capital from local Barbadians? I cannot be satisfied with people masquerading and coming in here and telling you that they want you to pass a Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, using the phrase "Barbadian controlled aircraft", when in fact the phrase is a mere technicality and the residual control does not reside in Barbadians. It may only be a means where in a company like this the Directors will get directors' fees and one presumes reasonable remuneration too. But it is not enough just to have a few directors on a board drawing fees when in fact they have no say because the shares are probably weighted voting shares and they will have no say because not a Barbadian owns one share, and to that extent we are only in the words of the hon. member for St. Michael North East, being used as puppets and a string is being pulled by people outside this country over whom we have no control or do not want to have any control.

12.50 p.m.

This company was registered on the 16th April, 1970. It is now very nearly six years that the proper financial basis of this company should have been assured, and if it was serious about having a national airline beyond the stage of a flag we should have invited the public to subscribe; and I am sure that if it was shown to be a viable thing, the public would have subscribed.

I do not see, for example, the Barbados Government on the company's register as having any shareholding. That is not fair. I am not an

expert on Air Law, and I am not getting involved into the ramifications; but I do not know if the Ambassador from the United States knew or checked the files or had his agents check them for him and saw in fact that the company was not Barbadian controlled in the sense that a reputable company lawyer or any businessman would understand the word "control". To that extent His Excellency the Ambassador may have got himself involved in local politics in this country; but he has highlighted something and he has set my brain working, and I had to do some research. I think that it is scandalous that after nearly six years the Government has done nothing to establish meaningful shareholding among Barbadians.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the member for St. Philip North really dealt with the purposes of this measure. I do not know if he feels that Barbadians should travel on aircraft and not have the same protection as the Montreal Convention gives. I would like to know....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation. I do not know if the member for St. Michael West was in the House because I started off by saying that I supported the spirit and principle of the measure. It seems that he only understands when you are talking about duppies.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of elucidation.

Mr. SIMMONS: We support it Sir, but I was asking what is meant by "control".

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, may be the dark glasses that the hon. member is wearing makes him feel that he is a duppy. If he calls himself a duppy I am not going to designate him as a duppy, but he should be careful when he attributes these things to other persons.

This is a Bill dealing with a Convention that was passed in 1971. If the Barbados Government had been earlier in bringing the Convention, I am sure that the hon. member would not have made the speech that he made today, because he would have been glad that the Government did something to save Barbadian lives. The only way to convince Barbadians about some of these things is if an aeroplane, maybe with 500 Barbadians on board was highjacked and then it would be asked why you did not have the Convention to bring Barbados into line with other countries.

The hon. member is a lawyer, and he admitted that the part about controls is technical. The law deals with technicalities. There is no point in saying that it is a technicality. You do not have to own an aircraft. The hon. member should know by now that an airline need not to be registered here. Liberia does not have any ships in Liberia, but there are more ships registered in Liberia than may be in any other single part of the world. The hon. member must know that.

If the people of Barbados want to put their money to buy shares in aircraft, that is their business. Sometimes the Government does foolish things. If the Government feels that it is a priority to buy aircraft or lease aircraft, that again is a matter for the Government. You must understand the reasons behind ICA coming here. Air Jamaica is not owned by the people of Jamaica. It is owned by Air Canada. So what is the point of making all of this big fuss? The Jamaicans felt that as a matter of pride they would put their money into the airline, and they called it Air Jamaica.

The member talked about exposing something. If the Ministers do not know how to defend the Government, let them throw away their portfolios or resign or something instead of letting those on the other side tell the people a lot of nonsense. The member said he was not an expert on Air Law. I am not an expert on anything, but I know that Air Jamaica — and he can ask any of his relatives if it is owned by Air Jamaica. What can he expose? Barbados is a place where you are vying for the Tourist Trade; and you are saying that you can bring people from Europe. More people are coming here from Europe by ICA at rates at which they could not come by British Airways before.

Why does he not say that? People have been travelling from Europe to Barbados at rates unknown to the Barbadians before. (*Aside: Barbadians cannot travel for that, you idiot.*)

Mr. WALCOTT: You are calling me an idiot, you clown?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: It is the person over there who I am referring to who said that Barbadians cannot travel on ICA. Barbadians travel on ICA backwards and forwards. He is talking nonsense. I do not have to defend the Barbados Government, but it is simple commonsense that if you can

make arrangements with an airline to provide you with a service you do so. Everybody does not own a motor car who travel in motor cars. In the USA some companies do not own cars. They go to some other company and rent motor cars so that they do not have the overhead costs of paying for garages and mechanics and those other things. They go to a company like Hertz and such people and rent motor cars on a monthly basis.

British Airways rents some of these aircraft to other people. Take West Africa. Take Air Ghana. Zaire rented aircraft from other people before they owned their own. The people on the other side should be the last to talk about people who are fronting for other people and telling people about exposing things. Can you expose something like an airline?

Ricketts came down here. Everybody knows that Ricketts is the managing director. Any fool would know that, because CAB made a decision about American Airlines. It has nothing to do with any question of hiding something and that you have to come out with the facts.
1 p.m.

The Government cannot buy an aircraft or own an aircraft unless it comes to this House for the money and says that is the money to buy an aircraft. They have shares, and all this came up in the House already, and all of us who participated in the debate made our various points. The hon. member has to realise that he is not too early or too late. I spoke about the airport and the whole air business. We challenged some people operating at Seawell Airport, because we are opposed to some people operating services at Seawell Airport that we can operate in Barbados. ICA is not owned by the Barbados Government, as you say, because there is a flag on it. Air Jamaica is not owned by the Jamaican Government, it is owned by Air Canada, and the hon. member knows that too, because the mere fact that he can go in the Registry and check shows that you cannot be hiding anything.

I will tell the hon. member something more, if he does not know this, I will give him some lessons. ICA cannot land in Portugal as ICA of Barbados because Barbados and Portugal do not have diplomatic relations, so it has to land there in its own registered name. Do you know that? I travel by aeroplanes and I study these things too. I have never travelled by ICA because I do not travel by the cheapest route. The Government does not send me out, I go out by the Trade

Union, so they cannot tell me how I must travel. When anybody sends me a ticket I will send it back and tell them how I will travel, you cannot tell me how to travel, I will travel the way I want to. I am a busy man, I cannot get in a plane and wait two weeks in it, and if it stops in the Azores I have to wait until they send another one.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, if the hon. member will give way, this is a Bill for the implementation by the Government of the provisions of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts. The hon. member is not really relevant now.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Philip North has now realised that. Please continue.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I could never be hard on the hon. member, the hon. member for St. Philip North is like my son. He is young and I hope that he will learn, and therefore I am only telling him not to get off with the idea that there is anything in this to hide. If you want to bring Barbadians and other passengers here at a good rate, and if you talk about employment, if you talk about training, you have to stimulate trade, and if this is a means of bringing people to Barbados at a rate that Europeans would not come because they are not going to pay 200 or 300 pounds to come here if they get it for half the fare, and if we can do something to get them you have to compliment the Government for doing it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, every election year we find that persons discover that there is something going on which should not be going on. For the first three or four years of a parliamentary term there is no problem, but as soon as they realise that you turn a corner and an election is right there, then you find all kinds of scandals being discovered, but never before in the parliamentary term is anything discovered, as if Government only begins in an election year and nothing takes place before.

What the hon. member for St. Philip North has said has raised two issues. He said during the course of his speech that he was no expert in civil aviation law. That is fairly obvious, because he has failed to make a distinction between an airways and an aircraft, which is simple. We have International Caribbean Airways which owns no aircraft at all. This is no secret, there are several airlines that do not own

aircraft. International Caribbean Airways leases aircraft, and airways and aircraft are different things altogether. ICA does not own any aircraft, that does not mean that ICA does not and cannot operate as an airline, and in fact it does operate as an airline on leased aircraft from Laker. That is the first point.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is this, and it is very simple. The hon. member gave us what was the position in 1971, and he was even more up to date, because he gave us the position in 1974 and he also made some mention of 1975, but we are now in 1976 and nothing has been mentioned about 1976. The hon. member does not even know that there was a changed position during 1975, and apparently he is not even interested, because if he was interested it would certainly have destroyed his own arguments completely, because he could not have come here and delivered himself in the way he has delivered himself if he was interested in the facts, but he is not interested in the facts. None of them are interested in the facts, they are only interested in putting forward what they believe to be hot information so as to paint or smear somebody else, and this is the situation all the time. I would suggest to the hon. member that he should do as much research not only in the Registry. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Registry is the place where information as regards companies can be had, and when there are changes then those changes are to be filed.

He did make mention that there were two Barbadian Directors in 1974, and in passing he merely stated that another three Barbadians were appointed in 1975 — I do not remember the names, one was Ian Archer who was mentioned as a Director in 1974 — but he said there were three others and Ian Archer's name was called a second time as one of the others, Maurice Jones' name was mentioned and another David Somebody, I am not so sure whose name it was that was mentioned, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to give the information because I am going to leave it for the Hon. Minister of Tourism who is more familiar with the situation than any of the others over there and who will let them know what the position is.

In 1975 the Government of Barbados negotiated with Lakers, the owners of ICA, and acquired a controlling interest in ICA. This is the crucial part of it.

1.10 p.m.

It was only on these grounds the Government of Barbados knew that in the conducting of its bilateral discussions with the United States of America and with Canada that there would be any chance at all of ICA being given an air route into the United States of America, or into Canada, or into Europe, or wherever it wanted to fly. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would like to say that I see members on both sides contravening Standing Order No. 33(6):

"Members must maintain silence except when called to speak by the Chair."

I am having difficulty in hearing the Hon. Minister and, I think, the Reporter as well. You may proceed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat almost immediately, because I believe that the Minister of Tourism has something to say on this matter. During 1975 the Government of Barbados negotiated a majority shareholding in International Caribbean Airways. I am fairly positive that the Prime Minister, at some point in this very Chamber, explained to the House and disclosed the entire negotiations that were had at that time with the owners of ICA. I want to say this, finally, for the hon. member to hear. The Government of Barbados negotiated, and is now the owner of the majority, which means more than 50%, shareholding in International Caribbean Airways.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael West likes to shout, and he believes that his shouting can frighten people. I noticed when he was challenged from this side and told that he was only a shadow of himself, he started fumbling in his bag. I do not know for what he was fumbling. (*Asides.*) He is in a position nowadays where he does not know what is going on. Some time ago, in this Chamber, I made a statement about young boys and young girls.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I have not heard a word about civil aviation. I do not want to hear about the hon. member for St. Michael West. I suppose the two of you can meet outside and have your little fiasco. Please let us hear something about civil aviation.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to open my speech like the Minister of Housing opened his, and nobody is going to stop me

from having my rights in here. I can shout like anybody else. He opened his speech by talking about election year. Well, I can open mine by talking about 4 "O" level certificates. I can open like everybody else opened. If they break the Rules, then I can break them, too. If they adhere to the Rules, I will adhere to them, too. When I spoke about people in Barbados walking about with 4 "O" level certificates and could get nothing to do, he got up and said it was not true, but his own colleagues have condemned that statement.

Now, when the Minister of Housing gets up to defend the Government, he says that in an election year you will hear all sorts of things. People, as he says, will try to paint and smear the Government. He must first understand that we on this side have been saying for the longest time that matters of national interest were not being discussed or made known to Parliament. Ministers were getting outside of Parliament and making their own Public Release where they cannot be questioned or challenged. The first time the issue of participation by the Government of Barbados and I.C.A. has come to this House is now.

The Prime Minister said that they were acquiring 51% of the shares in I.C.A. The whole operation, the managerial structure, and the directorship have never been discussed in this House. This House is the place that should control the interest of Barbadians. The Minister now says that he leaves it to the Minister of Tourism to tell us the situation with ICA. The Minister of Housing says that the Barbados Government now controls a majority shareholding in ICA., but that fact is still not registered in the Company Register of this Island. (*Asides.*) How will anybody know what is the position? They will always have excuses. In the same way as the documents registering the directors have been placed on the file, then all other relevant information should have been so placed at the sametime, or within a reasonable time. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I heard the member for St. Michael NorthEast, in a personal statement, say today, in effect, if we are not careful, we will have a dictatorship and a one-man rule. You can see it being perpetrated from over there. The Company Act requires at the end of each financial year certain documents be declared to tell the public at large what is the situation in the Company. The

Minister of Housing sits there and shouts that you only do what is absolutely necessary. He has forgotten the law. Not one of them over there understands what should happen in law nowadays. It is a question of being power crazy and power mad. You must make annual returns. Why do you not read the Company's Act?

Mr. Speaker, ICA must raise certain questions in the minds of Barbadians. Not less than a month ago I was at Seawell to meet somebody who came in on ICA. Barbadians have complained about the difficulty in getting seats on ICA to come to Barbados. (*Asides.*) If the Minister wants to be fair, and if he wants to investigate the matter, I have had to send a Barbadian, who came in from London, to the Prime Minister's Office to discuss the question of booking seats with ICA for Barbadians to come to Barbados, a so-called Barbadian Airways. The difficulty is due to the fact that it is operated by a subsidiary company that tells people that the seats are sold primarily in Germany and other places. (*Asides.*)

Mr. Speaker, a member over there says that it will bring more tourists down here. What, in effect, he is trying to tell me and which I now understand is that you have an Airline Company registered in Barbados, supposed to be Barbadian owned, or the majority of shares are owned by Barbadians, but Barbadians have very little facilities on the aircraft which is supposed to be flying the Barbados flag. That is what the dispute is about. This is a technicality of the Barbadian controlled aircraft, because it presents a system of discrimination. If you look at the words, technically now, Barbadian controlled aircraft means an aircraft where Barbadians have less privilege than other people. This is what the hon. member for St. Philip North was talking about.

1.20 p.m.

The hon. member was talking about what is supposedly Barbadian, but when you check the Registry there are certain defects in the registration of the company which does not show that Barbadians have got that major interest in it as you hear is going around the place. That is what the issue is about, but I do not believe that we on this side should teach those on the other side the law. I remember a man called Lloyd Smith when he was with the Barbados Labour Party said that **they** were lawyers and "awyers"; he said the **lawyers** were on this side and the "awyers" on the other side, and it is still true today because if we look at Chapter 308.....(*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have repeatedly spoken this morning about the behaviour of members not speaking. They are contravening Standing Order No. 33(6). Every hon. member has his chance to make a speech. I want to hear the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if I have to take up the post of lecturer in here to teach the "awyers" something about the law, I will do it now. I refer to the Companies Act, Cap. 308, Section 27(1) and (2) which reads as follows:

"(1) Every Company having a share capital shall once at least in every year make a list of all persons who, on the fourteenth day after the first or only ordinary general meeting in the year, are members of the company and of all persons who have ceased to be members since the date of the last return or (in the case of the first return) of the incorporation of the company."

If the Barbados Government is now a member of ICA, would the Minister of Labour now get a book and tell me why it has not so been registered? (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the Hon. Minister wants to answer, let him stand and do so.

Mr. BOLDEN: His brain cannot comprehend this now; he has too many things to worry about. Section 27(2) says:

"The list must state the names, addresses and occupations of all the past and present members therein mentioned and the number of shares held by each of the existing members at the date of the return, specifying shares transferred since the date of the last return, or, (in the case of the first return), of the incorporation of the company, by persons who are still members and have ceased to be members respectively, and the dates of registration of the transfers, and must contain a summary distinguishing between shares issued for cash and shares issued as fully or partly paid up otherwise than in cash, and specifying the following particulars —

(a) the amount of the share capital of the company and the number of the shares into which it is divided;

(b) the number of shares taken from the commencement of the company up to the date of the return;

(c) the amount called up on each share; etc. etc."

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of explanation.....

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not giving way. You cannot teach me anything about this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to teach the hon. member anything.

Mr. BOLDEN: Not you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well you are addressing me.

Mr. BOLDEN: All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if the hon. member wants to say that these things are only now being raised in an election year, it is the time when they are forced to come to Parliament and therefore these things will be raised the day before election. If they had come before they would have been raised, but the problem is that in an election year they have got too many problems in their heads week after week. We are not going to sit down here and let things pass through without making our usual comments; so he can rest assured that we will deal with them as they arise.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this really has to be an election year because otherwise we would not have wasted such a lot of time this morning on irrelevancies and incorrect statements.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, what the hon. member has just said is a reflection on the Chair about people wasting time. Is he now saying that we are not entitled to debate these things?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Let the hon. member take his seat. I want to hear the Minister on the Civil Aviation (Montreal Convention) Act, 1976.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I think it really is time we came back to that Act, as indeed unfortunately most of what was said this morning was based on out-of-date information. The hon. member for St. Philip North talked about facts dated 31st December, 1974, and really and truly if ICA belongs in this debate at all, and it has taken up a lot of the discussion, then the facts are very simple and they can clarify the whole matter. He spoke of foreign business people coming into this country and owning this, that and the other. He has got the matter absolutely backwards, Mr. Speaker. This was a foreign company which was started by a group of people from England, as far as I know, and they had one

local director in Lady Worrell who was their choice, and in the middle of last year the Barbados Government acquired 51 percent of that company. So instead of Barbadians selling out to foreigners, the Barbadian people through the Government acquired 51 per cent of this company. Not only did they acquire 51 percent in this company, but implicit in that was the fact that the Government of Barbados as the majority shareholder is entitled to appoint the majority of the directors on the Board of Directors. I believe it is seven of which the Barbados nominates four and the other shareholders nominate three.

In addition to that the Barbados Government nominates the Chairman of the Board of that company, and that is Mr. Ian Archer. I think the other directors representing Barbados are again Lady Worrell, Mr. Maurice Jones and I think Mr. Griffith that was mentioned, who is a senior Civil Servant in the Government of Barbados. There are three directors who are non-Barbadian. All this is plain to see, it is well known and has been published in the newspapers. I am sure it has come up in this House before, but the problem with the Civil Aeronautics Board was not this particular problem. The Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington has not denied ICA the right to fly into Washington and Boston; they have asked for more information and they have given the applicant which is ourselves six months in which to provide additional information. The additional information bears particularly upon the ownership of the aircraft and also the training and employment of Barbadian air crews, that is to say, except cabin crews, pilots, navigators and so forth. The Barbados Government has not stated any intention of an early purchase of aircraft; we have other things to do with our money, and what is surprising about the CAB request for further information is that there are precedents for such companies who do not own aircraft to operate into the United States with the permission of the CAB. However they have the right to ask for more information and that is what has happened.

In the meantime the Barbados Government is the majority shareholder on behalf of the people of Barbados of International Caribbean Airways, owing 51 per cent of the shares, appointing the majority of the Board of Directors including the Chairman. I hope this will clarify the matter a little for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Philip North.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and they stood part.

1.30 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA each seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Clauses 3 to 9 inclusive of the Bill were called and they stood part. The Schedule was called.

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

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 Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, each seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Civil Aviation (Montreal Convention) Act, 1976.

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LANDS AT FONTABELLE AND LANDS END, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item is Item No. 2 standing in my name. I gave notice of it in the absence of the appropriate Minister of Housing and Lands and National Insurance to move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Fontabelle for extension of the Deep Water Harbour and industrial purposes.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, the Hon. Leader of the House gave

notice of this Resolution on my behalf, and it is also on behalf of the Hon. Minister responsible for Ports, that is the Minister without Portfolio that I am doing this Order. It falls under my Ministry because it is vested in me by statute to acquire these lands.

In proposing to acquire about 12 pieces of land in the area of Fontabelle, which lands already adjoin the Deep Water Harbour, I think that it is generally well known — it has been discussed in here at the time of the Estimates, it has been spoken about on public platforms and in the media — that Government plans to extend the Bridgetown Harbour. In order to extend, it will be necessary to acquire a number of properties in the area.

Sir, the Schedule to this Resolution sets out clearly what lands are to be acquired, and also from whom the lands are to be acquired. As required under the Land Acquisition Act, the necessary publications have been made in the Official Gazette and notices have also been published in the Advocate Newspaper of this country. The reason that the Government is seeking to acquire these lands compulsorily is that the Crown can have a proper title to these properties.

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

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

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, recently it has been revealed that the Government acquired land at \$2,100 from some poor person and that land was only valued at \$7,900. Now land was bought or acquired for a cement factory in St. Lucy for a price of \$1,300 per acre which was acknowledged to be far above the market value.

What I want to know, because this thing has been reported in the newspaper, it has been revealed there, what I want to know is if Government is discriminating against the poor people or if for the matter of friendship there are some persons who can get a better price and other persons are not entitled to a fair price. I want to know if this Government really knows what justice is and is prepared to give justice, because if the poor people cannot get a fair price for their land, if land is valued at a high price and then it is acquired at a low price, can anyone honestly tell me that this is fair or that this is justice meted out to the poor people of this

country? Anyone can clearly see that something has to be wrong. Any Government that can do this is not fit.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, I will undertake to investigate completely the allegations made by the hon. member if she can identify to me (a) who that poor person is and (b) where that poor person lives. I will definitely make an investigation and make a full disclosure to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mrs. EASTMOND: There will be other reports that I will be tabling, (Hon P. M. GREAVES: Give us the name). I do not have the person's name, it will be revealed through the Press. I am here fighting for the poor person, but there are other persons who will be revealed, because I have visited some person's land recently, whose land was valued at a high price, valued above the price it should have been valued at. You will have all of them. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not mind those over there, you continue to address the Chair.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Yes, Mr. Speaker. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would like members to allow the hon. member to speak in peace. I want to hear her clearly.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am sure that this House is interested in the truth, in justice and in fair play. The information I have been asking the hon. member for is so that the whole House can have the full facts about what the hon. member is accusing the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech, no point of order.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I know of poor persons who have land valued at very high prices and they can scarcely pay the taxes on those lands. Something has to be radically wrong with the valuation, especially on lands belonging to poor people, because poor people in Barbados value their houses and land and that is what they have to turn to. Barbadians have been proud people over the years and if the persons they sent out to value the land are not valuing properly the people must have a hearing. Some of these persons have appealed and often they cannot hear anything about the appeal. I am dealing with all

the people of Barbados, but moreso I want to see justice done. If the Government intends to give justice, then they will get more facts coming about this and about other things. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points on this Resolution. I seem to recall that within the past year land at St. Lucy was purchased at \$13,000 an acre, making it the most expensive land there was in Barbados at the time. I am not going to impute any motives or any improper or collateral consideration to the other side of the House, but this matter has been gazetted and advertised, as the Minister said, in accordance with the regulations, and I would hope that every effort is taken to see that a proper, reasonable valuation consistent with the going rate is offered for this land, because among the properties sought to be acquired — and this is why the Minister was very particular, Sir — are properties owned by the Hon. Minister without portfolio and a certain other gentleman who is a well known supporter of the Democratic Labour Party. I am not casting any aspersions because the Hon. Minister without portfolio is a person for whom I have a healthy respect and he knows that. I am only issuing a warning, because during the debate on the Estimates for Vocational Training what I had to say about the purchase of Melbourne was distorted and taken out of context because that involved a member of the Government. The report issuing from CBC was taken out of context in terms of what I said. I spoke for 15 minutes on that one Item and I recall advising the Government to set up an all-party committee with independent values to ensure that if they intended to acquire Melbourne that it could have been done fairly, but under the directive of the Minister of Tourism that part was left out. We had that out in here already, Sir, so I do not want any mistake this time.

What I am submitting is that in so far as some of this property involves the Minister without portfolio and the basic Minister of Ports that the Government must be very careful that the land is not purchased at an enhanced price or at a price way above its market value, so that there can be accusations of unfair dealings. There should be an arm's length transaction. I believe that the Hon. Minister will be glad for what I have said, Sir, because I want it clearly exposed that we want the thing properly done and that no enhanced price is offered for it. I am only issuing a word of warning, I am not being critical at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you know I have some very strong views about land. I do not

believe in freehold. You know if I had my way nobody would own land at all, land would belong to the State and you would not have to buy it from the land sharks. None of you would be able to get any fees, but it is so already and we have to live with it. There is no point looking out now for a new theory, but I was very interested to hear the hon. member for St. Michael North East make this revelation of her former colleagues, who seem to be persons who get in these land deals and sell land from poor people, and it looks as if I was in a party with people that I did not know we had this kind of association. However, I am very glad the lady said she has come to light and she was going to the point of making it clear that she does not like what she sees going on. I am very pleased to hear that she had this revelation, that her colleagues have been doing these things for the last four years, she adjourned it very long and I must really admire her for her patience and endurance. She put up with it so long that it must now be over-bearing, but I would like to say....(Asides)...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the point now, that you say we are buying land for ourselves. You had better check over there and see.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have spoken already.

Mr. SIMMONS: I apologise, Sir.
1.50 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can make him slip. He will learn. He is talking to me and looking at the Gallery. The Gallery cannot talk in here, he has to deal with me in here. When he gets outside he can deal with the Gallery. You have to debate matters in here. If you make innuendos you must know what you are doing. You should make the innuendos outside and say that the members are dishonest. You can say outside that they buy land for each other, and you can make the innuendo that the hon. member is your good friend and you will not have any imputation regarding the hon. member in charge of the Port but — a big but — as big as the United Nations, and all of the dirt will be underneath the but. These are the things which we challenge, and we find people trying to impute certain things in the debate. They are trying to impute motives about the character of people as it relates to these things.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to hide in these matters. I have said repeatedly that when they bought the land in St. Lucy they were paying a

lot of money for it. But when the Government is buying land near to certain people everybody sits down and nobody stands up to talk. What is of importance now is the price the Government is going to pay for the land involved. You should go back and see what the Labour Government paid for land in 1956. I was the Chairman of the Deep Water Harbour. We had to buy land in Fontabelle; we bought land at the back Badleys, and we bought land from everybody, but the moment Government is buying land from black people, you will hear that they are a lot of thieves, but you never hear anything about how many thieves they have spending other people's money and acting as fronts for them. All you can hear is about black thieves.

The hon. member for St. Michael West has been owning a property in Fontabelle for a number of years. He would not have owned the property on the basis of when the Government would come to buy it. That property was there some 50 years ago. His father owned it before him, so why should anybody come now and make such a stupid statement? I will be tempted to say that sometimes you have to wonder how such statements can come from certain areas that are not fit to make them. What is important is what they will do with the area of land for the extension of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister responsible for the Port will bear in mind that this is a very important matter and a very important area. When the Deep Water Harbour was going to be extended, my organisation, the Barbados Workers Union, made it quite clear that any displacement taking place in that area would be regarded as a condition of extension and that priority be given to those people who have lost their jobs. Now, there have been changes taking place in the docks and at the Harbour. There has been bulk loading and there has been bulk handling. There has been a contraction, and I want the hon. member to understand that we are not going to take the contraction on the basis that you will contract here with one group of workers and do not give them an opportunity to work where the expansion takes place. That is not going to work. That is what we have to make them understand very clearly. Wherever expansion takes place and contraction is the result of the expansion, the expanded area must give priority to those who have lost their jobs as a result of the contraction provided they are capable of carrying out the duties in the expanded area. This is the only way that equity and fairplay will be on a basis that one can say it is fair to everybody.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the hon. member for St. Michael South West is the owner of land at Fontabelle. I do not think anyone in this Chamber would accuse the hon. member and his family as people who are trying to gain something as a result of the accident that they were born at Lands End and lived at Lands End. The Harbour will be extended on their land. This is not a case of somebody buying land where he knows that the Government is going to extend. We have had people in the past who went and bought land knowing that the Government was going to expand going north. Nobody can accuse the hon. member of that, because I do not think the hon. member in those days would know that the Barbados Labour Party Government was going to decide that the Harbour was going north. At one time it was going to be south. In 1898 they said that it was going up by Christ Church Lighthouse. I do not think the hon. member was around in 1898, and I am sure that nobody could accuse him as getting ready, or padding up since 1898 to come down the pavilion steps now the Government is ready to buy the land.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think that these things are a bit exaggerated when it comes to throwing the paint brush, or the scandal brush, on members in a matter such as this. I hope the hon. member will bear in mind that the Port is very important to the economy of Barbados and, therefore, fairplay and justice should be done to those who are likely to lose as a result of contraction in some areas, and I hope he will not forget them when the expansion takes place.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to contribute to this debate. It is in relation to the land at Fontabelle on the west coast to be acquired. There are about twelve properties there.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Hon. Minister is aware of the Standing Orders of this House in relation to matters in which he has an interest? I think the Minister should either declare an interest in the matter, or refrain from commenting on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken. (*Asides.*) Order!

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The hon. member should observe, Mr. Speaker, that I am an interested party — myself and my wife. I want to make it quite clear in this Honourable Assembly that one of the properties belongs to myself and

my sister in the U.S.A. One of the properties consists of land donated....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The hour being 2 p.m., and the Standing Orders not being suspended, this House now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Oral Replies yet ready to questions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, we do not propose to proceed with Private Members' Business today.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

RESOLUTION RE THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FONTABELLE

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the Hon. Minister without Portfolio was addressing the Chair.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I have a direct interest in the land that is to be acquired. I was born practically on the same spot where I now live sixty-five years ago, and absolutely no compensation could ever reward me for what it means to me at this time of my life to have to move. The sea has been part of my living, and at my age of retirement when I once looked forward to it for peace and quietude, I will have to quit, and I will quit going west further to the sea, but progress must go on and I do not think I should prevent progress.

I should like to say that neither the Minister responsible for Lands, the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General or anybody else

concerned with lands could say that I ever even suggested or hinted to them my ownership or relationship to this land. I would say that I know that all the owners of the land including myself received notes of what we considered valuations of the land from the Crown Solicitor, and I would go far enough as to say that I have never discussed with my wife to ask what she has stated as the price for her property. I have made a special point not to reply to the note that directly concerned me so that nobody could have a lead of what I thought was honest, or to think that because I was a Minister of Government I would have a better chance of receiving more for mine than any other person. I have left that out completely and feel satisfied that whatever under the Land Acquisition Act the land is acquired at or whatever the other people receive for theirs, I would receive for mine, but no pattern should be set by me at all for anybody to receive for theirs.

I have made it clear that I do not like to embarrass, nor would I do anything to embarrass my colleagues, the Prime Minister or any other Minister or any Government officials responsible for anything in Government. I would always take that precaution. I would take the very precaution I took when I was appointed Minister responsible for Communications and Works where shipping was involved. I was President of a company registered in the Bahamas owning my own ship and I sacrificed it and sold it out because I did not wish to be involved in business as a Minister with my sons and other family involved. I felt they were all educated and had professions and could make their own living without any help from me and I told them to go on their own. I taught them navigation and they could make a living any part of the world. I felt better in that position than to be in a position where my children would be dependent on me, or in which any position I held in Government would facilitate or help them in their field of life, and I still maintain that.

Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in land or even in the replacement of it anywhere. I think I own two spots of land somewhere in St. Mary's Church Yard and one or two in Westbury Cemetery. That is the interest I have in any land because I prefer the sea. If I should die and my family care to put me in either of them, they would be there although I would prefer the sea and they know that would be my wish. I have made no provision nor do I intend

to make any provision as far as looking for somewhere to go is concerned. I have a wife and one daughter that live at Fontabelle and my wife has brothers in Fontabelle who are old enough and can look after themselves, and I am not worried about where I go. I can go back to sea.

Mr. Speaker, this land is required for improvement. Part of the extension of the Harbour would be running along the line where the Polytechnic was after dredging and reclamation of part of that area where the shallow draft harbour will be, and it would be necessary to have all the houses removed from that area. I think there are about twelve houses from the President Kennedy Drive to where the old dungeon used to be, from Mitchell's property down to Mrs. Matthews' property called "Westgate" at the end. Although this may or may not be used in future for warehousing, this will be necessary as a sort of security for the area not to have houses there, because the shallow draft harbour will be placed along the site where the Polytechnic was. Further to the north there will be a reclamation of about 18 acres for bulk handling facilities. As far as I can see, the houses on the east side of Fontabelle will remain, but the twelve houses from President Kennedy Drive right down to that part of Lands End will have to be removed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Minister for Lands would like to allay the public's fears with respect to the price that is being paid for these lands. After all we have heard the Hon. Minister in charge of the Port telling us that he was at pains to make sure that the valuation placed on properties in which he had interest was not to be used as a basis for valuing other lands; so we take it for granted that that formula having been adopted, it would mean that the price for the land in which the Hon. Minister has an interest would have been arrived at at the last rather than being the first. It would mean therefore that the Hon. Minister for Lands would have gone through the whole gamut of things and would have undoubtedly at his finger tips the price arrived at in respect of each of those areas of land.

We must bear in mind that we have information to the effect that there are buildings, erections and appurtenances connected therewith, and with all this before us we would like to have matters rounded off to keep the public's mind at ease, because the hon. member for St. Michael North East attempted to hint

something to this Honourable House today, and I can bear out in some respect that there is some substance. We appreciate the fact that the hon. member was ultra cautious in approaching the matter, but I believe that as she grows up and gains a matter of self-confidence in her new role as party leader and independent member in this Honourable House that she will better be able to approach this man-sized task in the way we would wish to have her do.

2.55 p.m.

I believe that when she grows up she will be better able to approach this man-sized task in the way in which we would have her do. However, we would like to hear from the Minister what information he has as to the price in respect of these various properties.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I want to make it quite clear that the Solicitor General carries out negotiations with the owners and find out what they think their properties are worth. I would not wish to give a figure at any time to give a pattern for anyone to go by which might embarrass my colleagues. I do not even discuss it, not even the lands belonging to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is made.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to what members have had to say. With reference to the member for St. Philip North, he said that the lands are owned in part by a Minister and a Minister's wife. He suggested that, and as he put it, a friend of persons in the Democratic Labour Party, and therefore he hopes that there will be no enhancement in the value of the property.

The fact is that where you have persons close to the parties involved it can lead to the suspicion of inflation of prices being offered in compensation to certain persons. I want to make this statement that at absolutely no time has the Minister for Lands, my Cabinet colleagues or otherwise — and that includes the former Parliamentary Secretary now sitting on the other side — ever negotiated with anybody about ownership of land or price of land, and never at any time did any of us — and again this includes the hon. member for St. Michael North East pay anybody for any land being purchased by the Government.

I say that because no one can come here and give the impression that for one reason or another you can get an increase in price beyond what the valuers say. It is simple, Sir. When the

Government proposes to purchase a piece of land, where the Government decides in its wisdom to acquire that piece of land, it is out of the hands of any Minister or politician and goes to Government Officers. At no time does any Minister negotiate for the purchase of land for the Government. (*Aside: Do not say so*). That is the position. The Government has Valuation Officers, and a valuation is placed on the land which it is proposed to purchase. When that land is valued, that valuation is sent to the Crown Solicitor for him or any of his officers to negotiate with the owner of the property. The owner of the property can accept the offer of the Government or refuse it. The owner is free to get a valuation of that property from his or her own private sources; so that when the Crown Solicitor, who is the person who negotiates for the land for the Government makes an offer, the owner of the land has an idea before hand what that land is worth and then negotiations take place.

When agreement is reached with the Crown Solicitor and the owners of the property, the Crown Solicitor contacts my Ministry, he contacts the Permanent Secretary. He informs the Permanent Secretary that he wants so much money to pay for the land. That is the case with this set of lands and therefore at this point in time I do not know what the valuation is. It is for the Crown Solicitor and the owners of the properties to arrive at their own valuations and carry out their own negotiations. In the course of time I will make a complete disclosure to the House as to for how much the lands were acquired. That is my undertaking this afternoon.

I have heard a lot of nonsense advanced by persons who ought to know better claiming that Government was buying lands for \$2,000 when the land was worth \$7,000. I am quite willing to investigate this, but give me the facts because that hon. member must know from her own experience how unauthentic newspapers can be about matters relating to her work and matters relating to herself. I would like to know who the person is and where the person lives; I would like to get full details of how the Government has gone into purchasing land to the disadvantage of owners of land in this country.

3.05 p.m.

I want a full disclosure and I will investigate it. Some time last year Government came to this House to purchase land at Checker Hall. Government was purchasing around 60 acres of land at Checker Hall, I think that was the figure. The land is on the sea and the Government paid for this land at a rate less than 30 cents per square foot for land on the sea. It might look like a big figure, it was a big figure, but it was also a lot of land - that is what one has to remember - and it was beach land. This is land to be used for a commercial undertaking, Mr. Speaker, it is not land we are using to plant canes or yams or eddoes or cotton, for that matter, this is land used for a cement plant, a commercial undertaking, and you are going to come and tell me that land you are acquiring for a commercial purpose, beach land, not worth more than 30 cents a square foot?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, when you are dealing with 60 acres of land you do not talk about a square foot, you talk about so much per acre.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That holds good, Mr. Speaker, if you are purchasing land for a social purpose; if you are purchasing for an agricultural purpose I can understand it, I can understand that type of argument. If you are purchasing for a social purpose like housing I can understand it, and I can tell you, I do not know where you are going to get land at 30 cents a square foot today, because as this House knows or as some hon. members might know, we have been acquiring land in Free Hill and in some cases there are large areas of land involved and we cannot get it at 30 cents a square foot, we would not even offer 30 cents a square foot because you cannot get it at that price, and that is for housing, a social purpose, low income housing at that. The lands we acquired at Checker Hall were for a different purpose, a commercial undertaking, a profit making venture at less than 30 cents a square foot. Am I to understand that they would part with their lands to Government or to any other person at a lesser price than this? That, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much, but what I do deplore is the kind of innuendoes rampant in the discussions in Parliament, instead of discussing matters on their merits that we get a little innuendo here and a little innuendo there being put in to confuse issues, as though these are the only lands we acquire in this country.

We have acquired lands from members of the Opposition. We have acquired lands from a person who was a candidate in the 1971 General

Election; he is not a member of the House, and by all reports he is to be a candidate in the coming General Election again, and in between these two elections Government acquired land from this person, but you have not heard anything about that. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: If you want to know, I will call his name. He is Mr. Rannie Fields. Government acquired land from Mr. Rannie Fields in Christ Church, but because it is Mr. Rannie Fields it does not mean that Government does not need the land.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir, the new word seems to be "innuendo" but the Minister must not then fall into the area in which he is making a complaint, because the Minister knows full well that the only time we know of Government acquiring land is when specific questions are asked or when something like this arises, because the Government has made it so that they can acquire and pay for land without the knowledge of Parliament. Let them tell the public that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We compulsorily acquire land and we come here for it. He is right in a sense, but if we do not acquire it compulsorily we still have to make a disclosure to the House, we cannot acquire land secretly, because whenever we have acquired it we still have to come to the House and make a disclosure, we cannot acquire land secretly.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the member must not mislead the House, the only way this Chamber knows about land which Government has negotiated, as I said, is by a substantive question or in the case of acquisitions of this nature. When they speak about having acquired land from a member of Parliament, ask them if the purchase ever passed through this House. It only arose by virtue of a question being asked.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, that is absolute rubbish, because the Act requires the Government to make a disclosure, it is not done on a question. It may be done on a question. If hon. members want to ask a question nobody can stop them from asking a question. The member for St. Thomas asked a question and the reply was given, but one does not have to wait for that because the Minister has by law to give this

information, so when the hon. member for St. Thomas asked the question the information was given. Therefore, the information has already been given to the House, you do not have to table it a second time.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 27th April, at 12.00 noon.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to give notice of two Resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Permission has been granted; proceed.

Mr. HINDS: WHEREAS the records of National Housing Corporation reveal that one Elmena Mascoll occupied Lot No. 14 at Church Street Gardens in the parish of St. Peter since 1959;

WHEREAS the said Elmena Mascoll was a tenant, notwithstanding rent arrears, until the time of her death on 25th March, 1976;

AND notwithstanding the Certificate as to cause of death, the said Elmena Mascoll and five of her children, with three of tender ages — 13, 10 and six years respectively, together with three grandchildren occupied this Lot No. 14 eeking out an existence in a windswept, delapidated, termite-ridden shack the property of her landlord — the National Housing Corporation — wherein she became the victim of pneumonia amongst other ailments;

AND WHEREAS the said National Housing Corporation's neglect to maintain its property — to wit — a chattel house situate at Lot No. 14 above, in a condition fit for human habitation may be of some account;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House takes note of the National Housing Corporation's role in the matter of maintaining its houses, at all times (except in extraneous circumstances) in a condition fit for human habitation; and calls upon Government to view

with deepest sympathy the circumstances under which the late Elmena Mascoll lived and died; and to take immediate steps to remedy the hazards, the exposure to the elements and like conditions under which her young children now live, and to accord them, bearing in mind their tender ages, such assistance as their condition merits under the circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT

The Question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th April, 1976, at twelve noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

3.19 p.m.