
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th May, 1977.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read by Rev. Father Cayless.

Mr. Sandiford and Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 3rd May, 1977.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask that these Minutes be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to lay an Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended 31st March, 1977.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on behalf of the Minister of Labour and Community Services the Report on the Severance Payments Scheme for the years 1974 and 1975.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$250,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977–78, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 1, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we would be very glad if it is possible to do this Resolution today. It relates to sums of money necessary to keep Carib West Airways afloat while a decision is taken on its future. If the Opposition has no objection – we will not try to push it through against their wishes – but if they have no objection, we should be glad of the opportunity to deal with it today. The Opposition can take counsel among themselves and intimate later on if it is convenient for them.

NOTICE OF BILL

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1975.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1975, be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

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

ORAL REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Question No. 24 is ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we are not ready with Orders No. 1 and No. 2, and I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of Government Business.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill; but before Your Honour does that I would like to confirm that the proposed amendments have been circulated to hon. members. They should have been circulated this morning.

Mr. TAITT entered the House and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again, perhaps, I could ask the permission of the Opposition and say that the Government intends to move in Committee a number of amendments relating to the original proposals. They are a little more extensive than the amendments which were first circulated in the Bill which is now withdrawn. They change the penalty and they refer to Part III of the Bill. If hon. members are opposed, I do not propose to proceed further at this stage.
12.20 p.m.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to dealing with this matter because we appreciate that this arises from the Budgetary

Statement and Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance, and this is a necessary step that has to be taken. We would like to see these amendments before the debate on this matter is concluded.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Very good, Sir. We will not pursue that. At this stage, I beg to move that further consideration of Order No. 3 be postponed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Prime Minister did get the position, as stated by my colleague here correctly. We were not objecting to proceeding, if at some stage during the debate the amendments would become available, but we were not preventing him from proceeding inasmuch as we realise that this is the responsibility of the Government to proceed with the matter. We were not holding the Government up on this particular matter because we realise that these are problems which come up from time to time and, maybe, we will be a little more understanding of these problems than they were when they were in opposition.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will not pursue that. In that case, I withdraw that motion, with the leave of the House, Sir.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, before moving Clause 2, there are two deletions I would like to move. In subclause 6, line 5, delete the word "redeemed" and substitute therefor the word "deemed".

In subclause 55(3), delete the parenthesis appearing at the end of the word "accused". There are some typographical errors that came into the printing of the Bill, Sir.

I beg to move that Clause 2, as amended, stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would ask to insert a new Clause 3 in terms of the circulated amendments which are set out in 1 of the circulated amendments.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In seconding this, Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain that Section 221 of the Companies Act provides for Companies outside Barbados to be allowed to register in Barbados without reincorporation here. This is a common form. We have had very liberal company laws for a long time. Where, for example, I believe that in England statutes of Mort Main apply, and a company cannot ordinarily own real property in England without a licence from the Commissioners in Mort Main, in the Colonies as a result of a Grenada decision back in the 1780s, the laws of Mort Main have never applied and, therefore, the Colonies became fruitful hunting grounds for foreign Joint Stock Companies to own real property.

There has been a growth of these companies in recent years, and a number of companies registered in the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands have taken their place alongside such long established companies as the Banks and the Airlines, which normally do not have subsidiaries in Barbados but operate local branches of Overseas Companies. It was considered that all of these companies should — since they do not incorporate in Barbados and give employment to lawyers and their office staff to make out the necessary documents — pay fees rather more substantial than they had been paying in the past. In the past, if one turns to Chapter 308, it may be noticed that the fee is \$1.20 and, technically, I would not be surprised if the law has not really been that such companies as the Chase Manhattan Bank and Barclays Bank and so on could have filed — indeed Barclays Bank did file and paid the \$1.20 for the privilege of registering as a company in Barbados.

Some years ago it was sought to change this state of affairs by amending the Registration Office Act to provide that these foreign companies should pay, and I quote very roughly, “the same as companies incorporated in

Barbados.” I consider this to be a singularly infelicitous way of achieving the object of making them pay. It led to a lot of inconveniences as these over simplifications often do. I believe that Air Canada wished to register locally and found that it would have had to pay — I would not like to tell you how many thousand dollars. Then the Companies Act itself had certain amendments made to it. Now that we have looked at it, we see that the whole matter required further consideration.
12.30 p.m.

We have tried to give it such consideration in the Budget Speech and as a result of that we discovered that apparently the Judicial Advisory Council in its wisdom had repealed that part of the Schedule to the Registration Office Act which provides for the increased fees so that it seems that for the last year or two there should have been a reversion to the \$1.20. That would have been a matter of neglect, and of course the Registrar never, I think, allowed it. We have tried our best to carry the amendment where it properly belongs which is the Companies Act itself and not the Registration Fees Act, and this is the purpose of this amendment.

We partly did it in the first Bill that was submitted, but it was not done quite correctly. The paragraph 3 which we are now seeking to amend will increase the penalties for not registering under section 221 from \$240 to \$1,000 and the penalty of \$24 a day to \$100 a day. It is within the experience of many of us in our private capacity that many overseas companies do in fact fall into default of these provisions. In some cases it is wanted to sue an overseas company and it is often found that there is no officer properly designated to receive service of process. In many cases these overseas companies like Caymans Islands and other companies fail on their initial purpose. They get themselves into serious financial difficulties and they then do not carry out the provisions of the Companies Act, but we feel that some teeth need to be put into the penalties, and we are therefore asking for the penalties to be increased.

If one looks at subsection 7 it now reads there should be paid to the Registrar for registering any document required by this section to be filed by him a fee of \$1.20 or such smaller fee as may be prescribed. Well we are repealing this altogether and changing it to the form which will be seen in sub-paragraph 7 the fee specified in the paragraph 3, Table B of the first Schedule or such smaller fee as may be prescribed. That is to make allowances if we do

get a situation where there is a very large nominal capital and it is thought desirable not to charge quite so much.

There are one or two other matters. I myself wonder how the Registrar will handle the situation of North American companies that do not have par value shares, how he will determine what the share capital is, and I recall that I did suggest to him to have some definitional section giving him the power to deem a share capital to be such and such, but apparently the overseas companies do state what their worth is, and they do not seek to get around this by saying they have no share capital value, they state what they are quoted at at the Stock Exchange and multiply that by the number of issued shares and it seems this will create no difficulty.

It will be observed that we are imposing a minimum fee of \$500. We will come to that later on. As was said in the Budget Speech, we think that an overseas company should pay at least \$500 to be registered in Barbados; so a Barbados registered company will pay \$150, and an overseas company \$500. We think that these amounts are not unreasonable and with that explanation I hope that hon. members will be satisfied, and I beg to second that Clause 3 stand part.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister or the Minister who moved the Clause could indicate how or if the section 3 relates to the off-shore business companies Act. I have not been able to look at it. Is there any conflict at all?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I will reply very briefly to this. The off-shore business companies at present have to pay these fees, but their position will not be governed by the provisions of the Companies Act as such. Once they are registered as international business companies, we will have the power to prescribe different fees which we may or may not take, but as things are they have to pay these fees once they want to be regarded as a company at all. We may prescribe additional fees, less fees or no fees at all, in which case these will stand, but as things are they have to come in under this.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, just a small point. Ever since I have been in the House I have been calling, when we have had to deal with matters affecting company law, for the establishment of an inspectorate within the Registration Office or the Registry Department

to assist the Registrar who must ultimately have final responsibility in the policing of companies and the collection of default fines and so on. Here we are increasing the default provisions of this Act, but I would wish the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for the establishment to tell us to what extent the Government proposes in the future to create an inspectorate within the Registry to assist in carrying out the penal provisions of the Companies Act. I have said several times that I believe there are millions of dollars to be collected from companies which are in default of filing necessary documents and matters such as this before us today, and I think it is an essential area for the better administration of the company law in this country. I think I am fortified in that view by advertisements which I have seen in the newspaper recently in respect of the Central Bank who are advertising for, I think, one or two inspectors to help them carry out their functions of policing and I think we need this as a matter of urgency in the area of company law.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's point is well founded. It has been a complaint about the administration of the Companies Act that has been going for a considerably long time. I think the hon. member is aware that there is a new draft Companies Act and part of the reorganisation of the companies law will call for reorganisation of the administration of that law as well, but I am well aware, and I should like to inform the Committee and the hon. member that the Prime Minister has minuted the Registrar asking him to put up proposals for increased staff to deal with the problems of the administration of the Companies Act as well as other Acts like the Trade Marks Act, the Merchandise Act and the Patents Act which call for the collection of revenue in addition to dealing with the day to day problems which occur.

The hon. member is also aware that there are some problems in the Registry in terms of physical space and we are hoping that certainly within this five year period to complete arrangements for the improvement of the physical premises available to the Registration Office. There are various proposals before us some of which have been put up by the Bar Association. We have taken the Registrar's view on another proposal that came to us.

12.40 p.m.

I think I should clarify for hon. members how the amendments go in. In Clause 2, in addition to the amendments which I mentioned, I am also asking that the circulated amendments be included. In other words, the words in this Act referred to as the principal Act, be inserted after the words "the Companies' Act" in the first line of the existing Clause 2; and the Clause 1 above of the amendments will then come as the new Clauses 3 and 4 in the arrangement of the sections. I think this makes the position quite clear to hon. members.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we know the member for St. Philip North has been asking for certain additional staff for the Registration Office to deal with the penal provisions of the Companies Act. Even without that additional staff I believe there has been some notification going out from the Registrar's Office to companies which may have been in default about submission of certain information, maybe the register of shareholders, and so on; and I notice such information has been going out to companies. So it is good to know that the advice coming from the backbenchers is being taken note of. This is a good sign, and indeed I am certain that the advice coming from over here will be taken into account during this first five year period of the Barbados Labour Party government, which will probably be the only five year period for them.

Hon. deB. FORDE: Briefly, I think the hon. member raised the question of striking off companies. At present, the Registrar does take some steps to strike off defunct companies; not as many steps as perhaps we would have hoped, because I agree with the general statement that the administration of the Companies Act leaves much to be desired. And I again assure the hon. member that we intend to deal with that in the first five year period of the BLP government's life. Now the hon. member has no prophetic powers greater than anyone else in here; but if the performance of this government to date justifies anything, it certainly justifies a further five, plus another five years. I can assure the hon. member that despite what is said on the DLP platforms on the few occasions when they have returned to the public, we will not be abolishing elections, and hon. members on the other side can have the assurance they can run again. What I cannot assure them is that they will win their seats again, unless they perform much better.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg that Clause 2 be recommitted, so as to get the additional amendments in of which I spoke, because I think I moved them globally, but hon. members may not have followed the bill; certainly the Clerk at the table was at first a bit confused about it; so I move that Clause 2 be recommitted.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 2 be recommitted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to clarify the amendments to Clause 2. In addition to the two amendments of which I gave notice, like deleting the parenthesis after the word "accused" and deleting the word "redeemed" and substituting the word "deemed" in the subclause, I wish to move that the amendment set out in the circulated and printed amendments now be inserted in Clause 2, and that Clause 2 as amended with the arrangements of the sections set out in paragraph 1 of these circulated amendments stand part.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I hope that this is now the final form of the particular amendment. Maybe this is the type of good government efficiency the hon. member for Christ Church just spoke of, which will assure them of a second term. If this is the type of efficiency he is talking about, maybe the term will be shorter than five years. I do hope he has everything in order now and that as soon as we get through these amendments the government will be able to proceed with Item 1 and Item 2, which have had to be deferred, I believe, until certain documents arrived.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I thank the hon. member for his comment on our efficiency. I can assure the hon. member that these budgetary measures are coming to this House sooner than ever happened in the past government, Sir. As a matter of fact, Sir, some of the last budgetary measures were not brought at all. This Prime Minister has issued instructions to his Ministry, which have been passed on to the legal section, that we wish all of the budgetary proposals that need legislation either by way of regulations or Acts, before this Honourable House so that Parliament, the Supreme Body, can debate on them within this month, and certainly I hope that by June we will have cleared the Order Paper of all the budgetary measures, although we have three months in which to do so. And

already we are working on the next budget, and the hon. member will realize this as a sign of efficiency. Now it takes a little time to change structures, to change organisations, but the hon. member can be well satisfied that the Ministry of Finance will do things in an efficient way. They may not want to admit it; even the hon. member for St. Michael South West, Sir, when he speaks for fifteen to twenty minutes, I find it difficult to find anything concrete to say in criticism.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I really should not get involved in this debate, but I believe the hon. member has lost his senses since the election and therefore anything he says about the efficiency of this Government should be ignored, because he is complaining of certain amendments in a Bill before it has been passed in its final form, and what we are trying to do on this side is not to fall into the same position that he as a member of the last Government agreed to and allowed to happen. One example, if he has any memory, would be to look at the Land Tax Bill. Up to this day the Land Tax Bill as passed by his Government is not in any state that Solicitors, lawyers, tax-payers or Government can deal with it, and when we were in the Opposition we drew to the attention of the Government at that time that the Bill was not a complete Bill; it was riddled with errors; he sat on the front bench and did not have the guts to tell the Leader or who ever was piloting the Bill to go back and make amendments and make a proper Bill. One of the problems Barbadians face today is that for the past fifteen years that the DLP has been Government, they have made a hotch potch of the law in this country, with Bills, amendments, and amendments to amendments.

12.50 p.m.

I sat in this very House and saw the Leader of the House and the last Minister for Transport pilot a Bill through this House dealing with taxes on motor vehicles and amend the wrong Bill. The Prime Minister came down a few days later and said something else in his budget speech, came down a week after that and amended another Bill. I can tell you something, ask anybody who ever has to register a motor car, lorry or a cane cart and they will tell you that there was a mass of confusion. Up to now, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you something. Look at the Bills passed by his Government, particularly those dealing with Highways and Transport and Motor Vehicles, and they are still in utter confusion up to today, and

if we bring a Bill down and realise that something is not what it should be, what does he expect when you have a Cabinet of the most competent lawyers that ever graced the whole of the island of Barbados? What do you expect? To pass foolishness through the House? That is exactly what we are not doing. We are bringing our own personal skills to bear upon legislation that comes to Parliament so that when it leaves Parliament nobody can say that a bunch of lawyers have produced bad legislation. If we have to amend it once or twice before it is passed in its final form, I go along with that 101%, because when it gets out of in here the people outside who have to interpret it would know exactly what is meant, not like the legislation passed under the Democratic Labour Party. Check your legislation and you will see Bill after Bill has been amended within a month or two when the errors start showing up. That is what you must check and see.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, since hon. members have been kind enough to indicate that they would do the Carib West Resolution, I beg to move that the Resolution for \$250,000 of which notice was given earlier today be the next Order of Government Business.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House for this matter to be dealt with in all its stages. (PAUSE). I think it has been granted, Sir.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78
NO. 1

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I will disappoint some hon. members by making no references to El Toro and to the infelicities of Carib West and the things that have happened, the money that has been wasted, and so on, because these are matters which will come before a Commission of Enquiry and I have no wish to anticipate them at this stage. However, I must say that Carib West Airways could very easily adopt the old alleged signification, but with amendments, of BWIA. They used to say that B.W.I.A. stood for Britain's Worst Investment Abroad; Carib West could very well stand for Barbados' Worst Investment Abroad.

The Government put in \$500,000 the money was received by the company, I imagine out of ignorance rather than anything else in a technical breach of the Companies Act, because a company really cannot buy its own shares as at some stage appeared to be what was happening, and the further sum of \$500,000 was made available — and as I said, I cannot go into this because it is part of the Commission of Enquiry's terms of reference — a further sum of \$500,000 has proved insufficient bearing in mind the way it was disbursed to pull Carib West out of a financial hold.

1.00 p.m.

Now, Carib West has indeed exceeded its overdraft although I think that strenuous efforts were made to bring it down under the limit, and has fallen into another quarter million dollars debt. It finds itself back in the old position of having its aeroplane taken away and so on because it cannot pay its bills.

I am Minister for Civil Aviation, but I do not really profess to be an expert on airline operations. Those whose duty it is to advise me are unanimous in saying that without a vigorous promotion drive or a packet sharing agreement with other CARICOM airlines, Carib West cannot be viable by just bringing cargo from Miami and points North of Barbados, and not getting cargo to carry in the opposite direction.

For this reason the hon. member for Christ Church South Central is conducting an indepth survey of Carib West, about its potential and its viability. He has already started and is going to continue to investigate the possibility of regional co-operation in this area. We hope that now that the somewhat abrasive personality of the hon.

member for St. John in airline matters has been removed from the negotiating field, that we will be able to get a more fruitful meeting of minds in the area.

The Addendum to the Resolution indicates that through the assistance of the Caribbean Development Bank, an official of the Columbian National Airline is assisting us in conducting a feasibility study of Carib West to establish its viability and to enable the Government to reach a decision on the long term future of the airline.

In the meanwhile Carib West is still not in a viable position in as much as it cannot pay for the aircraft. Yet, for some reason while Carib West's receivables are not so great as to allow salaries to be paid and the ordinary day to day expenses, Carib West is not an airline which can be said to be under-managed. It has a well paid management staff. I did see the salaries list, and I said let me see how much better officials of Carib West are paid than I am. When I reached the fourth or fifth I said I did not wish to embarrass myself any more; but a casual glance convinced me that they must have nine or ten employees there who are better paid than Ministers of Government. I did not realise it at first, and I said you do not pay these high salaries. I only saw one that was greater than mine; and the official said very gently, "excuse me, Sir, they are US dollars that you are looking at."

It is necessary also for us to take a decision on the status of the overdraft. The negotiations relating to the overdraft are also in a very delicate position. The overdraft itself and the circumstances under which it arose from the apparent participation of the hon. member for St. John will form part of the deliberations of the Commission of Inquiry; and the manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia who sent up the document to the hon. member who signed has been informed that his evidence will be desirable, and he has been invited to give evidence before the Commission.

It is therefore very difficult, and I hope that hon. members will not press me; because the only answer I can give is that even though the proceedings have not started, they are in prospect of being *sub judice* and I think that this is really a case where we should apply the House's *sub judice* rule strongly. I do not see how anything could be said in here which would not prejudice proceedings if you were asked to bring them out in Committee.

With regard to the overdraft, we are continuing to negotiate with the same bank

manager who will have to give evidence. I do not want to say anything that will prejudice the proceedings. Carib West has an overdraft of \$500,000 and we are asking the House to appropriate \$250,000 towards this to ensure that the Government can claim something for this facility. These are all in prospect, even if they are not in public reality.

We are coming to the House to ask for this money. The original guarantee was entered into without the House being asked to discuss the matter. So if we cannot discuss the matter in as great a length as would be possible today, at some time in the future we can have a debate when the Minister can say what is intended for Carib West. We cannot deal with it in depth at the moment, and I will ask hon. members to forgive me for that. I will still ask them for assistance to keep Carib West running while the Commission of Inquiry plus the feasibility study are carried out — assistance to keep us running by enabling us to reduce the overdraft by this amount of \$250,000.

I beg to move that this do now stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I will assure the hon. member for St. Joseph that he is obviously right when he says that there are outstanding attorneys on the Government benches; but you know that there are always exceptions which prove the rule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The exception is now speaking.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You see what I mean? What point of ignorance is that? They will not press the Prime Minister on areas in which he does not want to be pressed. I would like to make the point that we believe that it is time the Government should make a clear and unequivocal statement on its aviation policies. When the Government was in Opposition it spoke very clearly and very eloquent and at length on the policies of Civil Aviation pursued by the then Government; and Carib West and ICA figured prominently in those analyses.

I think that the Government owes it to this country to make a clear statement on its Civil Aviation policies, particularly in view of its previously stated position while in Opposition about the need to rationalise air services and such matters. I am not going to expand on this in any way; but I am not aware of any statement setting out fully and clearly policies on Civil Aviation by the new Government. We have seen

certain developments about ICA and now we see certain moves in respect of Carib West.

1.10 p.m.

But in terms of the stated views expressed before and the fact that the Government now has, or the Party now has, the reins of Government, maybe, this whole position can be clarified at some future date. I would certainly, hope that the Government would pay attention to this particular matter.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, after the performance of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance on the question of ICA both in here and outside, I myself treat anything he says about airlines with the greatest reserve because if you know, Sir, the Prime Minister had some very strange things to say about the airline, ICA., when he was sitting on this side of the House, and, soon thereafter, when he was sitting on that side of the House, he had things to say which, apparently, were the complete opposite. I am not even going to raise the question as to whether he was speaking two truths: one from over here and the other from over there.

What I wish to say is this: I believe that if the Prime Minister is saying to us, and we have to be very careful with what has become a trade mark of a very subtle and very sugar-coated language pattern which, constantly, suggests that he is not about to make a statement, but when he is finished the innuendo and the implication of what he has said is stronger than anything he could, possibly, have said. I have got accustomed to that, and I believe most people in Barbados are getting accustomed to that particular method which the Prime Minister so brilliantly uses. I confess and I admit that, in that particular regard, he is probably, second to none.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, very briefly is this: If the Prime Minister is saying to us that this airline is in such bad shape — I remember listening to him when he was speaking in reply to one of the several Budgets that were delivered from the then Government; he talked about something you get in Economics I at Cambridge or Oxford, I do not remember, and I remember his saying that in the first six weeks you get a lesson. One of the lessons which, I am sure, he must have picked up in that six weeks as well is that you must not throw good money in after bad. I do not see how he could come to this House of Assembly and tell the people of Barbados that this airline appears to be totally hopeless, the situation is so unbelievable that I would rather you did not press me to tell you about it because it is going to be — (*Asides.*) Well,

the Commission of Inquiry will bring out all the slime or whatever it is. We would like you to take \$250,000 more and put into the airline for the time being, until we can straighten it out and find out if it is all right.

I say that if he had found that the airline is totally corrupt, totally unviable, that the thing to do is to close it down. You cannot take up the people's \$250,000 and put it in an airline which has the reputation which he did not tell us, but left us to understand. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it is the last part of the member for St. Michael South West contribution that causes me a little amazement. I understood the Prime Minister to be very careful in presenting this Resolution to say that, first of all, he is not omniscient or proficient in Civil Aviation matters and is, in fact, holding the brief of the substantive Minister of Civil Aviation. What he said is that there are certain problems and they have been certain problems of financing and proper capitalisation of this airline, which the airline itself does not seem able at the moment to get out of.

He went further. In the Addendum to the Resolution, which was circulated today, there is a clear statement that the airline is now subject to a feasibility study by an expert from Columbia, given to us by the Caribbean Development Bank, and that before any final decision is made to close the airline, or to write it off as an unviable prospect, to throw people out of employment and things like that, he would wish to come here armed with all the necessary background information including the feasibility study for the long-term future of the airline so that he would be able to justify the case, but in the interim — you just do not close down owing the lessor \$250,000, Trevor Mayers, Colin Mayers and the employees of the Company so much money that they have not been able to draw! Sometimes they work without drawing money! Do you know that? You cannot just close it down.

It seems to me to be a very unreasonable posture for the member for St. Michael South West to adopt. All we are saying is that if a decision is made to close the airline, or to continue with the airline, the decision would be made on the basis of informed opinion. Of course, the member for St. Michael South West would wish us to close it down so that he would be in a position the next time he chairs a meeting, rather than be a front-line speaker, one of the financial wizards of the Party, but he can only chair the meeting. He cannot talk for an hour like the others. He would wish to be able to

go and tell the general public: "They were employing so many Barbadians and they closed it down. More people are thrown out of jobs." You are advocating unemployment, but not for this Government. We have to be two thoughts ahead of you all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to hear the Prime Minister say that in the management structure of the Company, it would appear that the wages and salaries of various individuals are so handsome as to be disproportionate to the general capital structure of the Company. I think that an auditor looking at the financial statement, or the financial position, of the Airline would probably recommend a reduction in salaries or some reorganisation to make the position of salaries more proportionate to the general capital structure of the Company. Some people talk about debt equity ratio and things like that. Well, that could be part of the debt equity ratio, Sir. Again, you just do not throw off people or reduce their salaries like that. You look at the long-term position, and that is one of the things the Columbian will have to take into consideration. He will have to look at the staff structure, the present salaries, the possibility of income over a period of time in relation to salaries and determine and advise the Government as to whether the project is going to be feasible.

I cannot support the point made by the member for St. Michael South West that we should just come here and say that we have been throwing good money after bad for so long that we should shut it down. The Government is going to carry out a study of Carib West, and based on the results of that we would take a decision. That is as I understand the Prime Minister's position. When we were in opposition we criticised the fact, and I was one who spoke on the matter last year, Sir. We criticised the fact that it appeared that Government had become a shareholder in Carib West and this House of Assembly, including the members on the then Opposition, were not told a word about it. The point that I made when I spoke in the debate was, How is it we could read in a newspaper report that Government had become a shareholder? It, therefore, suggested that money from the public coffers of this country had been invested in Carib West and we in the House had no say in it. As far as I was concerned, that was not the way that Government money should be spent. We think that just as a decision is being made about North Point and we had to come here for interim financing, if you call it that, some months ago to pay the workers up to the end of the Financial Year before the whole future of the North Point

is determined, then in the same way we are doing it in respect of Carib West.

1.20 p.m.

For the time being we are giving them an interim advance to keep the lessor happy, to pay some of the wages and other liabilities which the airline has and ultimately as the Prime Minister has promised, the House will have the full picture put before it for its consideration as to the future of the airline.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Hon. Prime Minister a couple of points. The Addendum states that a sum of \$250,000 is required as an interim financial measure to reduce the overdraft which Carib West Airways Limited has, so I assume I am right in saying it will not be eliminating the overdraft and that there will still be some overdraft left. Now some money has already been put into Carib West by the Barbados Government, maybe for the same purpose of giving it some financial viability, but that has failed, and what I would like to know at this stage is what guarantee do the members of the House and the people of Barbados have that another infusion of \$250,000 into Carib West at this stage is going to prevent a repetition of the same type of mismanagement or whatever word you care to use from occurring subsequently to the injection of this money, because if you were to put in money now and later on you are going to find that there will be in as bad a position as they were when we put in the first \$500,000, we will have to ask if there is any wisdom in putting this money in. I accept all that is being said about the enquiry, but if you are putting money into Carib West, we would like to be assured, and when I say we I mean the people of Barbados, that there is to be some benefit not only to the airlines, but also to Government and the people by putting this money in there. If this money is being put in there to reduce the overdraft and not necessarily to put the company on a financial footing that would allow it to survive without having to come soon again to Government or may be go to the Bank again for more money or to hear later on that the overdraft has gone back up to the level from which we are now trying to reduce it, I do not think it is worthwhile and I hope the Prime Minister will take the opportunity to assure us that some good benefit is going to be obtained by putting this money in again, bearing in mind that we have already put in \$500,000 into that operation to give it financial viability, and that did not achieve that. I want to know if there is any hope of this sum of money achieving something like that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to say something now, and if arising out of it anything transpires I will be glad to deal with it further. First to deal with the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I must say I am not accusing him of being untruthful, and this is not even the prelude of a remark which will convey it, but he should be advised to look at any book of quotations and look at all the aphorisms that have been uttered to the effect that all politicians sooner or later choke upon their own lies. I take that to be part of the substance of what he was saying about the Government's *volte-face* but I would recommend to him if he wants to see where the lies lie to read carefully what was said about ICA by hon. members on this side including myself before the election and what is now said. It is becoming an article of faith repeated in the newspapers who I think sometimes take the statement that is said loudest and most often as being the truest and most worthwhile, that the Barbados Labour Party made some particular attack on ICA as an airline or as an operation, or upon the honesty of those who were concerned at the Laker end before the election. Our attacks in here first of all were on the then Government for not bringing to the House of Assembly the circumstances in which ICA became Barbados' National airline.

The speech which I made in here, if hon. members would care to look up Hansard, was to the effect that what kind of airline was it that you could buy for \$349,000, and I said then that the transaction was a sham transaction designed to assist Laker Airways into getting a toe hold in the United States. I said it and some months subsequently to that the Civil Aeronautical Board of the United States bore out that what I had warned was correct, because exactly on the grounds that Government's ownership of ICA was a sham was ICA's application to fly scheduled routes to the United States rejected. We also said in here that ICA could not be called a Barbadian airline when there was no office in Barbados, no Barbadian pilots, at the instant time there was then no Barbadian directorate — that was changed under the last Government — and when the only staff are a few Barbadian girls I said if they want — I remember vividly because this corresponded to my own experience — to fly ICA, all they had to do was to go and put up a decal over the Laker Airways body-work marked International Caribbean Airways and sometimes they did not even bother with that.

I well remember one day trying to come back from London on ICA. I think we got to Luxembourg and then went back to London on

one aeroplane. We then took off on another aeroplane marked Laker Airways and came back to London and we did not eventually get to Barbados until a later stage still on yet another aeroplane marked Laker Airways, and we have always attacked the Government, not ICA...

Mr. TAITT: If the Hon. Prime Minister would give way, I believe that the Prime Minister may have looked at one of his speeches on ICA. I invite him to look at page 7080 of Hansard. There he would see what he had to say about Laker Airways spelt out very clearly, and then he can go to the Advocate of February 24 and see what he had to say about ICA, and we will have a clear picture of what I meant when I said that I treat whatever he says about airlines with the greatest reserve.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member is referring to the fact that I made a speech referring to Mr. Freddie Laker losing a case relating to airline licences at a particular time, he is absolutely correct. Mr. Laker had many cases. I hear that the hon. member for St. John has since said at that time he had won one. You cannot win them all and equally you can't lose them all sometimes. Laker may have won one, lost others and so on. If the hon. member reads further into the speech he will see that I commented on the ownership of International Caribbean Airways as revealed at the Registry in Bridgetown being divided into three — one-third Laker Airways, one-third a company in the Bahamas, I think it may have been called International Air Services, and one-third another company in the Channel Islands, and I asked, and I am quoting from memory and I hope the hon. member would be able to bear me out and if I have quoted myself correctly will admit it, I asked how could the Government have a half share of purchases from Laker Airways if Laker Airways only had a one-third share. These are the sort of matters which I dealt with, and I indicated how we had had an investigation made in the Bahamas as to who owned the Bahamas Company and we discovered it was a lawyer, an office messenger, and typist and so on. All that is in the speech. I observe that it is not only the hon. member for St. Michael South who is a fan and a devotee of the words that have fallen from my lips from time to time, but that the hon. member for St. Michael South West has wisely joined him in that exercise of political education.

1.30 p.m.

I observe that it is not only the hon. member for St. Michael South who is a fan and devotee of the words that have fallen from my lips from time to time. The hon. member for St.

Michael South West has wisely joined in that exercise of political education. But there is this difference between the two hon. members; in that the hon. member for St. Michael South reads the whole speech; evidently, the hon. member for St. Michael South West is reading a transcription which he or others have prepared apart from the speech.

Mr. TAITT: If you would give way Sir. Not only is he prepared to say that he is the best speaker in the world, he is even able to see through everything we have here and know exactly what I am looking at.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member said it, not me, Sir. I thank him for his kind words and his kind thoughts, but I must assure him I am not omniscient; he must not in any way regard me as infallible. I would not like him in this day and age to go away with any kind of complex which would stop him from sleeping at night.

This basically is the position we have taken with ICA; we have always said that the Government's dealings with ICA needed exposure; and we particularly said this in our Manifesto. We said that the general public still does not know the full term of Government's contact and contracts with Mr. Freddie Laker and Laker Airways. We went on to say in our Manifesto that the few facts which are available about this whole business points to the conclusion that the intention of Laker Airways was to get a toe hold into the USA. Now having said that ICA is not truly a Barbadian Airline, and that one of the reasons is that it does not have an office in Bridgetown, are we then, when we get it to come to Bridgetown and open an office, going to criticise it? This is the burden of our criticism, that ICA must be made a genuine Barbadian institution. And we see the signs that it is being made a genuine Barbadian institution; but when we say good things about it we are attacked for inconsistency. Who then is inconsistent, Sir? Those who do not understand the language of the criticisms that we level at them; those who could sit down in Cabinet and wallow in the mire of ignorance dealing with major matters of this sort so that they are incapable of even seeing the mistakes which were made, and then when the mistakes are corrected say that there is inconsistency.

Mr. TAITT: Irrespective of the mire of ignorance which may have existed in the Cabinet, according to the Hon. Prime Minister, the point that was made had nothing whatever to do with the mistakes about ICA. The point I made was

that the Prime Minister said one thing in here when he was in the Opposition and when he became the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and went to open the office in Bridgetown, he said something else. I am sure that if he himself would only read the two things, he would be highly amused that he could have been so transparent on that occasion, for usually he is not so.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member can quote a contradiction between what I said in here and what I said at the opening, I congratulate him. He is saying that there is a contradiction, and I am trying to explain that there is no contradiction; and he is answering me by saying yes, there is a contradiction. Well, if he can quote it, throw it at me; that is all I can say. But I do not want to dwell upon this; what I said at the opening of ICA stands. I have often travelled on ICA — I said that at the opening — and I welcomed the opening of an office of ICA in Bridgetown and I welcomed the fact that ICA was contributing at the time of the opening of the office — and we could very reasonably say since the change of Government, although I really wouldn't want to take credit for it — ICA was contributing to the expansion of tourism from the continent of Europe, and none of these things have I ever spoken of in terms of inconsistency. So I think it is time to lay to rest this nonsense about the Prime Minister of the Government saying one thing in Opposition and now saying something else. We have ICA to run Sir; and we are going to benefit from the mistakes made by the previous Government.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South asked for a general comment on policy. This will have to come following the feasibility study; sufficient to say that the notion sought to be given the public that there was some kind of agreement to make ICA the national carrier is quite untrue; when one considers its source, however, one should not be surprised. This was a notion sought to be given by the hon. member for St. John. One should not be surprised at its untruthfulness, but it is in fact untrue. There has never been any shadow of agreement for making ICA the regional air carrier — I beg your pardon — make Carib West the regional air carrier; we are getting on to Carib West now. British West Indian Airways does a lot of cargo work; so does British Guyana Airways.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I sit and hear the Hon. Prime Minister from time to time making statements which appear as if he is making them on the authority of proof. I can

state categorically that I attended the Heads of Government meeting at which was discussed the joining of BWIA as a regional air carrier and that Carib West would take a front role as a regional cargo carrier. So that to say it is untrue coming from the member for St. John is misleading.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is not a point of order you know.

Mr. TAITT: Well Mr. Chairman, whether it is a point of elucidation.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would have been happier if the hon. member had said that the hon. member for St. John never said that Carib West would be the regional carrier; because the hon. member for St. John did not in fact say that it was agreed that Carib West would be the regional carrier; he suggested and he implied it; and his acolyte is now saying, yes it was agreed. I have the Cabinet file here in front of me.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir. The Prime Minister surely ought not to get up in front of my face and accuse me of saying something I did not say. I know he is defective in some areas, but surely it cannot be his hearing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No point of order, Sir. He said it was discussed. To tell the honest truth Sir, I really never said it was not discussed. I only said it was not agreed, so I thought when he contradicted me for saying it was not agreed that what he meant was it was agreed. Apparently, to say it was not discussed is to contradict it was not agreed. Well, I cannot deal with that kind of argument; it is not even sophistry, just ignorance. I sat personally at a Heads of Government meeting at which it was discussed.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, he said it was an untruth; that is what I heard him saying; he did not say anything about not agreed. These shifting sands of his language may confuse some of his colleagues, but not me. I heard him say it was untrue.
1.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I cannot say any more. I hope he has got it now, that he will write it down, take it home and study it, and with his great command of the English Language deal with it in his own way at his own time. If that is an argument I am losing I really have to wonder who the referee in this particular fight will be. The point is that it was never agreed that Carib West Airways would be a regional carrier, and in my outline I indicated this. I said that Carib West Airways' viability probably depends on such an agreement.

To deal with the objections and questions of substance which were made, I would like to compliment the hon. member for St. Michael North Central for making the basic commonsense point about this whole thing. Do not go and throw good money behind bad. That is the substance, I think, of what he has said. The hon. member for St. Michael South West also said though putting it in not quite such a cogent way as the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, close it down if it is not viable. I am very surprised to hear hon. members putting forward the closure of Carib West Airways whose purchase was after all one evidently of the high points of their regime. Carib West has had a lot of good money put into it already, much of that good money has gone into paying past debts, this is why it has no working capital.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, on a point of elucidation. I do not wish them to go out saying that I indicated that Carib West should be closed. There was a condition, if Carib West is in the state which by inuendo the hon. member said it was, then instead of coming here and asking for money he should close it down. I wish to make it clear that is the position I took.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Oh, dear me, Sir, it is a very dangerous thing in this House to try to give credit where credit is due, and it is even more dangerous to try to give credit where credit is not due to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. When I complimented the hon. member for St. Michael North Central I saw the hon. member for St. Michael South West making signs with his arms that he should be complimented too. I tried to compliment him and that is the answer I get. Why did I do it in the first place? You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Why did I do it? Lord above in heaven, I really ask to be delivered from this turbulent member, because I like the debate and the cut and thrust to be of a high standard in here. I have left the sixth form a very long time ago, and the third form an even longer time ago. I cannot get back down in there with any comfort.

The point about this \$250,000 is this. The former Prime Minister did sign a document purporting to be a guarantee. At an early stage I called the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia in and I said to him that there would be a Commission of Enquiry and so on, but whatever the result the Government was going to stand by at least as much of the purported

guarantee, whether it was lawful or not, as represented the Government's shareholding in Carib West Airways. Therefore we are committed to that extent, and subject to parliamentary approval, this being part of that, we are committed to that extent to put in more money there. If hon. members see the point, the whole overdraft is \$500,000, I think the Government's shareholding on issued shares is 72%, therefore theoretically we are committed if Parliament approves on the initiative of the Government, I think it is \$360,000, in that region. This \$250,000 forms a part of that and will have to be paid whether Carib West is viable or not, as long as Parliament feels that the former commitment is qualified and it is a minimum qualification as qualified by my own discussions, as long as Parliament feels, that is correct.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, I would like to find out something from him. Is this commitment legally binding on the Government?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know which commitment you mean, but I do not think either is legally binding. The hon. member is asking me to anticipate the results of the Commission of Enquiry. My view is that guarantees of debts by the Government have to be approved by Parliament. That is my view as fortified by opinion. Whether the Commissioners will come to the same conclusion is a different matter, but Parliament can commit, and this is what we are asking to do now, this is exactly what we are asking Parliament to do, we are asking Parliament to pay off part of the overdraft, and we are saying that we cannot tell you whether there is a legal duty to do it or not, but should it turn out as a legal duty to do it, well that part of the overdraft will no longer exist, so we will have discharged that part of the legal duty. If there is no legal duty to do it, we have asked Parliament for the legal authority to do it as a matter of policy.

I hope that explains to the hon. member that in fact this amount we are asking to have voted today the Government would be asking even if we were closing down Carib West. We do not have to do anything to close it down, all we have to do is pay no attention to anything. Inaction might close it down by itself. Indeed if we were sufficiently discouraged without saying anything or putting anything on paper, I believe that if we pay the Bank of Nova Scotia the whole \$360,000 and say that is an end to that, I believe it would close down. I believe that the Bank will take that and would

be glad to have it and would put an end to the whole operation, but we are asking them not to put an end to the operation until the feasibility study comes on and until we can decide on the future, but in the meantime — I suppose hon. members will think of it as a moral commitment — a part of the moral commitment of the Government we are seeking to discharge by means of this Resolution and this is why I commend it to the attention of hon. members. Close it down or keep it, this money is still payable. That is really what it comes to.

Dr. CADDLE: One more point. How long is this feasibility study going to take? Is it not possible that if it takes too long they could run up another overdraft, and due to our commitment as a Government we will be called upon to pay still?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, it is made unmistakably clear that the Government's commitments stop at a certain point. The point so far is 72% of the overdraft. That has been made unmistakably clear, and when I say the Government's commitments I mean policy commitments, they stop at a certain point. What arrangements Carib West Airways is then able to make with the banks, what convictions they can give their creditors that they can get out of their morass is a slightly different matter in which Government is involved at management level, and that is a different matter about which I really can say nothing at the present time. But as far as the Ministry of Finance's commitments — well, this is not a Ministry of Finance Resolution — but as far as the financial commitments are concerned it is "X" and no more. We are not telling the bank that it has *carte blanche* to go ahead and do as it likes and we will bail it out. Is that satisfactory?

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

ON the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one money Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
1.50 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Question Time be now taken until 2.15 p.m. Since hon. members will hold off private matters today and then we can proceed with Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand that that is a wish of the House? I ask that because Standing Orders were not suspended.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that it is the wish of the House that we now go into Question Time, notwithstanding the relevant Standing Orders. It is now Question Time.

QUESTION RE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS RIVER BAY GULLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 24 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: Is the Minister aware that travel from Hope Road, St. Lucy to Pie Corner, St. Lucy and on to Boscobelle, St. Peter and the East Coast Road could be considerably improved by the construction of a bridge across the River Bay gully and a road connecting to Bishop's Tenantry Road, St. Lucy? Will the Minister consider the feasibility of constructing the bridge and connecting road?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:—

The benefits likely to be derived from the construction of a bridge across River Bay Gully and a connecting road do not at present justify the expenditure which such a project is estimated to cost. However, the proposal will be considered within the context of any future major development in the northern section of the country and in particular a northward extension of the East Coast Road.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further questions, this brings us to the end of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday next at 12. o'clock noon.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in seconding that, now that the hon. member for St. Lucy is here, relating to the Order Paper for next week, since there is a Private Member's Bill relating to the Holidays with Pay Act, I will submit now or at a later stage that this cannot be in order because there are a number of employees of Government who may be affected by the Holidays with Pay Act; and if you seek to extend the Holidays with Pay Act to that extent you seek to extend the charge on Government which can only be done by a Minister. Casual employees would still be able to go to court in their separate right of

holiday; and there are a number of corporations supported by funds voted from the Treasury which would be affected. It is not the principle of the Bill but the fact that it is a Bill moved by a private member which will impose a charge on the revenue and therefore cannot be dealt with in this form.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 17th May, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2 p.m.