
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd November, 1982.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. Hinds, J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.D (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Leader of the House)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite
J. G. Odle, B.Sc.
B. M. Taitt, B.A., (Hons.), M.A., LL.B., (Hons.)
Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A.
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw
L. L. Sisnett, Esq.
Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.)
P. M. Greaves
R. E. Brathwaite
Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman
L. A. Weekes
M. A. King
W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
N. K. Simmons
H. A. Blackman
A. Truss

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, Mr. L. E. Sandiford and Dr. R. C. Haynes entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, November 16, 1982.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of November 16, 1982 be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by honourable Members, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1982.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Community Services, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report of the National Assistance Board for the period April 1981 to March, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of:

A Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1982.

A Resolution to approve of the lease of land at Prescod Boulevard to Mill Reef Company Limited.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South; his notice of motion respecting the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the Government of Barbados has signed an agreement entitled a Memorandum of Understanding

with certain governments of the Commonwealth Caribbean relating to security and military co-operation; and

WHEREAS by that Memorandum the people of Barbados are being called upon to commit their financial, physical and human resources upon an undertaking; the concept, scope and implications of which have not been discussed either in principle or substance by the representatives of the people in Parliament;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly

- (i) condemn the Government for the manner in which Barbados is being committed to this undertaking, and
- (ii) call upon the Government to give an assurance that in the future it shall seek prior authorisation from this House before entering upon such firm and solemn agreements involving regional or foreign governments.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on the last occasion, we sat, I gave notice that Question No. 16 was ready, but we did not do Private Members' Business, and I would like to inform the House that the Question is still under consideration.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day. Order No. 5.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1982

Order No. 5 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1982.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, although I might have preferred to wait a little longer to deal with the three Orders which appear on the Paper relating to the salaries of Members of Parliament, on the principle that we usually wait until the end after everybody else, including the judges and the Governor-General, has been dealt with; on this occasion, due to the misrepresentation which have appeared in the newspapers, I have thought it desirable to depart a little bit from the usual procedure to reiterate the Government's stand upon the matter of parliamentarians salaries — the salary of the Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary

Secretaries and Members of Parliament — so that we are not subjected, once again, to misrepresentations about the subject.
12.30 p.m.

The salaries of Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, and, to a lesser extent, the Members of the House, as a matter of policy, have been agreed by the Government to be fixed in relation to the salaries which civil servants get. The policy of this Government is that, whenever civil servants get a salary increase, Ministers of Government and Members of Parliament will get salary increases in the appropriate proportions. We believe that this policy is morally justifiable in itself and is also justifiable on the grounds of political wisdom and common sense.

We think that it was an error for the House ever to have set separate periods and separate criteria for the raising of the salaries of its Members. The period for both used to be five years, broadly speaking. Then, when civil servants were narrowed, Members of the House allowed their own salaries to go on unraised for a very considerable length of time.

There is always one point of view in the Opposition that when you are in Opposition you must oppose salary increases, and there is usually another point of view in the Government that you must appear to give salary increases only unwillingly and only when dragged to the post.

I want, and I have said so in the House on two previous occasions, to put an end both to hypocrisy and, as far as possible, to contention. We stated — it must be six years ago now — that our policy was that Ministers' salaries would go up at the same time, and as far as possible by the same percentage as civil servants at comparable grades.

The Ministers' salaries were fixed at a point just a few dollars above the pensionable emoluments of senior civil servants. I think that, if it is examined, it will be found that a Minister's salary is now perhaps not even as much as \$100 a month more than that of a Grade A Civil Servant. I have not got the new S.1 grade to hand, but it will be found to be very near to that of a Minister, and, of course, all the Permanent Secretaries are now eligible for promotion to the S.1 grade, no matter in which department they serve, after ten years as a Permanent Secretary.

The Order now before the House reflects the Government's decision to give exactly the same increase to Ministers and the Prime Minister, and Parliamentary Secretaries, as civil servants were given — \$108 per month.

To those who look on the Prime Minister's salary — it is, in fact, my salary, but still there it is — as being nearly \$100 000 a year, the increase represents something like 1.5 per cent to the Prime Minister. In fact, it is the only increase I get, because I do not have a travelling allowance, unlike other Members of the House, and that is my increase.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not defending it, I appreciate the sentiments of the Attorney General and the Leader of the House. I do not mean to be defensive, but I am going over on the defensive now.

I just want to make it clear to the Press and to everybody that Ministers and the Prime Minister have got exactly the same increase as everybody else. The increase is 20 per cent for some, it is 1 per cent for me, but it is a cash increase, full stop.

Now, I read in the Press that Mr. Frank Walcott, who, whatever his virtues are, the virtue of the avoidance of intemperance of speech has never been particularly well developed, has apparently been misled by his advisers, since I do not believe that Mr. Walcott has any intimate familiarity with salary scales himself, into thinking that, in the matter of travelling allowances, different percentages have been awarded to Members of the House from those awarded to civil servants.

The *Nation* specifically said so. It also said that I will receive an increase in my entertainment allowance. That is a lie. I have not received any increase in my entertainment allowance, I have not received any increase at all in any allowance. All the other Members of the House have had additional increases, but I alone, as it happens, will only get \$108 a month. This particular burning deck is occupied by only one boy.

What has apparently escaped the attention of the Press and of Mr. Walcott, although in this instance I am very happy to say that I do not think that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has jumped in with both feet in a musket, what has escaped attention is that travelling rates for civil servants were raised by 31 per cent. Commuted travelling allowances have been raised by 31 per cent for Civil Servants, and the ordinary per mile travelling rate, for those who do not get commuted allowances, has also been raised by 31 per cent. There is therefore no other percentage by which the allowances for Cabinet Ministers could be raised.

If honourable Members can tell me that the burden of travelling is any less on a Member of Parliament than it is on a civil servant, who, perhaps, travels when he drives from home to Government Headquarters and back home, I will listen to the representations. But I cannot believe that those of us who have to travel to St. Lucy,

St. Andrew and St. Philip, or who may live in Christ Church and have to travel to St. James, or live in St. James and have to travel to St. George or wherever — I do not know where all honourable Members live — live between Black Rock and Inch Marlow and have to travel to St. John, as the case may be, if you tell me that those honourable Members are less entitled to a travelling allowance than civil servants, I would politely have to disagree with you.

So the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, comes over to me as no more or less than an effort to lay on the whip where the target is missing, to flog the dead horses that have died and have been buried long ago, and to misrepresent, yet once again, the situation of the Government in respect of policy decisions.

You cannot even say this is new. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Barbados Workers' Union and the NUPW alike have not emphasised the percentage increase that they got in travelling allowances. That is what has happened. They have emphasised the \$108 a month which is the salary increase, but they have not emphasised the fact that the travelling allowance, which is a calculation — it is not capriciously arrived at — went up by 31 percent.

12.40 p.m.

The travelling allowance, Mr. Speaker, is calculated on the basis of the cost of a motor car of a particular size including duty and Consumption Tax, on the cost of gasoline, on the cost of spare parts and the cost of oil and so on. The average price of a motor car is worked out and depreciation is estimated. The cost of so many hundred kilometres a month of the average consumption per kilometre of gasoline of that model car is then factored in. An estimate is made of garage repairs, on the basis of what the civil servants own representatives put forward to the Government, and an assessment is made of the cost of spare parts.

These things are brought together and the NUPW, the Workers Unions and the Establishment Divisions of Government then battle. I felt, myself, that the depreciation allowance was a little bit too big. I felt that many people get commuted allowances and, perhaps, do not travel, but it is all hammered out and the figures are arrived at.

There was complete agreement by the Barbados Workers Union on the appropriate figure for travelling. We negotiated with them for postmen travel. I believe we may even have negotiated with them for the watchmen who just had bicycles — how much you give a man for bicycle maintenance. I believe that somewhere buried in the agreement, there is Bicycle Travelling Allowance,

In the case of motor cars, the per mile allowance is worked out and then the commuted allowances are then also worked out. The computed allowance, when it was worked out, it happened to be 31 percent more. I, myself, thought it high, but you cannot go back to the negotiating process.

The negotiating process revealed that the cost of cars has gone up, the cost of gasoline has gone up, and, therefore, people should be paid more for using their own vehicles to travel on Government's business. It came out at that, so be it. And I believe that not only have civil servants been receiving it, but we have even had Supplementaries in here to give effect to the new rates in particular departments. Certainly, I have seen such Supplementaries; whether they have reached Parliament or not, I cannot recall.

It is agreed that a Travelling Allowance is payable to Members of Parliament. We do not get car loans, although the Government has taken a decision that there should be no difference in principle between a Member of Parliament and the senior civil servants in respect of the matter of car loans. We cannot see, if you tell people they have to represent constituents all over the country, why they should be any less eligible, once they can pay the loans on time, than anybody else. That will come, no doubt, in a few months, if it is all crystalised, Mr. Speaker.

We do not get car loans, but we get a travelling allowance. There is no other measure to increase the travelling allowance by, except the same measure that you apply to civil servants; and yet we have to put up with Senator Greaves, with Mr. Frank Walcott and other people abusing the Government for increasing Members of Parliament salaries.

There does not seem to be anything we can do, Mr. Speaker. You chose the most fair and the most equitable method possible — and yet you find yourself under criticism. I know I have no apologies for this.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I agree it has no stay in power. I never even heard anybody complain to the electorate in 1981 about parliamentary salaries; but big on the front page of the newspapers, Members of Parliament must not get increases.

It is not any Member of Parliament of this side who put the American rate of interest up to 16 per cent so that, ultimately, tourists do not come to Barbados. I only wish that they paid Members of Parliament and the Minister of Finance a bonus according to Government revenue; tie our wages to Government revenue and unemployment, or something like that. I would not mind

them coming down sometimes, but I know they would go up high. That is what I know. We doubled the standard of living in this country in five years. Our salaries were not doubled. *(Applause)*.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more to say. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we are hearing today that it is the policy of the Government that whenever civil servants' salaries are revised — my own expression — that the salaries and emoluments of Members of Parliament should also be revised. The expression used by the honourable Member who has just sat down is that it is morally justified, it is politically wise and, in my own words now, conforms to the dictates of common sense, which is his expression.

The honourable Member went on to say that it is an error of the House to set separate criteria and times for its members for exercises of this nature, and that it is wrong for Members of the House to go on to allow their salaries, to use his expression, to be unraised when the salaries of members of the Civil Service are revised. He then proceeded to pronounce on an axiom that it is an Opposition practice to oppose salary increases and it is the position for the Government to appear to be unwilling to introduce those increases.

Now right at the outset I wish to say this: the Public Service Unions, using a generic term, commenced negotiations with the Government on the basis of collective bargaining; and after two or three short meetings, the encounter was terminated. No one in their right senses could compare the two or three short meetings which the Government had with the Public Service Unions this year, after a pre-emptive strike had been made by the Governor of the Central Bank and the Minister of Finance themselves, long before the negotiations started, by firing a shot across the bowels of the negotiators by saying that there would be no negotiations at all.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, the debates on salary increases in 1976, the Official Debate on salary increases. At that time, my recollection is that the Government and the public workers unions had 18 meetings, no less than 18 meetings, lengthy meetings, with no pre-emptive shots fired across the bowels of the negotiators before they entered into these negotiations. Eighteen meetings with the various representatives of the public officers in this country, capped off by three meetings between me, as Minister of Finance, and the representatives.

It is significant that a gentleman, who is a Senator now and who was the President of the National Union

of Public Workers, because he was in closer consultation with the then Leader of the Opposition than he was with his own people, he has now been rewarded by being elevated to a high office and will no doubt be a beneficiary of the debate which has been instituted today.

12.50 p.m.

None of the meetings that I presided over, the 19th, 20th or 21st meeting, did he grace with his presence, but he came into this Chamber.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Walking in from outside? He did not sit. You can only rise after you are sitting. He has now risen.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order; the honourable Member must not reflect on the behaviour of a member of the Other Place, and he has reflected on his motives.

He said that he negotiated with him on the basis of friendship with the Opposition and he was rewarded by elevation to the Senate. That is a reflection on me and it is a reflection on the honourable Member, and I submit that the honourable Member must withdraw it.

He is suggesting that I encouraged a person to make difficulties with the previous Government and then rewarded him, and he is suggesting that this person did not negotiate in good faith and was rewarded for his negotiating in bad faith, and I really submit that both of those are improper.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member was not in the Chamber so I do not think what he is saying is correct.

What I was at pains to point out was that the President of the NUPW did not attend any of the three meetings over which I presided. That in itself was remarkable, but he was acting as an adviser to the then Leader of the Opposition, and he organised a demonstration outside here, in which people threatened violence on members of the then Government after 21 meetings and said that we had abrogated the principle of collective bargaining. All these are facts and I can quote the honourable Member right here from the debate.

Far from making a criticism on the honourable Member, I am complimenting the honourable Member on rewarding persons who had rendered him such service and

his loyalty to those members of the NUPW. Now if there is anything unparliamentary about that, I do not know. I do not think that we should be thin-skinned when we are quoting facts.

Now, we had at that time a budget deficit of \$20 million; we were in the middle of the greatest upheaval in the annals of international trade in 1976, the 400 per cent increase in fuel prices at that time, and the honourable Member came in here and said it was a black day in the history of Barbados.

Now I do not use expressions like "black day", because that in itself is a question of approbrium that every thing black is bad. If he had come in, said it was a white day or a pink day, it would have been better, but he said the blackest day in the history of Barbados — after 21 negotiations.

Now what I am complaining of as a parliamentarian, to get down to what is commonly described in modern day parlance, and I hope you do not find it offensive, Mr. Speaker, the nitty-gritty of this subject matter here now, is that I remember a famous occasion, Mr. Speaker, on which the honourable Member was negotiating parliamentary salaries with a joint committee of members of the Government, and you said there is no way that he could represent you because he had gone in there and negotiated for himself and himself alone. That is on the record of the House too, but at least we had a Committee. It is true you did not approve of the way the negotiations were handled by the honourable Member at the time, but we had a committee.

The first time that we knew about this — not that I am in favour of it, no matter what they had brought — was when he sent the Order Paper out in what they call the bundle, and we noticed that there was a Resolution.

No committee had been set up presided over by Your Honour or anybody else to discuss parliamentary salaries, so I am saying to the public workers of Barbados that they have been treated with courtesy compared with the way in which His Honour the Speaker and the members of this House have been treated with respect to this, because we did not have any meetings at all. At least they had a few.

They are objecting to the negotiations being broken off; we are objecting because we have not been consulted at all. We have not been given the privilege of saying that we approve of an increase or not approve of an increase. It is being handed down like the decalogue from Mount Sinai — not the ones that were broken, the ones that were unbroken on the second trip of Moses to that place — that it is now the policy of the Government that it should be automatic.

Now when did this policy arise? Obviously not when the honourable Member was in Opposition. It had never been my policy, I want to make the position clear, it has never been any part of my policy that because civil servants get an increase Members of Parliament should get an increase. The two things are not on all fours.

You can put up an argument that sounds plausible of maintaining relativities and you must not allow Permanent Secretaries to go over and above the salary levels of Ministers who, after all, are supposed to be, I would not like to say employers, they are directors; that is the political directorate should get more money than the administration. you can put up that kind of argument, but it has never been any part of my contention in so far as salary revisions are concerned.

I have pointed out on the floor here that Ministers in Israel get US\$400 a month and some of their scientists are getting US\$50 000 a year working for the Government, and that is why they are able to stave off — I am speaking about defensive operations, not offensive ones — that is why in times of trouble they are able to stave off attacks from countries who are hostile to their survival, because they do not have any sacred principle that Ministers must necessarily get a big salary, or a chauffeur-driven car with a policeman in uniform, and that kind of nonsense that we in poor developing countries are being subjected to.

Noise.

Mr. Speaker, I am not drawing your attention to the noise that is going on in the back down there, but we will get this kind of behaviour because when on a previous occasion Sergeant Bend tried to evict a person from the Speaker's Chair, the honourable Member for St. Thomas said, "don't touch him", so they had given the impression that it was all right to get on as you like inside here. It is bad.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I was drawing to Your attention that I heard noise in the Gallery, but the party has now ceased.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the Speaker is aware that the noise in the Gallery is being dealt with.

The honourable Member said that it is now the policy of the Government — maybe the "now" is my expression — that Parliament should have their salaries adjusted at the same time as the Public Service. He went on to say that it is morally justified, politically wise and conformed with the dictates of common sense.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, both sides of this Honourable House: the noises from Members not

addressing the Chair, the Hansard Reporters have complained to me during the week past of the interference that they suffer. I am appealing to honourable Members to observe the Standing Orders in respect thereof. It is a tax on the Hansard staff.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is also a rule of the House which says that a Member should be heard in silence, but I am surprised that the Leader of the House is the chief offender when it comes to the asides. Some of them are jocular, but it is an interruption nevertheless.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will deal with you when you are finished)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You see what I tell you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate. I do not want to see, I want to hear.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And I should be heard in silence. Now, Mr. Speaker, when did this become a principle? The last time that parliamentarians got any increase under the dispensation of the Democratic Labour Party was in 1973.
1.00 p.m.

When we came into the House in 1976, I told the parliamentarians, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries that they would have to hold strain, they would have to mark time, and allow other people to catch up with them; and I said I had no intention of bringing up any amendment to the legislation to increase the salaries of Ministers, parliamentarians or members of the Cabinet in that year — 1976 — 1977 or 1978.

The right honourable Member for St. Thomas, when he rose to his feet, had said this —

I am quoting from page 6726 of the Parliamentary Debates of 1976 — the right honourable Member said:

"without this braggadocio and pomposity, without boasting, bragging, or anticipating, we would just like to say that we have never heard this famous pledge about the 1st April, 1978. We are not going to compete with pledges by saying that we are going to make it the 1st April, 1979, but we will just say that, if elected to power, we have no intention of taking any decision in 1977, 1978, or 1979, to increase the salaries of members of the House."

Those are the words of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas. And we know that, in that period between 1976 and 1979, the Member came and increased the salaries of all the Ministers, he increased parliamentarians salaries marginally — again, there was no machinery

set up — and, as far as I can remember, Mr. Speaker, in the six short years this is now the third time that the honourable Member has come in here and increased the salaries of parliamentarians.

Now, to equate the salaries of parliamentarians with people in the Public Service, a man working in the Ministry of Transport and Works for \$114 or \$115 a week with Ministers who have, again, without any consultation on this side, been given — parliamentarians, I should say been given constituency secretaries, a recent Bill allows contributions to the tune of \$4 200 to political parties to be exempt from Income Tax, Ministers who, with the exception of four I understand, and I would not be invidious to name the four, with the exception of four now have Government cars, all purchased, I believe, from Sir Kenneth Hunte's firm — he is not a member of the House so I can call his name — cars at their disposal with Government's, taxpayers' gasoline.

The Prime Minister does not come into that, he always had a car at his disposal, so he does not render increase in travelling allowance. But the point is that these same ministers are being given a travelling allowance and are driving about in Government cars.

I have not been invigilating the delivery of gasoline to every car, but I understand that sometimes private cars — and I want to be corrected — the only reason why I am mentioning this is that it has come through drivers that some private cars are also being given gasoline, and we are giving Ministers travelling allowance — the same 31 percent that they say they give to Government officers.

I understand that the rationale of the increase in travelling allowance is due to the increase in the repairs, maintenance, on mileage basis, and gasoline, which public officers travelling on duty — they do not or they are not supposed to have a 31 per cent increase in relation to travelling which they do on their private occasions, private and lawful occasions.

How are we going to distinguish between the travelling being done, which would be very little by a Minister, like visiting. I notice there are a lot of side visits nowadays, almshouses and so on. Very laudable.

Ministers should be in their office doing their work. That is my view. And the few occasions on which they have to attend a function could not consume all of this gas. They should not be driving about all day long.

So, the rationale for an increase in travelling allowance to a public officer can never be extended to the kind of functions which a Minister performs. A person who is an engineer in the Ministry of Transport and

Works has a lot more to do in seeing that the Government's money is well spent than a person — I would not name any particular Ministry.

After all, I have been a Minister of Government and I did very little travelling outside. I used to spend 16, 17 hours a day at the office, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not have time to go out on travelling. As a matter of fact, frequently, when I was supposed to be out travelling, I would forget that I had a function to attend and had to apologise unless I was reminded in good time.

But, Mr. Speaker, we now hear this new policy being enunciated; and not only enunciated, but elevated into a high principle which the honourable Member said is "morally justifiable" — he who said in 1976 that there would be no increase for parliamentarians and Ministers if he came into power, in 1977, 1978 and 1979, and, no sooner than he assumed office — I am not saying the day after, but within an indecent, hasty period — salaries were raised.

I heard the Ministers coming in here complaining, Sir, about not travelling first class, complaining that the salaries may have been alright for us, but they have given up so much in their private practice like if we over here were employed before we were Ministers. We have the whole spectrum of professional activity represented on this side of the House.

I would say categorically right here now that in 1976, at that level of salary, which we threatened to roll them back to, which was the 1973 level, every single person on that side who accepted a ministerial position was infinitely better off than he was when he was pursuing his private business; every single one.

(Aside: Nonsense.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the honourable Members over there want to tell me I am talking nonsense, let them produce their Income Tax returns prior to assuming office to satisfy me that I am scandalising them.

I am not picking on either one of them, I do not care what kind of profession they were carrying out. Some of them were headteachers of schools, I understand, some of them were lawyers. I am not saying only the headteacher was getting less money — all of them, including the Minister of Finance. Did he ever send in an income tax return saying that he was getting \$60 000 a year? That would be the absolute proof.

So, they were better off, and they should have done like the people in Israel, put the brakes on and hold strain. Israeli Ministers at that time were getting \$400 a month. But what did the Prime Minister do?

He voted himself a salary which, even taking out the tax free element of it, transcended the total emoluments of the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

1.10 p.m.

When Mrs. Thatcher realised what was happening, she immediately increased her salary to \$132 000 a year over the \$90 000 odd; although when Mr. Callaghan was there, he was getting more.

A country with 250 000 people. Great Britain has something like 55 million people — army, navy and air-force, a membership of the European Economic Community to subscribe to and all that sort of thing!

Mrs. Thatcher went and got the salaries increased; but I think it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister of Great Britain who decided that they would not get theirs. There is nothing automatic; there is no equation that one can engineer between the level of remuneration of the political directorate and the administration of any country in the world, as far as I am concerned.

There is something I would like to see, and then you would know, Mr. Speaker, who are really representing the people. I know all the arguments, I know all the arguments that if you do not pay Members that you would only be able to get rich people representing the people in Parliament.

I do not believe that, Sir. When I came in Parliament, Members got \$100 a month — and that was all; no travelling; nothing at all. It did not prevent us from winning an election and holding on in 1951 with people from all walks of life at \$100 a month.

There is some kind of myth being promulgated and perpetuated in this society, that you can only get people of a certain income bracket if you remunerate them. I feel that the best thing that can happen to Barbados is to abolish salaries and remuneration for Members altogether, and ask Ministers to be compensated at the level of the sacrifice that they make — not the potential sacrifice that the Member for Christ Church West has discovered, but the level of the actual sacrifice that they are making, up to a certain level.

I would like to see the whole thing abolished, because we would get people of a greater level of sincerity and dedication to the community rather than people who are interested only in maintaining the status, relativities and differentials which they claimed must inure to their office only.

I am very serious about this. There is a source here saying that it sounds strange for me to be saying that. I do not believe that only people of wealth would be able

to get seats in the House of Assembly if you did not pay people at all. I think it is time, probably, that we go back to the days prior to 1948, when there was no remuneration for anyone, not even His Honour the Speaker.

Now I am not saying that His Honour, the Speaker, should be placed in the same ignominious category. I just want the Speaker to understand that. The Speaker's Office has now become more onerous than it was in the days of Sir Frederick Clarke. Sir Frederick Clarke did not have to contend with what the office holder has to contend with nowadays, so I am not saying that this applies to the Speaker.

But, by and large, Sir, I do not think it would be a tragedy: No great harm would befall the Republic, to use the words of Cicero, if we abolish remuneration for Members and compensate only those who work on a full time basis carrying out the people's business.

That is what I believe, and nobody can stop me from believing that. I would be the first one, provided everybody would agree. I would be the first one to say that we should not accept anything at all. Certainly, in so far as the very in fashion plea as to the moral rectitude of the present measures are concerned, we are not having any part of it. We will be taking corrective measures; which will be announced in due course; corrective measures to ameliorate the imposition which is being now imposed on the taxpayers of this country.

The honourable Member went on to say that he would put an end to hypocrisy. Well, what is hypocritical is a question of your point of view, but what I can say is that the speech that he made in here today discloses a high degree of cynicism on the part of the honourable Member. Because someone who, when he was not in office, could tell you that he is not going to agree to any increases for parliamentarians in 1977, 1978 and 1979, and soon after he gets into office inflates the salaries out of all proportion to what they were before, and then come in here today and say that it is a policy that salaries should always be linked — when did the dim light of revelation dawn upon the honourable Member like the light with which St. Paul was afflicted at the gates of Damascus? When did this revelation beam down on him?

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member said it was an enlightenment; no revelation. Then he is saying that he was ignorant all the time that he was in Opposition. I remember the honourable member, in relation to the Civil Service increases, far from saying that the Government in 1976 had ill-treated the civil servants, as he managed to get Mr. Trotman and his demonstrators to say, he said not very long ago that the real problem in

Barbados is that in 1976 — I invite the honourable Member to tell me whether I am misquoting him — he said that the real problem in Barbados today is that I gave the civil servants too much money in 1976 — too much money in 1976.

Asides

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You did not say that. I heard you say that. Mr. Speaker, I would give way to the honourable Member to allow him to deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would wish the honourable Member to address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, that is what I am saying, that I would give way to allow the honourable Member to deny that he made that statement. He said that we gave them too much money in 1976; but in 1976 he said that it was the blackest day in the history of Barbados.

Now, he speaks today about hypocrisy. I am not saying that the honourable Member is a hypocrite — not yet. I am saying he is cynical; that he sort of despises people intelligence and he makes all these averments, thinking, like his illustrious predecessor, that the memories of Barbadians are short. Because how can a person who made that pronouncement, which I read out from page 6726 of the Official Gazette, the debates on that occasion, subsequently come and say that he gave people too much money? That is what is the real problem.

He made another statement, in respect to bus fares; that the real trouble with the Transport Board is that the Democratic Labour Party

Aside....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: An analogy, I understand.

Anyway, the bus fares were kept at 35 cents and they made the mistake, instead of increasing it to a \$1 of only increasing it to 60 cents when they came into office; and that, those were the two biggest mistakes made in the history of Barbados — that and the salaries of 1976.

I do not want to waste time, Mr. Speaker, by looking for the debate; the honourable Member knows he said this — we all heard it; and I am saying that that is cynicism of the highest degree. In other words, you are playing with people. What it suits you today to say, you will say: And there is no question of any high principle involved here — that suits you then, have a demonstration outside, bring up General Trotman and his troops to

beseige the citizens, and give him a V.C. for his endeavours. Now I do not mean "Victoria Cross".

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the fourth time I have heard you on this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the fourth time today, Sir, or on a previous occasion?

Well, you know in Barbados, when you say the doxology, you have to say it three times before it reaches the Almighty; so you will forgive me for being repetitive. 1.20 p.m.

But, Mr. Speaker, my main objection — I want to make the position clear, you may have heard it before, but I want to clarify it — is that at least the public officers had some kind of meetings.

We had a kind of machinery established whereby members outside of the Cabinet, back benchers on the Government side, and the members of the Opposition could be consulted as to whether there should be any increase at all and the level of those increases.

My objection is not that the level is inadequate; my objection is that there was no consultation. There may be inadequate consultation with the Public Service unions, but there was no consultation so that we could save the honourable Member the embarrassment that he is going to be faced with by letting him know that we did not think it was any high principle established in any law in any part of the Commonwealth or in Barbados that our revisions must be automatically linked with the revisions in the Public Service. We would have been in the position to tell the honourable Member that we were not in favour of it at all, not until there had been a decent kind of dialogue re-established between the Public Service unions and the Government on the other side.

Do you know what is the problem with this country today, Sir? We are not masters in our own house. The honourable Member is like Edgar Berger of the Washingtonian and the IMF, and the Charlie McCarthy of Barbados; His Master's Voice. They used to have pictures of a little beagle, a black and tan or black and white dog, sitting with his ear to the victrola, and they used to call it His Master's Voice. Some of us used to wind them up in the early days, some of us, like you and some of the more affluent Members, who could afford those luxuries.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are referring to the victrola.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is right, Sir. Absolutely. His Master's Voice.

Every day we pick up the newspapers we are hearing that the IMF says this and the IMF says that, and one of the most ridiculous statements that I heard in the course of my political career was that if the Government conceded more than the \$108 a month, that in its wisdom it has decided that it would give to the public officers of this island, then there would be a danger to the Barbados dollar, it would have to be devalued.

This was the statement. I am not saying it verbatim, but certainly fairly accurately, which emanated from the right honourable Member for St. Thomas and the Minister of Finance.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: I am listening to His Master's Voice and all kinds of foolishness. The honourable Member, if he is to be the Master's Voice, must not be the voice of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — he must jump through a hoop held by somebody bigger.

I have never said what he quoted. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has said that I said so.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I heard you).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, if the honourable Member thinks he heard me, I regret that is yet another doctor upon his long list of medical advisers of whom he is sadly in need. I have always avoided saying so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not going by any hearsay, I have it on tape. I will be pleased to play it back for him at any time the honourable Member would like to be reminded of what he said.

Way back in 1976 such a statement appeared in the local Press. I am not in the habit of getting up and castigating the Press, because I do not agree with what they write, because I would be pre-occupied every day with what they write instead of doing the business of the people of Barbados in trying to answer the Press. The honourable Member is very painstaking. Any time somebody is not full of adulation and adoration, he comes in here and castigates the Press, he calls a parliamentary reporter a long, black something or the other, very derogatory and derisory expressions.

(Aside).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is absolutely true. I do not want to indulge in any cross talk with you, I am not going to misquote you at all.

What I want to say is this. In 1976, when somebody in the Press wrote — and it is quoted here in Hansard — that an increase in civil servants' salaries would cause an adverse balance of payments, and I was careful to come in in the course of introducing the Resolution not to blame the civil servants for any deterioration in the balance of payments.

If you will just bear with me, Sir.

A Pause.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, the wind blew the marker out, but I will try to summarise what I said on another occasion.

I said that increases for the Civil Service had very little to do with balance of payments, and I said that I checked with all the officials in the Ministry of Finance and no one had made such a statement at any time to any member of the Press, and I accepted that this was so. I think that the article was probably inspired from other directions.

What I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, about the balance of payments was very simple, that when you give increases in salaries to members of the Public Service in Barbados or any large group of persons, that, in the first place, if what they have been claiming is correct, that they had been faced with inflation and continuing rises in the cost of consumer goods and so on, the first thing they do when they get a salary increase is to cope with the increase, unless the increase is far above the level of inflation which is taking place within the period. Then the next thing that they do is to reduce their level of indebtedness to the business community.

The only danger to the balance of payments, which is of a very transitory nature, is, when they get — if you have been negotiating for a long time — a large massive sort of infusion of back pay. Then you will find that consumer durables like fridges, stoves and motor cars are foisted, some of them are willing victims, but these consumer durables are foisted on the civil servants, because all the merchants in Bridgetown know back pay is coming, so they start an elaborate campaign to convince the people who have this little extra money that they need a new fridge, a new stove and that kind of thing.

Obviously, since we do not produce what we consume, whether they be consumer durables, food or anything else — the civil servant is not going to eat more food just because he has a little back pay, but he will buy a ham at Christmas time — and what happens is that if he does have, after satisfying all his urgent requirements and settlements of his debt, a little money

left over, if you have liberal hire purchase laws, if you do not have import restrictions and so on, the impact effect on importation might imbalance your accounts. In other words, in the impact period, say, three or six months, you might get a swing away by this large importation.

1.30 p.m.

But that is only from back pay, because the little extra money that people get, especially when it is a "tralyah" like \$108 — you cannot call it anymore — a wafer — does not go to do anything more than to cope with the daily and weekly bills that they have with the super-markets.

I just wish to set the record straight, because I am in violent disagreement with any suggestion that paying an adequate level of increases to the members of the Public Service could be responsible for a devaluation, which a lot of us fear is going to happen; and it is unfair for the honourable Member to try to transfer the responsibility from bad management to the legitimate demands of the members of the Public Service.

On page 6716 of the debates for 1976, I have the volume here, I said this:

"Now while I am on that I would like to say this, that a statement appeared in the Press, I think day before yesterday, purporting to quote a Government official, that these salary increases would deplete Barbados' foreign exchange reserves. I have checked carefully with the officials in the Ministry of Finance and the Civil Establishments Division and no official in either one of those departments or any other that I know about — because certainly nobody outside of these two departments would be qualified to speak on an issue such as this — had had any discussion with the Press on balance of payments matters. As a matter of fact, the article is completely and utterly misleading, because Civil Service salaries do not directly have any bearing on our foreign exchange reserves. I want to make that position clear. Civil Service salaries will have some kind of effect on your balance of payments reserves if as a result of the increased borrowing locally and maybe abroad, the import bill of the country is increased and indirectly it may have some bearing on your balance of payments because we will have to pay for those imports.

"Any increase in imports over and above the existing level must have some kind of effect, therefore if you pump more money into the economy and as a result of your pumping money into the economy there is an increase in the demand for imports, that may have an effect on your balance of payments; so I just want to disassociate myself and my officials from any statement which appeared

in the local Press to that effect during the past two or three days. I just want to get that straight."

Now, we have gone further. That was a misleading statement in the Press — certainly it did not come from any of the officials with whom I dealt and I disassociated myself from any such suggestion — but we have gone further.

We have a very adverse balance of payment situation, we have had compensatory financing from the International Monetary Fund, we have gone back to the International Monetary Fund who are now laying down the rules for us, they are breathing down the necks of the Ministry of Finance and laying down all kinds of terms and conditions, so the honourable Member fires, again, a shot across the bows, — it has nothing to do with the legitimate claims being made by the members of the Public Service for a level of increase of remuneration to assist them in coping with the very high level of prices which still go unbridled in this country — and what is it that we are told? That if the Government concedes any more than \$108 a month to the public service, that it is likely to cause the devaluation of the Barbados dollar.

Now if any devaluation takes place, it is going to be because of the reckless mismanagement which we have suffered under during the last three years. To blame the public service for a devaluation of the Barbados dollar is, in my opinion, not only unfair — it is more than unfair. It is almost criminal to make a suggestion such as that.....

(Asides.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You want me to take back something? Just let me know, and I will consider whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. If and when a devaluation takes place, I do not want to be in anyway associated with it for causing any inflationary pressures. We are not interested on this side at all.

I wish it was possible, in passing legislation that is slightly unconstitutional, to discriminate between those who believe, in the words of the Louis Aragon — *celui qui croyait au ciel et celui qui n'y croyait pas* — those who believe in Heaven and those who do not believe in it; those people who believe in ideas and principles and those who have no principles at all; those who are cynical and those who are sincere.

I think we should have some machinery whereby some legislation, despite the Constitution which says

that we cannot discriminate, to discriminate between those two classes of persons who are imbued with principle, on the one hand, and have no principle on the other hand, but who believe in political adventurism and whimsical opportunism.

Somebody will say that I have been treated by the honourable Minister of Transport; that sometimes, by process of osmosis, his literary language rubs off on other Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, what are the principles which we should really establish? We are not accepting any principle, I am not accepting any principle, that there must be an automatic escalation in the salaries paid to Members of Parliament whenever there is a revision upwards of salaries of the members of the Public Service in Barbados. That is point number one.

There is no such principle enshrined in our Constitution or even by the custom and practice of Parliament. Parliament has on occasion conformed with the idea that this could take place, and on other occasions, especially when we read the words of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, Parliament has emphatically disassociated itself from establishing any such principle of automatic equation between the exercise for the Public Service as far as salaries. That is the first point I wish to make.

The second point which I wish to make Mr. Speaker, is this — it is a point which has been made by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas himself — that Parliament should regulate its own affairs.

I do not accept that a Minister, without reference to Parliament, can come in here and treat us worse than he treats the Public Service Unions, because at least there were some token negotiation taking place between the Public Service Unions and the Ministry; there was some token negotiation, but there has been none of that in our case, although we had such a machinery established before.

So what position did they put us in on this side? We were not asked whether we agreed with it or whether we disagreed with it, we were not invited to any by-partisan deliberation.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member said that we refused to serve on the last.
1.40 p.m.

I have never cursed anybody inside here yet. I would like to curse you outside, but I have never cursed anybody for asking.

The point is that they are under a duty to establish such a dialogue even if for reasons best known to themselves or ourselves — I cannot remember what the honourable Member said.

On a particular occasion, we may decline to accept the offer particularly in circumstances where it may be clear that the Government has already made up its mind and is only using the co-operation of the Opposition as a kind of sham. So do not let us say now that you are not under any duty to at least put up the appearance of discussing.

If on an occasion we said we were not taking part in such a discussion, we may have had good and sufficient reason at that time, and I am not saying it is any question of adjusting salaries to a certain level. It is at least to let us tell you that we do not agree with any salaries at all — and then you will be spared a lot of embarrassment.

I, personally, am not going to go into any question of quantum. I have already dealt with travelling allowances. I am not concerned with whether the Prime Minister is only getting one and a half percent. One hundred percent of one is one, and one and a half percent of \$10 000 may be a lot more money than the man in the street is getting who is working in the Ministry of Transport and Works.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is the same percentage.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well if it is the same, let us change. I take yours and you take mine. You say it is the same; the same is the same. Do not start talking percentages, because if that was the principle that you get the same percentage, then we would give the people at the top of the Public Service the same percentage increase you give the people at the bottom, which we have never accepted; and even the honourable Member has never accepted that this should be so — the people at the top always get less; they do not get more.

Let us look at it this way. Let us examine salaries now, which have to assist you in coping with providing the basic essentials of life. If you give 10 per cent to a Permanent Secretary who is getting \$20 000 a year, that is \$2 000 more. If you give 10 per cent to a worker who is only getting \$1 200 a year, it is only \$120.

Now the prices of goods go up for everybody, and the reason why we give the larger percentages to people down at the bottom is that we are trying, as the honourable Member has rightly said, to close the gap between the people in the lower echelons of the Public Service and the people in the higher bracket of the same Public Service.

At one time it used to be 15:1 — the ratio differential between the salaries. With consecutive salary revisions the gap may now be as low as 8:1 or 5:1 — I am not quite sure, but it is probably more like 8:1; the honourable Member will have the statistics to prove this — therefore, the principle which has always guided the Government in negotiations for salaries is that the people at the bottom get less.

Mr. Speaker, gasoline prices go up for everybody, so when we give a 31 per cent increase, say, in travelling allowance, entertainment allowance or anything else, there is no point in your saying that it is 1.5 per cent. The point is that it is a lot more money to buy the same amount of gas or to pay the same increase in price as the man who is only getting \$100 a week has to cope with.

So, we are not mesmerized by this juggling that goes on with percentages and that kind of thing. We are not impressed at all. The point is that the principle is being abrogated here where, when you look at the global amounts which would be received by Ministers and so on, I am saying categorically that it is far in excess of anything they used to work for before, and, therefore, as far as I am concerned, unjustified, morally or otherwise.

I do not care how long the honourable Member goes on in this strain, glibly saying that these things are all right and, after all, this is a principle and that kind of thing. It is sheer unadulterated hypocrisy, that is all it is. It is worse, it is robbery with violence; it is a rape on the taxpayers of this island — iniquitous.

It is all right for us to come in and rant and rave about certain things that a Government does, as the honourable Member feels the Opposition always has to adopt an attitude whether it is reasonable or unreasonable. If we oppose things like this, it is because we feel so, not because it is convenient when we are in Opposition. He said it was all right for him when he was in Opposition because that is what he is supposed to do, but now he is in the Government, he does not feel the same way at all; the Government should not appear to be unwilling to line their pockets. That is the new theory which we hear being enunciated — Government should not be unwilling, and Opposition and ordinary Members of the House should not go on to allow their salaries to be unraised.

You hear the kind of IMF language creeping in, like conditionalities and facilities and that kind of thing....

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you want me to read something for you, son?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have a Resolution here for you.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Does the honourable Member want to speak, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I asked whether he wants to speak, because he is interrupting all the time.

I will go on and say this: we have a staff in here which are the employees of the Debates Committee. I should like the honourable Member to tell me what negotiations have taken place between the members of the staff and the Government Establishments, or Ministry of Finance, or whoever, in relation to their remuneration.

That is a question which I am asking, because whatever the justification which was advanced, because somebody wrote something in the Press, for coming here for ourselves before the judges and other people like that, that justification could never be extended to the people who have to sit down in here at half past ten and half past nine at night and listen to members ranting and raving, railing and fulminating, getting cramp and sometimes not even having time to go and make a telephone call, because as soon as they leave here they have to be transcribing and that type of thing.

I think it is immoral and indecent to look after yourself before you look after people who are facing the heat of the sun, metaphorically speaking. It is true it is sometimes chilly inside here, but when I speak in those terms, they are the people who are really doing the brunt of the work, who are keeping the wheels of Parliament running and the machinery functioning.

To come in here and look after ourselves is not really doing justice to the level of intelligence of even the Members of this House, because there must be people on both sides who feel much the same way that we feel, not only because we are in Opposition.

I do not have one tune to sing, Mr. Speaker, when I am in Opposition and a different tune to speak when I am in Government. I sing from the same Psalter all the time. It used to be the Cathedral Psalter, but in recent years I have fallen away from the Cathedral Psalter, but Psalter nevertheless. I should say the Cathedral Psalter has fallen away from me.

1.50 p.m.

So, we are also very, very concerned over the failure to negotiate, to have some kind of machine set in motion, not only for the members of Parliament, but, also, to set the machinery in motion in respect of the employees of Parliament. I think that they deserve better treatment from us than that.

As far as I know, not one of the Members of Parliament in here has a vote in my constituency, so this is not a political matter; this is a domestic matter. I think we ought to put our house in order before we do anything about approving increases.

I want to make my position clear. I am not even concerned about whether it is \$100, \$1 000, whether the Prime Minister is going to get more money now than Mrs. Thatcher and that kind of thing. Those are secondary issues altogether, those are not primary issues. The primary issue is that I disagree fundamentally on any pronouncement that this has now been elevated to a policy.

It cannot be a policy of the Government as the honourable Member says. It has got to be a policy of Parliament, because it is Parliament that is involved. You are not now giving a dispensation to a group of people working for the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, you are dealing with parliamentarians, you are dealing with us; and parliamentarians have got to be treated insofar as discussion — because this is a discussion place — at least on as high a level as you accommodate the members of the Public Service through their trade union representatives.

We are not such a large body because we do not have a trade union. They may say that all parliaments are trade unions, but what we normally do is to select certain representatives from among us on both sides to sit down with one another and discuss, first, the principle and then the quantum of any changes which may be made in the level of remuneration which they have been accepting.

But we have not done that at all and now, I am being assailed with an accusation that on a previous occasion that we declined. Well, I will have to check this out with my colleagues. My memory does not go back to a broad accommodation of that statement. There had to be considerations which had to be borne in mind if such an event actually took place.

The best advocate that I would have to support my observations here today is the right honourable Member, himself, in the course of the Debate. This is the right honourable Member on page 6723 of the same debate:

"To simplify my argument, Sir. If the cost of living is stationary civil servants would still deserve an increase. If in some strange way the cost of living had not gone up at all since the last increase in 1972, but production had improved, the number of tourists had increased and so on, the civil servants should get an increase to give them a share in the greater prosperity of Barbados.

6.20 p.m.

"In 1962 the Prime Minister came to the House and said he would not have granted the civil servants an increase, the increase which the Barbados Labour Party promised them in 1961, and he spoke then of giving them increases which were related to the cost of living. If you read the Daily News of the 26th May, 1962 you will find a full account of it. I haven't been able to trace it in the debate, there was a lot of attack then on an increase in the civil servants' salaries, and he was wrong then. It is true that the cost of living had in fact fallen in the last half-year of the rule of the Barbados Labour Party; 1961 was a year of falling prices and I believe you will find that the end of the year index perhaps was less than that at the beginning of the year. Certainly it was less than that at the middle of the year, and this was despite the completion of the harbour and the airport, and despite the productive works that were going on at the hospital and the housing areas, so Barbados happened to have had a very prosperous year in 1961. It was a year of political discontent coupled with great economic prosperity, one of these paradoxes that happens, and of course is clearly attributable to the fact that the Barbados Labour Party had been in power too long then and it didn't matter what they did, how good they were, the people had in mind to put them out as being there a little too long.

But the Prime Minister did not understand either the economic rationale of an increase to the public servants or the just claims of the public servants in 1972, because he could say they should not have got the increase then because the cost of living hadn't risen, and now he has returned to it and all that he has shown is that after fifteen years as Minister of Finance there are still large, vital important areas of public finance and economic activity with which his familiarity is less than competent."

When you are speaking about abuse, the right honourable Member for St. Thomas is a past grandmaster, and he would understand what I mean, I am on the level. He is a past grandmaster at political abuse and political assassination. Past grandmaster. He said then that there are:

"large, vital, important areas of public finance and economic activity with which his familiarity is less than competent."

If I make that statement about the right honourable Member today, Sir, it would be the greatest understatement of the 20th century.

I will say this: not that there are large, vast areas of economic activity and public finance of which he is incompetent, but there are large areas of anything relating

to the sound management of Government of whose very existence he is completely innocent. So, he cannot be incompetent if he does not know.

But, anyone who would make a statement to the effect....I am not likely to conclude in ten minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not likely to conclude by 2.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

The Reply to the Question asked by the honourable Member for St. Michael West is ready.

I do not see the Member in his place, so let the Reply be laid.

This brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business. When this Resolution was before the House, the honourable Member for St. Michael South was addressing the Chair. That honourable Member may continue to do so now, if he so desires.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, my contribution is in support of this Resolution moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central which, in the operative part of the Resolution, is calling upon the Government to take immediate steps to withdraw those Notices of Arrears of Land Tax which have been sent to persons who are not in arrears with their taxes.

I think from the very start we must get down to the basic issue. Some time ago, I recall the distinguished Prime Minister of this country indicating that the people of a country can live in relative opulence, but the Government of the country, itself, can be poor. I believe those were in the heedful early days.

But it seems that today, now both the Government is poor and the people are poorer. So the position is that the Government appears to be short of money, and that is a situation which is due in no small measure to the management or mismanagement of the economic resources of this country by the Government. No doubt there will be some criticism of that, but I would advance the view that the Government has some large part of the blame to carry for the present position in which the country finds itself. When things are going good, the Government takes the credit; and when things are going bad, the Government must take the blame; so I am saying that the Government has a large measure of responsibility but what is the present state of the country.

So, in order to raise much-needed cash, the Government, among other measures, is seeking to press or impress upon the taxpayers of this country to pay up, and the Government is trying to collect whatever money may be legitimately and morally due to the Government.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with that kind of principle. It is a matter which any Government, in its responsibility as the Government of a country, must try to implement. In this instance, however, it is clear to everyone, including the Government, that the procedures being used are faulty and that those procedures have worked massive injustice upon those people who find themselves on the Land Tax roll.

We are told that some 23 121 demand notices have been issued by the Government to the persons who are on the Land Tax Roll, telling them that they are in arrears and indicating that some \$14.4 million may be due by such persons.

Now, the Government must admit, and I believe that they have admitted, that there are massive errors in the list of arrears notices. We are told that by the end of October some 10 per cent of those persons whom have been sent notices have put in objections.

The Government, secondly, have sent out notices to persons who did not owe the Government any money; thirdly, it has sent out notices to persons who may have made some payments in respect of their indebtedness and those payments did not show up on the notices that were sent to them; fourthly, the Government had sent out notices to persons in respect of land which the Government itself owns and, lastly, persons who in fact do not own any land and who have Tax Clearance Certificates to show that they do not own land, they have received such notices.

In any kind of situation, that is a very serious muddle that the Government has found itself in. Not only

that, there are some fairly ludicrous cases as well. I understand that there was a land owner in Christ Church, I believe the parish is Christ Church, who, apparently, was indebted to the Government for Land Tax arrears in the sum of one penny from 1975 — and a whole big envelope, "On Service" and that kind of thing, was sent out to the person to collect that particular penny.

(Asides: Not true?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is false? Two cents, you know what a penny is.

(Asides)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is the second one, because I was not talking about you.

(Asides)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not know. But these are things that you are getting in this kind of situation, and I think there must be a situation of desperation when you get that kind of wastage. I am positive that it cost more to send the collection notices for those 2 cents than the Government is going to get if it gets back the 2 cents. 3 p.m.

Now, we have got to ask ourselves why have these errors occurred. We have to approach this in a very systematic manner. Why have they occurred? I would like to put forward the view that there may have been certain inelegancies inside the Rates and Taxes Division.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Like St. John).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The parish of St. John? Now St. John is in the parish of St. George.

But, Mr. Speaker, more than that, I believe there have been major blunders in the Data Processing Unit, which falls under the Ministry of Finance and directly under the purview of the Minister of Finance. That Data Processing Unit is a service department in regular service to the other departments of Government, and it appears that there have been major blunders in that particular department.

I believe, also, that the errors occurred because of major conflicts and differences between the Rates and Taxes Division and the Data Processing Unit of the Ministry of Finance.

Finally, I understand that the Minister has been very intimately involved in the operations of both the Data Processing Unit and the Rates and Taxes Division. I understand that a number of minutes have been going backwards and forwards from the Minister of Finance to those departments, and that has had some effect.

I do not know if the officers have been allowed to carry out their particular functions as they would have wished to carry them out, but those are some

of the complaints that I understand are being made by some of the officers themselves. That is what I understand. If it is not true, I am certain that someone from the Government side will deny it, but what I will say is.....

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is not true?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That you have been.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly address the Chair.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that there have been quite a number of minutes going backwards and forwards from the Minister responsible for these two departments to the departments in respect of these matters.

This brings us to the position, having established that there have been major administrative blunders, mal-administration, and having established some of the causes for these blunders; it brings us fairly and squarely on to two fundamental problems relating to Government in this country — it is the question of individual responsibility of the Minister who may be in charge of a particular department, and it brings us, also, to the doctrine of collective responsibility. In this particular case, we put forward the view that the Minister carries the credit when things are going well and the Minister and the Government must correspondingly carry the blame when things are not going well.

I do not think in this particular situation we can get up and blame civil servants, because, too often, there has been a tendency — when anything goes right it is the Minister who is doing well, and when anything goes wrong it is those civil servants who do not know what they are doing. That kind of situation is not fair either to the Minister, nor is it fair to the civil servants themselves.

In this particular instance, there is no doubt that the Minister was fully aware of what was going on. He was on top of his department, he was minuting backwards and forwards on these particular problems. Indeed, it has been said in this debate — and I have not heard it denied yet — that there was an OAS expert, and the Rates and Taxes Division itself, who advised against sending out the notices of arrears because there were so many errors detected in it, and that the list should be purified before being sent out. I heard it in this debate that the Minister indicated as a directive that the notices should go out.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite coincidental that a matter occurred in the British Parliament some time in 1954 — I believe the Prime Minister was very familiar with that,

the Crickle Down Affair — and quite coincidentally it had to do with land as well, although not with Land Tax as I understand it, and in that case the responsibility of the Minister was clearly laid down, I believe it must have been the Attorney General at the time, Sir David Maxwell Fife, setting out clearly the responsibility of a Minister in that particular regard. It so happened that the Minister, Sir Thomas Dovedale — I believe his name was — resigned on that particular occasion.

We have an instance here now in which the Government in its own words admitted that there have been major blunders, that part of the blunders has been due to Government directives, and so the Government must answer the charge, why are not those who are politically responsible rushing to take the blame for what has taken place? The Government must answer that question.

I do not think the solution is to scare people that they are going to sell out the land which their fathers and forefathers, their grandmothers and so on have worked so very hard over the years to acquire and to send up the blood pressure and to bring about other kinds of illnesses, the intensification of illnesses of people, because people have a particular and peculiar attachment to land in this country.

I am hearing about 900 properties, 4,800 different parcels of land, giving a total maybe of some 5,700 parcels of land which may be in jeopardy, I do not know, but this thing raises all kinds of fears in the society, and I do not believe that this is really the way in which it should be dealt with.

Some time ago, I suggested that a task force should be set up to look at the economic problems, major, macro-economic problems facing this country. I see the Prime Minister has now come up with some kind of task force, but not to deal with the problems which I was talking about; this is to deal now with a narrow area which I do not think a task force is appropriately fitted to deal with.

I believe what may be needed inside the Rates and Taxes Division — and I do not know why it is to be dismantled — I believe it was set up in 1969, but I do not know why it is to be dismantled — but what we are interested in is efficiency, and I believe that there is a need for getting into the area of tax compliance measurement as far as these Land Tax arrears may be concerned, and setting up a small body of persons who are skilled in dealing with receivable accounts in a humane manner, and trying to use persuasion. If such a regime were established, I think persons would feel a lot happier.

3.10 p.m.

What has to be dealt with, too, is the kind of unnecessary friction that has been allowed to develop between these two units. As I understand it, one of the functions of the Minister is to ensure that differences between the departments under the Minister's control are ironed out at a very early stage, but it appears that the Minister has allowed these matters to grow out of all proportions, and I would like to know why this has been allowed to happen.

When the present Attorney General was Minister of Education, I never heard that he allowed two departments to come to loggerheads to such an extent that the matter erupted into the public domain in that particular way, but the Minister —

(ASIDE: — Why are you picking on me?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Because you never allowed it to happen. You want me to say that you allowed it to happen? All right, well the collective responsibility, the collective responsibility anyhow.

(ASIDE: Go outside and say that).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Right in here. I am a Parliamentarian. I believe in Parliament. I am speaking in here. You are not going to catch me outside. Not you, Mr. Speaker, there is no catching as far as you are concerned; I know you like to collect — not outside.

So what we are saying is that, in this situation, the Demand Notices should be withdrawn from those persons who are not in arrears; they should be withdrawn, and then those persons whose accounts are in doubt should be invited to give the department some assistance in getting their accounts straightened out — and we need that small team of persons who are skilled in handling accounts receivable to put.....no task force headed by any political hack.

I have a feeling that this task force which is being set up might be providing a job for some political party hack.

(Aside.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: To run against me? That is what is happening?

I think a Crown Law Officer should be seconded to any team to deal with these matters to give the legal advice, but I do not believe any party hack should be....

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, you are not allowed to go on any longer.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is my time? If my time is up, I will be quite happy to sit.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, let me first start by making it very clear that I support the number of the views expressed by the Member for St. Michael South. Number one is, when things are going good the Government is cheered; when things are going bad, the Government must stand up to the jeers.

I do not believe, Sir, that this debate should have even gone this far after the statement made by the Minister of Finance and Planning, but, of course, we have the grandstander of public life, the Member for St. Michael South Central, who has to impress upon his audience and impress upon his colleagues that he is the master of all the skills of public life within the past years.

It is a fact of life that there has been a degree of confusion in the collection of these taxes on this occasion. As the Leader of the Opposition said quite clearly last Tuesday, because you see a letterhead on it with "E. W. Barrow, Consultant", it does not necessary mean that he is going to see every single piece of paper that goes out of his office — and he has a little two by four office. But here is it that you have the head of the largest firm in the country, the biggest firm, and in a two by four office the chief consultant is not going to see every little scrap of paper put into an envelope and sent out, I mean, do you expect that the head, the Managing Director of the largest firm in Bridgetown, the Prime Minister, is going to see every single scrap of paper?

It is a clear fact; there is no denial as far as that is concerned that a number of tax bills has been sent out to people who were granted tax relief. Some were sent out to places like the secondary schools, owned by the Government, that do not pay taxes; some were sent out, I believe, to people whom I believe are probably dead — I would not be surprised. It has been a complete and unfortunate incident which has occurred on this occasion.

The Minister of Finance has made it very clear, that those people who can satisfy that they do not owe the tax are free to go, and those people who owe tax will have to pay the tax. But the argument put forward by the Opposition is that the country is so badly off, this is the argument, that the Minister of Finance needs the money to pay me \$3.35 a day — he needs the money to pay a Minister of Government and the parliamentarians \$3.35 a day, and I am on called 365 days a year, 24 hours a day.

That is the argument put forward, that we are in such bad shape that we have no money, things are so bad that he is prepared to even tax the dead; even the poor pensioners that he gave relief to, he is prepared to crucify them because he needs the money to pay Parliamentarians \$3.35 a day. As a matter of fact, U.S. \$1.67 a day, while a B class painter gets \$3.50 an hour. We will get on to that later on in the day.

So, Sir, the arguments put up by the Members of the other side, though legitimate in some cases, are only a matter of cosmetics — putting some lipstick on our lips and some eyeshadow on to make it look pretty; grandstanding.

A statement was made here where; we have taken the blame, but I am going to throw some blame down on the very department, too. I am going to throw the blame there.

3.20 p.m.

Some people are competent to do a job in 1920 and incompetent in 1980 — it is as simple as that — and they are not yet prepared psychologically or mentally to face up to the technological age. That is the problem.

The information you get, you feed into the computer — and only what you feed in is going to come out. I had an experience coming out of Miami, Mr. Speaker, where Eastern Airlines was to arrive in Barbados at 8.45, and the computer printed out that it was arriving at 9.45. The computer can only print out what is fed into it, and if the information which is given to Data Processing is not accurate, therefore all of these problems are going to arise.

Now what kind of Government could this be, Mr. Speaker, that would set about to call on old age pensioners and on the Government itself to pay these taxes. The Government gets tax bills for schools and institutions too, you know. The Government get tax bills for things they do not pay taxes on, but the blame is laid squarely in the lap of the Minister of Finance. On the other hand I am hearing that they hope it is not any political hack involved in this.

I have always made my position quite clear, that as long as I hold a ministerial post in this country, any Government Department that I am in charge of, I am going into it, look into the books, pull out the desk drawers and read the notes, because it is my Ministry, and I am the person who is responsible for it. On the other hand I am hearing that we should not have political interference.

I do not understand how you argue. You argue on the one side that the politicians are responsible for this awkward and unreasonable attack on the citizens of this country and that the politicians should not get involved, and then, on the other hand, you come back and say you hope it is not some old party hack, it should be a Crown Law Officer. You mean it should be a legal man, not necessarily a Crown Law Officer.

I am not talking about any task force or coining any phrase about bunching of projects and calling for any task force, but the person who is looking after this

project for relieving the taxpayers of this country of the problems which have arisen is a legally trained man, fully qualified to carry out the duties. (A VOICE: Who isn't?)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Michael Simmons. That is the man, if you want to know who it is. Only you would have to have the police up there again. You ask the questions and I will give you the answers.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the Government is going to do everything in its power to make sure that this matter is resolved. We can safely say that it started way back, I think, in 1974 or 1975 when the Member for St. Philip North was the Chief Valuation Officer. It started from all back there. You used the word "purify". All that we are doing now is rectifying the problems that were started from 1974 when the honourable Member for St. Philip North was the Chief Valuation Officer. From all those days you had these problems and you were in power then. Now that we are trying to update everything and bring it under control to make the departments more efficient, you have got this problem of tax bills being sent out wild. I got some too.

(Asides.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You have to ask me that privately. I have some tax bills, too. I got three. I have asked my task force, an individual, to look at that for me. That is a different ball game.

Sir, I have no doubt that, since you have ministerial responsibility, you must be collectively responsible for any problems in the country. I have no doubt that if a bus went down the street, for example, and the brake fluid ran out of the master cylinder and it went into the Careenage, you would say that the Minister of Transport and Works is the worse Minister, that he allowed a bus to go on the road with bad brakes.

On the other hand, the honourable Member for St. Michael South and Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a car out there with bad brakes, because I saw him about a quarter to seven an evening putting brake fluid in the master cylinder; but nobody can blame him, because that is his motor car, but you would blame the Minister of Transport and Works. That is the problem with collective responsibility.

A Minister is responsible, so the blame is laid squarely on the shoulders of the Minister of Finance; he has to accept the responsibility, but in the meantime the Rates and Taxes Division also wants a good shaking up.

There are a number of people about this country who refuse to pay taxes, and when you ask them about paying taxes, the first thing they tell you is, "Man, pay taxes? You all don't want money!" That is the sort of

response you get, and all that we have set about to do is to make the department more efficient and this has stirred up a hornet's nest.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance and the Government are doing everything within their power to have this matter resolved, and those persons who are involved in this unfortunate and unpleasant exercise at the end of the tunnel are going to see the light.

The Government is not scrambling around to rob people of money, as you have tried to put across, because we are so poor in the Treasury or because of the country's mismanagement — and this is the same Minister of Finance and Planning who gave the workers \$50 million a year and a half ago, when he was hailed as the Lord's anointed.

That was all right then, but a single error is made in the department which has to collect money and which he has set out to upgrade, and a hornet's nest is stirred up.

Now I am hearing this nonsense from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that the Minister of Finance was advised not to send out the notices, and he went against the advice of the individual who gave the advice.
3.30 p.m.

Well, I know that the Member for St. Michael South Central is busy telephoning at night. You could not get through to his telephone — how his patients make out, I could not tell you — between the hours of 5 p.m. and midnight, Mr. Speaker, for nothing — he is telephoning every single person.

I try to get him sometimes. He is my friend, I try to get him sometimes. From 5 p.m. in the evening, when the clinic finishes, until midnight or 1 a.m. in the following morning, the line is busy telephoning Bishop in Grenada, Sandiford in St. James, Mr. Pile from the Rates and Taxes.

You cannot call a single department that he would not call — "This is Richie. It is the brother. You know how it is." So and so and so and so and so and so. That is his job. I will no longer call him, Richie; I will call him Reuters or CANA — he has all the information you can think about.

But do not forget he said that truth does not matter, only impressions. So, whatever information he receives, he twists it up, brings it in here and grandstands.

On this occasion, he came in and said that this was something of public importance and it was urgent. He

rang to the Press and told the Press that it was not urgent for him to bring it in, but the right honourable Prime Minister was in a position to come in and make a statement.

So confused is the Member in his mind that he does not understand that a Minister of Government can get up on the floor of the House and make a statement. He quarrelled with the Speaker and with every single person in connection with these matters.

On this occasion, he has brought a Resolution. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has made a clear-cut statement. We recognise the problem and we are setting out to have this problem rectified, and I have no doubt in my mind that this is going to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Resolution, Sir, in the light that the Government has set out to have this whole matter rectified.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I intervene at this stage of the debate because so much has been said about the Land Taxes that anyone would really believe that no Government department has ever made a mistake before in history.

I remember when our record Income Tax debtor, a Mr. Kyffin Simpson, who according to the Inland Revenue, now owes the Government over \$700 000 in Income Tax; when this matter was put in the newspapers as being a defaulter, no enormous howl was made; no howl was made from the Income Tax payers, many of whom claimed, and have gone to court about their claims, that mistakes were made.

But because in the case of Land Taxes, some amounts, although small, are reflective of mistakes, all of a sudden, the Government is the worst thing in the world because it makes an effort after ten years to stop this friction between three departments and put its final delinquent roll into operation.

In 1978, there was a similar exercise. At that time, perhaps, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had not found his feet and, therefore, the same outcry by the people to whom arrears notices were sent did not receive the same publicity.

The first thing that has to be understood about Land Tax is that, since 1973, no single piece of land in Barbados has been sold for taxes and, for this reason, a number of people have come to the conclusion that Land Taxes are like an overdraft to the bank — you can avoid paying them and nothing much will happen to you. I am going to call some names, too. I am not hesitant about this. There is no rule of secrecy.

I can therefore understand why the St. Thomas Development Company, Inland Investments, other companies from the same stable which owe several million dollars to banks in Bridgetown — these are matters of record, they have been sued and judgement has been obtained are hardly going to care about the \$30 000 or \$40 000 they owe to the Government by way of Land Tax. I can also understand why Turner's Hall Plantation, that owes \$800 000 to the Barbados National Bank and is scrambling day by day to get enough money to pay its labourers — goodness knows what they do with the proceeds of the crop; neither the Land Tax Department nor the Government ever sees them, for they have not paid Land Tax since the new system has been in force. I have just mentioned one or two examples.

The list of major delinquents, that is people who owe over \$2 500, does not include any Members of the House, as I have been able to discover, though it includes an ex-Member in respect of several parcels, somebody who is widely reputed to be a millionaire, and it includes other people. And if you look at it, you can understand that people have come to have a casual attitude towards Land Tax. Now, the reasons for this are numerous.

I am going to give an opinion as to how all this started. In 1973, I do not believe that the honourable Member for St. Philip North, who was then a public officer, wished to work in a subordinate position to Mr. Kenneth Pile, who was Collector of Rates and Taxes, and his position of influence with the then Government was such that he was able to persuade the then Government to set up a department of Land Valuation separate not only from the Data Processing Department, which, eventually, would use the material he put out, but separate also, from the department which had the duty of collecting taxes.

A dichotomy was created at an early stage, and it is noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that the period 1973 to 1974 has given more trouble to small people, not the sort of people I have just spoken about, than any other period, the period of the change-over. In those days, many, many difficulties arose between the Valuation Department and between the Collector of Rates and Taxes.

Now, such difficulties as exist still, in my opinion, persist. I cannot believe that a valuation officer, well knowing that the Crown does not pay taxes would pick himself up, go to St. George's Secondary School, rate it as a new hereditament of \$3 770 000, and, without telling the Collector of Rates and Taxes, deliver that valuation to the Data Processing Department to go on the taxpayers' roll. So you find that every year St. George's School is accumulating taxes.

It is mainly the fault of Data Processing, but you also have to blame the Land Valuation. They do not like

to consult. It never occurred to them to divide the tax roll so that Spring Hall Plantation, Graeme Hall Plantation, St. George's Secondary School, Half Moon Fort School, schools all over Barbados, the property of the Crown, Pelican Industrial Estate, Wildey Industrial Estate, Grantley Adams Industrial Estate, should be put on one list and the people who have built houses put on another.

The Land Valuation Department is to be blamed for that, and it is a mistake that goes back to when the honourable Member for St. Philip North was the Valuer. They did not conceive it their duty to administer the Collections Act. They said that is for the Crown. They could not look in the IDC Act to see that the industrial estates do not pay, and so on and so forth.

Similarly, the Data Processing have never yet looked into the subsidiary Acts that relieve certain bodies of taxation, the churches and so on, the Canadian High Commission, Embassies. They have never made the effort.

They all want to put it on the Rates and Taxes, but the essential thing in this matter is that the collection department has no control over either the assessment or the keeping of the records on which collections are based. Now, this has gone on for years and years.

You get the departments together, you take a decision, and if you want something to blame the right honourable Prime Minister on, blame me for the fact that, when a decision was taken that the Valuation Department do not type out any more tax notices, I allowed myself to be persuaded by the Permanent Secretary (Finance) to reverse that decision in 1978. That has caused a lot of trouble and a lot of tribulations in the preparation of this list. Blame me on that. I acted on what seemed to me to be the best advice from the Permanent Secretary of Finance, but it was bad advice. You can safely blame me. 3.40 p.m.

Now what is our situation? We inherit a dreadful system.

(Asides.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to hear the *sotto voce* remark of the honourable Member for St. Michael South. It is bound to be amusing and, if possible, it will be offensive to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central or one or another of his colleagues.

We have inherited a dreadful situation in which three departments are pulling against each other in this vital matter of land taxes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, honourable Members are talking a lot that civil servants have told them. Every civil servant has an axe to grind in giving honourable Members information. Just take that from me. The OAS expert — did you say OAS or O and M? — he reported in 1978 and all of his recommendations have been put into effect.

It is quite untrue to say that he advised against issuing this roll. He set out in 1978 what were the difficulties. He said that the computerised land tax files were designed as information files, not as accounting or accountability master files, because he picked out the Land Valuation Notification Forms which were not being kept in a proper transcribable form.

So, we did not publish the official Delinquent Taxpayers Roll then, although I was pressing at that time. My sending minutes, Mr. Speaker, to get this matter dealt with are not recent. We did not push it then; we gave Data Processing a chance of dealing with the errors.

I could not conceive, Mr. Speaker, that the errors would be as inadequately dealt with as some of them have been. But I would just say this: whatever honourable Members may feel about the enormous volume of faulty notices sent out to small people, the true complainants are not the small people — the true complainants are the Crown, the IDC, the Housing Corporation and, in some cases, the Anglican Church and other bodies which are not liable for tax in volume and, perhaps, in amount. They will be the largest number of persons to whom erroneous notices have been sent.

As of today, Sir, 650 taxpayers, that is all, have stated and supported their cases that their taxes have already been paid although they got an Arrears Notice. That is all, and this includes taxpayers who have had re-valuations and were billed for small differences.

When, later on this week, I am able to find my receipts and complete my forms, and I do not go back any further than this year, I will make 681, because they made a mistake with me, too. Maybe it is the second time they made a mistake with me — I do not know. Mr. Ulric Denny went to my house and revalued it after I had appealed and I am now faced with paying Mr. Denny's valuation as well as the original valuation. But we understand that this is an error, and it is being corrected.

The chief complaints relate to five things really. People complain that they received arrears for land which was sold long ago. I dealt with that when I made my statement. In many cases, the people were wrong and they owe the taxes — indeed, in nearly all the cases. I am not going to spell it out anymore — they are wrong.

In nearly all the cases — not all, Sir — not all, but in nearly all the cases the confusion that has arisen arose because developers have transferred the names of property

owners at the Valuation Department before they have completed the conveyances and have ceased to pay the tax on the property, the developers are still liable for the tax.

In other cases, land has been sold between April and the sending out of the tax notices, and neither the purchaser nor the vendor has paid the tax.

There is a complaint, also, that people received notices for land which was not in their possession for the period mentioned. This complaint in my opinion, is largely subsumed in the earlier complaint.

It does appear that the Relief Roll and the Delinquent Roll have not been properly co-ordinated, and, therefore, the third complaint that some people get relief and then are called upon to pay again may, in some cases, be justified.

But there are far more cases, Mr. Speaker, where somebody gets relief in one year and assumes incorrectly that that relief carries on from year to year to year. You get tax relief in one year and you think that you do not have to ask for it the next year. You have to ask for tax relief every year.

I think that I will ask the Land Tax Relief Board to waive any question of penalty in any cases where that may possibly arise. I do not think that it will arise. What I think will happen is that many people who have been on the Relief Roll will now have to make new applications and the work on the Land Tax Relief Board will therefore increase.

But that is not a mistake of the Collector of Taxes or the Chief Valuation Officer or the Data Processing; that is a mistake of law on the part of the people who think that one relief necessarily continues forever. That is my information anyhow, Sir.

I have already spoken on the question of revaluation. I am satisfied that there is an adequate handling at the Data Processing Department of the Revaluation Roll.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to deal with arguments of the Opposition. I was of the impression that the Resolution said that all the notices must be withdrawn. I was very happy to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South say that the notices found to be faulty should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, putting that Resolution is like putting a case for motherhood; it is like putting a case that we must show respect to our mothers and fathers that our days may be long in the land of the Lord, because commonsense must tell you that, if a notice is shown to be faulty, it is withdrawn.

There is no need to bring a Resolution to say that — it is foolishness — and the notices, when they are faulty, are withdrawn. Several hundred of them are withdrawn. The notices to the Crown and the others will be withdrawn. I mean, that is mere looking for words. Nobody has ever suggested that Government collects on a faulty notice. In fact, the Government has not been collecting.

The whole amount for which arrears have been charged comes to \$14 million. Suppose you knock off \$1 million for the Crown and the other corporations. Suppose you knock off a bit more, come say to \$12.5 million. Mr. Speaker, since April of this year, nearly \$3 million have been paid in Land Tax arrears. We are not inventing a problem, and the problem has not just started because the Delinquent Roll is finally prepared after all these years and goes out in October or November. We have collected nearly \$3 million in arrears so far this year.

3.50 p.m.

As to the suggestion that I hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has made, that the International Monetary Fund told us to collect the arrears, to tell the truth I believe that the International Monetary Fund has told the honourable Member to write prescriptions with his left and not his right, and if he does that he will understand economics better, because the two statements are about as true and as relevant.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North knows about these things, since he was one of the architects. He said that \$4 million is no particularly big amount of arrears. Obviously St. Philip seems to be a parish where money does not matter. At least the honourable Member for St. Philip North is a little more reasonable, \$4 million is no big thing. The honourable Member for St. Philip South said \$40 million is no big thing. I hope that neither of them survives into the next century ever to have anything to do with the financial affairs of this country, but let that be as it is.

I do not want to say that six or seven hundred people who claimed they paid the taxes already are not many, because it is a pity that 600 people got notices for taxes they paid. It is a pity and I much regret it, and I am very sorry that our machinery is not perfect, and that out of 23 000 — say 20 000 individuals — that as many as 600 or 700 have had a mistake made in their case. But it is not a large number. Do not let us fool ourselves, Mr. Speaker.

As it happened, I have not given another figure that really is a large number. What do you think about the 4,800? That is the number we have now collected of bills returned. These are the people who care so much

about land, you must not take land away from them, it is a terrible thing, people value the land. "Refused", "Not Known", "Left address," 4 800 like that. People that care so much about land that they let taxes accumulate on the land and then refuse the tax notice when it comes to them. This is what the Government has to think about.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution puts us into some difficulty. The Resolution calls on the Government to do something that the Government is already doing. It calls on the Government to do something — well, at the same time the Resolution was filed, I made a statement pointing out that the Government was withdrawing the notices from people who were not in arrears, and, therefore, when the Attorney General is finished his drafting, I will be moving an amendment to this Resolution to reflect the true position with Land Tax.

I have the roll here, honourable Members are welcome to see it. Perhaps the employees of the House might also like to see it and see their names appearing in it in some places. This is the roll of the people who owe more than \$2,500. Look how fat this is, thousands of names.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Is that the true roll?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Some are not true, because the Crown is in it, but there are a large, large number of true accounts in here. Eastern Caribbean Development Limited, taxes on \$532 000 that they will not pay. H. M. Simmons, Cottle Catford & Company appear so far in five places in here.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That may not be true).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It may not be true, I believe it is true.

The National Housing Corporation, where is the property? The Garden Land on Country Road. They owe \$4,000 on it, that is a clear mistake. But there are numerous, numerous companies owning land of very, very substantial value who have not paid and I do not believe, when it comes to the point, are going to say that it is not true.

Now, the rest of us cannot put up with this kind of arrear situation where we are all suffering under taxes and imported inflation which, thank goodness, is going down at the present time. The honourable Member's next door neighbour, Mama Investments Limited, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, your good friend, your canvasser, your financial supporter, a good DLP friend, he owes us taxes from 1978 to 1981.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have not said anything. Why can you not call out people's names? There is nothing private about this, the Delinquent Roll is a matter of record. If my name is in it, as no doubt it will be next year, call it by all means. Secrets are secret, but unsecrets are not secret. Income Tax is secret up to the stage where the Commissioner puts you in court, and then it ceases to be secret. This is the Delinquent Tax-payers' Roll.

I do not want to call out a great number, but they are household names in Barbados. Oh dear, I see a Member of the House here. These are household names and all of us feel that these are people who should pay the taxes, so that the tax burden on the small man can be lowered. That is the important thing.

We run down small people who are proud to own a piece of land to ask them for taxes, when big men who know the law is too weak to sell out their places, ignore the law and do not pay taxes. These are the people at whom the exercise is directed, and I really cannot make any apologies for wanting to collect these amounts from people who have not paid tax for eight to ten years — Dowding Estates and Trading Company. You would not find Barbados Shipping and Trading, they seem to be taxpayers, but all kinds of companies and individuals well known you find in this roll.

Now, I understand that the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central could have many friends on this roll. I understand that these are the people, perhaps, he talks to on the telephone and he has to represent their interest while pretending not to on the political platform, but I, myself, am not giving any pity to these people, and this is why the Government has said it will be taking legislative steps to make it possible to sell out the properties that owe more than \$2,500. Miramar Hotel, one other in St. James, these are the properties, these are the wicked people.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You will sell out Johnny immediately).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not mind who we sell out.

These are the people at whom the arrears notices are pointed. I see a case in here, a house recently built valued at \$400 000. Wild rumour in Barbados is that that house was built out of cash. The man would not pay Income Tax, never paid a cent tax on the house and so on, would not pay other matters owing to the Government.
4.00 p.m.

These are the people that have to be punished, these are the people, and if my words are falling in the Chamber, in the precincts of the House on the ears of persons who either are on this \$2 500 list, or have the ears of those on this list, get and pay their arrears because the Government is going to be relentless. These are not old ladies in St. Clements or Cave Hill whose husbands have died and the land is not surveyed and they have not got conveyances and so on. These are not who there are. They, in fact, can be helped by this procedure, because they might end up by getting title to the land. They can be helped, but these are not the people to whom we are aiming.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central does not perhaps realise that the procedure for selling land for taxes use to be used for many years for poor people to get title to the land. That was abolished in 1973, abolished with the change over from Local Government. The small people may be helped if they are prepared to say, "All right, I do not have true title to the land, but I am on it, sell it for the taxes and I will come at the sale and buy the land". I believe many small people would get a good title to the land through these proceedings.

Mr. Reynolds Weekes in the last Parliament, when I discussed this with him some years ago, said that it is a necessary procedure which we should bring back up again to help the small man get a title. They are a little hesitant about going into the Supreme Court with the big advertising procedure and they know, perhaps, that the person from whom they got the land, him or herself got the title through buying at a tax sale. They know that, but are not in a position to pass it on; so that will be part of the Government's whole approach to that.

The only point that I would make in conclusion — because the Attorney General is not ready yet with the amendments, perhaps I will move it later — is this about the gentleman whom the honourable Member for St. Michael South described as "a hack", who is put in charge of this operation.

The Crown Law Officers just do not have the time. They do not have the personnel at the moment to take on the matter of Land Tax. For years I have been asking the Collector of Taxes to get some land sold for taxes. For years he has not sold any, and I have seen some of the opinions when he had tried to sell it — you cannot do it this way — they never say how you can do it, just you cannot do it this way — you cannot do it that way, you must have a survey, you must have a description setting out every abuttal before you can advertise it, all of that foolishness. All of that is foolishness.

In Barbados land can be sold by leaps and bounds no matter what the surveyors and the lawyers in the

Crown Law Office and the Property Act says. Well, not no matter what the Property Act says, but no matter what the individuals say.

The Crown Law Office has, to my mind comprehensively over the last few years proved that it is too over-burdened to deal with the matter of Land Tax. If the Government now sets up a small group of people, with those concerned in charge, and with an outside lawyer known to his colleagues as a person likely to bring a humanitarian commonsense approach to people's problems when they come with tax bills and say they have paid them already, or they have got relief, I really do not think we can be faulted because we are setting that body to do exactly what the honourable Member, if he had waited a few minutes, would have heard what the Government was doing — in other words, carrying out the purpose of the Resolution.

The Resolution came too late for serious consideration and I am very glad that the Attorney General has now completed his advice to himself and has produced his amendment, and I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to move the following amendment:

In the preamble, I propose to delete the comma after "Barbadians" and the words "Who are not in arrears in the payment of their land taxes."

In the second paragraph of the preamble, I propose to insert the words after "The receipt of" and before the word "those", "some of".

In the habendum I propose to delete the words "Call upon" and substitute therefor the word "support" and delete all the words after "Government" and substitute therefor "in its resolves to rectify any problems created by the issue of those notices." So that the Resolution will read:—

Be It Resolved that this House supports the Government in its resolve to rectify any problems created by the issue of those notices."

I beg your pardon, Sir, I stated that no houses had been sold. It does appear that one piece of land in Sandy Lane was put up for sale and Mr. Elliot Mottley bought it. That is the only sale that appears to have been done.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that that property is in my list. I think so. That property is still in my list. Mr. Mottley's name appeared in a few places on my list. I think that property is still on my list but, anyhow, that is personal.

I beg to move the amendment. Your Honour will put the question in due form, I am not sure how to move it. Do I move it? That the words propose to be deleted

stand part? No, I do not move that. I beg to move that amendment, Sir.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the amendment and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it was several weeks ago that it was brought to my attention that Government had been issuing.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now speaking to the amendment?

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I suppose that is all I can do now. I have not spoken yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever you do, what is before the House now is the amendment.
4.10 p.m.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, Sir.

Be that as it may, I am really reciting a few facts, and the facts are that several notices were issued to persons for these arrears of Land Tax. Now this first came to my notice several weeks ago when I received a call in my office, and, subsequent to that, it was not more than probably one or two hours thereafter that I received several calls, this time from several of my constituents, and it was then that I became aware of the extent and enormity of the problem that existed at the Rates and Taxes Division. And there is a problem, Sir.

Sir, this amendment moved by the honourable Prime Minister calls, in its operative part, upon the House to support the Government in its resolve to solve any problem created by the issue of these notices.

Sir, there are a few points which, before we on this side can support this Resolution as amended, we would have to know. We would have to know what resolve there is to solve these problems. Sir, I do not know how Government plans to set about solving the problems created by itself. These are problems created by itself.

We cannot separate the Rates and Taxes Division and the Data Processing Department from the Government. It is all part of the Government, and before we on this side can decide to support this amendment as it stands, we would have to know what the Government's resolve is about these problems and how it intends to set about solving these problems.

Sir, to merely phrase this in words and state "Be It Resolved that this House support the Government in its resolve" is not really telling us what the Government is thinking of to solve the problem. We have a tremendous problem here, and I would like to know what the Government is planning to do about these problems.

In fact, Sir, I go further. What the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was proposing was a solution to this problem, and the solution that he was proposing to this problem was that Government withdraw these notices to persons to whom they should not have been sent in the first place.

(Asides)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am being told by the honourable Prime Minister that they are being withdrawn, which means that the Government is in fact implementing what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is calling for even before we have concluded this debate. That is all well and good.

To this day, Sir, I am not aware of a single withdrawal. I am told that they are being withdrawn. I have to accept the Prime Minister's word for it, but I, speaking for myself, am not aware of a single withdrawal of any of these notices — but we are told they are being withdrawn.

Sir, I cannot understand why the Government has been hasty to amend this Resolution as it stands if in fact the Government is already carrying out what the Resolution is calling for. Sir, it just does not make sense to me except that the intention is that the Resolution of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central must not get through at all costs.

I can only then come to that conclusion, because the problems have been tremendous. Persons have been receiving Tax Demand Notices for arrears of taxes when, in fact, they have already paid those taxes. I have in my bag now, Sir, such a notice. I have in my bag in fact a photo copy of the receipt of the taxpayer, of the land owner showing that these taxes had been paid.

Now we have a problem.

We are told that all those persons who have been said to be in arrear and in fact are not in arrear have to inform the Rates and Taxes Division. In other words, what it is doing is putting the onus upon persons who have already paid their taxes. They have got now to be put to the trouble, they have got to stop doing what they have been doing and go or send to the Rates and Taxes to show to the Rates and Taxes Division that, in fact, they do not owe the money.

I would like to know what the position is if persons who have already paid refuse to so notify the Rates and Taxes Division that they have already paid. What is the Rates and Taxes Division going to do about it? Would the Rates and Taxes Division advertise the land of those persons, who have already paid their taxes, for sale? That is what I would like to know, because not everybody is going to take the trouble to go to Rates and Taxes, be

in a queue, perhaps, with hundreds of people, in order to prove to the Collector of Taxes that they have already paid their taxes. This is the problem.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew, when he spoke on this matter, did not see it as a problem. In fact, it appears to me as though the honourable Member for St. Andrew saw it as a call upon the people of this country not to pay taxes. In fact, that is precisely not what the Resolution called for in the first place, an amendment does not so call for it either.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew tells us that Barbadians are accustomed to keeping their receipts. Not every Barbadian keeps a receipt especially in this matter when he receives a notice year after year. If in 1973, when he received a Tax Demand Notice in the column showing arrears of taxes there was nothing printed there, why then must he keep the receipt for 1972? If in 1978 a taxpayer received a Tax Demand Notice and the column showing arrears of taxes is vacant and the taxpayer knows that he has paid all his taxes, why must he keep his receipts for the previous years when, in fact, the Tax Demand Notice shows he owes no arrears?

What has been happening, Sir, is that Government has been telling people they owe no arrears, because when they send out Tax Demand Notices and the Tax Demand Notices show no return for arrears, the people must understand that nothing is owed by them for arrears of taxes. That is a reasonable assumption.

I am one of those persons who one afternoon went home and saw a long Tax Demand Notice. When I opened it, that Demand Notice was telling me that I owed the Government two cents for taxes. That was in 1978. I remember showing the notice to Senator Milroy Reece. It would have cost the Government a lot more than two cents to try to recover two cents from me.

But, to this day, I dispute that I owed the Government any two cents, because I always paid the Government what they said I should pay, and so long as I pay what they say I should pay, I never paid them two cents short, and I received a receipt in accordance with the demand note.

(Asides).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I would like to know what the law is. They demanded of me to pay \$50 and I paid \$50, and then the next year they were telling me that I owed \$50 and two cents, and the honourable member is telling me that is not the law. What is the law?

The fact, Sir, is that the whole thing is in a whole mess. I will give another example, Sir. When persons are

selling land, before that land can be transferred, a land transfer form has got to be filed in triplicate with the Land Valuation Department.

4.20 p.m.

I am saying this now, Sir, that yesterday a former client walked into my office and brought to me a Tax Demand Notice for the year 1982-83, when, in fact, that land was transferred during the preceding Financial Year, and I was able to show the client my retained copy of the Land Valuation form, stamped with the Land Valuation stamp and dated by the Land Valuation Department as though the transfer took place in the 1981-82 Financial Year, as it did, in fact, take place during that year. But still, despite this, the former owner, who no longer owns the land, received a Tax Demand Notice for taxes for land which he no longer owns. This only happened this week, Sir.

The point I am making, Sir, is the problem is not solved overnight. We seem to have a bigger problem here than we are prepared to admit, because, when we listen to all of those members on the other side, we get the impression as though it is no great problem at all, except that, of course, tax bills as he called them went to the wrong people. But, Sir, it is bigger than that. It goes deeper than that.

I think that when the Government sets up the task force — and I do not know if this task force is the resolution to the problems that the Government is talking about, I do not know if that is what it is — I feel that task force has got to look into these problems, into the three departments, Sir — There is the Land Valuation Department, there is the Income Tax Department and there is the Data Processing Department. There is no point looking into two of them and not the third one, or any single one of them and not the other two, because they are all equally involved in this process, and unless they receive a co-ordinated effort, you will forever be having these problems.

Sir, I have to repeat here that we on this side cannot support this Resolution as it stands until we know what plans the Government intends to implement to resolve the problems that have been identified during the two days of this debate. The problems that have come to light are massive problems, they are massive problems, and until this is done, Sir, we on this side cannot support this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of consternation to the right honourable Minister of Finance, the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, blame everyone from the former Commissioner of Valuations to the now sitting Member for St. Philip North, to the present Collector of Taxes for the confusion which has arisen by the sending out of these notices of valuation.

Perhaps, the honourable Member for St. James North was a bit more contrite when he said that Ministers must accept responsibility. But I find it difficult to believe that, after all of these years, two significant features arise. First that over 20 000 Land Tax Notices are sent out in a year when the International Monetary Fund experts are enjoining the Ministry to rake and scrape and put their house in order before they get any further help — and the Minister can come in here and make a claim that it is absolutely nothing to do with him.

So, straight out of the blue, somebody in the Administration has got a rush of blood to the head saying, "We must try and get some money for the Government" and send out these notices.

Now, nearly every sitting Member in here has been a victim of this exercise. I have a briefcase full of notices sent to me from overseas as well, cheques and receipts of taxes which have been paid.

I think it is very unfair for any Minister to come in here and shift the blame on to the shoulders of public officers when it must be clear to everybody in Barbados that what is being done is being done clearly under a policy directorate. I want to make my position clear on that.

When the Minister of Finance states that there are only 680 people who have satisfied the authorities that their taxes have already been paid, the Minister in his good way, the Minister of Finance — is trying to give the impression that there are no other erroneous Tax Demand Notices, when all that has happened is that, so far — accepting this figure, whether it is 680 or 682 or whatever it is — that that number of persons are the persons who have taken the trouble to go, for one reason or another, and satisfy the authorities, the Collector of Taxes or whoever it may be, that their taxes have already been paid.

Now, I have news for the right honourable Member. There are thousands and thousands of persons who know that they have paid their taxes, who have omitted, neglected, refused or declined to go in and even treat the authorities with the courtesy of arguing the case. They are inviting the Government to put them in court. and when they put them in court, the Government will then find out that they have court costs to pay. There are a lot of people in this country who are so incensed to commit what some regard as robbery with violence in trying to exact from citizens....

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Encourage them.)....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, the violence is being committed on your side. I am not saying the taxpayers

are committing the violence. I said, "robbery with violence", because if you now come to put the heavy hand on people, they say, "Alright, put me in court and then you find the Government having to pay out a lot of costs" because these people are not going to go anywhere.

As a matter of fact, I think I am duty bound, as an officer of the court, to submit to the collector those people who have given me receipts and, therefore, I will not expose them to being put in court. But, as far as I am concerned, the Government can put them in court, because I know I had a principle of paying my tax on the day it was received.

It is significant that the years for which most of these Demand Notices have gone out happen to be for the tax year 1972-73, I believe, or 1973-74, round about there, then, there is a big gap and you jump to 1978.

Now, what has happened? What has happened as far as I understand is that the records for the years in which the Government is stating that people are delinquent, those records have been lost or destroyed or have become illegible; therefore, the Government is throwing out a net and hoping that some people will become frightened and go and pay again; others will not find their tax receipts and, therefore, the burden is on them that they will have to pay.

The honourable member says that only 680 people went down there, but that is too much, because an exercise was done, as we have heard before in here, in which it was clear that there were a lot of inaccuracies.

Now, I think that I have heard in here today, coming from the lips of no less a person than the right honourable Member for St. Thomas that he — he can correct me — if I am wrong — gave directions that arrears should not be put on the Tax Demand Notices. I think this is what I understood him to say, and he admitted that it was a mistake on his part — but that he did it on advice.

It is very unfair for people to stop putting arrears on a Tax Demand Notice and then ten or eleven years later come along and say, "you have been paying taxes for the past three or four years, but you did not pay seven years ago." In ordinary circumstances, between subject and subject, most of those Demand Notices by effluxion of time, by virtue of the Limitation Act, would no longer be due and owing.
4.30 p.m.

Furthermore, I also have in my briefcase, in the course of my business as an attorney-at-law, Tax Clearance Certificates. Every time a property is transferred, the parties, let me say, the vendor have to

obtain from the Collector of Taxes who makes a diligent search, Tax Clearance Certificates showing the taxes for the last ten years have been paid.

I know of a case in which a gentleman, who makes representation to me, sold his property in New Orleans secured a Tax Clearance Certificate. You also have to carry to another procedure — you have to register a change of ownership form. He complied with that. About three years ago, a Tax Clearance Certificate discloses that he paid all his taxes for ten years, the ten years preceding the presentation. About two or three years ago, the person to whom he had sold, sold again to a third party, and he obtained a Tax Clearance Certificate. So that is two Tax Clearance Certificates stretching over a period of, let us say, twelve to fifteen years. And low and behold, the original owner who is twice removed from the proprietary interest in the land, receives a Demand Notice for taxes for 1974, 1975 and 1978.

That is in my bag down there. I do not, like the honourable Member, throw out names and bandy about names, accurately or inaccurately. These are my clients and, therefore, I have no authority to disclose their names here, but I would show the honourable Member if he wants to see.

What has been happening is there has been too much monkeying around with computers by the political directorate here in Barbados. When we introduced this business of national registration, and then you abolished the Representation of the People Act, now everybody who knows about computers can have access to all the most classified information, including what kind of operation you had in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The minute you start that kind of racket, the minute you start one registration number in which you are insisting people put on their tax return, voting slips, National Insurance cards and that kind of thing — it is the cause of great concern now in the United Kingdom and in the United States where they are passing legislation against the illegal use of computers and, starting with election, this is what we are faced with.

You cannot blame the public officers who are trying to do their job. If the Minister of Finance said don't put on any arrears, it is just like the Electoral Roll, where every single Member on both sides of the House sent out circulars based on a list which had been prepared something like three weeks before the election, and, low and behold, three days before the election a different list appears, and people are sent chasing all over the country trying to find somewhere to go.

So it goes a lot deeper than this. It is not merely a mistake, and I would not like the honourable Member for St. Thomas to fool himself that because 682 people, or 600 or 700, or whatever the number is — I cannot remember the number — have so far, up to now, gone in and produced the evidence that they have paid, that there are not thousands and thousands of other people who have already paid, who, also, have their evidence that they have paid, but are just waiting to see for the Government to make the first move, and say that they are suing them and then the tax-payers will have to pay the cost for those proceedings.

Now in the Act....I beg your pardon.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As far as I know, the taxes were paid by the last Treasurer. The last Treasurer was always very prompt in his dealings. He was very meticulous as you know; he was a very meticulous man.

Now they sent me notices like they sent to you. But I am not prepared to say how I am handling mine. The Leader of the House says that he has a task force that will pay his bills for him. I don't have any task force to look after paying my bills. I know that I pay my taxes. As a matter of fact, anybody in Government will tell you, and always told you, I cannot go into the House of Assembly and owe taxes, because I am the Minister of Finance. I always paid my taxes, but that did not stop them from sending one to me.

Now this could be no mistake. You see, with the International Monetary Fund, people telling you to do this, and so on, it is all right for them to sit up there in Washington and pontificate and tell a Government that it is compliant and willing to do whatever they want, but they must do this and do that, this is Barbados and we know about Barbados.

When the honourable Member came in here and said that he was going to collect this and made a great show that he is remitting some \$2 million, he was speaking about an uncollectable amount which had gone back over 20 or 30 years. That was impossible, so that was no great act of magnanimity on his part when he said that, because it would have cost him more to collect those arrears — and I am referring now, of course, to things like Income Tax rather than Property Tax.

Insofar as the Property Tax is concerned, the Democratic Labour Party gave the taxpayers of this island a whole year in which they had to pay no taxes, when the change over took place around about 1970 and 1972. I cannot remember the tax year, but a whole year in order to get the system working right.

Now, in spite of that, you will find out, Mr. Speaker, that under the Vestry System, the Local Government system, where the assessment was based on annual rental value, that the books of the Local Government authority were so chaotic, to use a polite term, that it has been impossible even for the present Government, raking and scraping as they are, to go back beyond 1972. Because going back there, then you are going straight into the Local Government system where who your friend was in the Vestry depended on whether you got tax relief or not.

Now some very eminent persons in this country who are in good jobs have been getting relief from the Relief Board — at least that is what was sent down to the Collector of Taxes. I think it made a certain amount of ill feeling, because the Collector, quite rightly, said, "How come these people get on the Tax Relief Roll?"

I have a client up in Fairfield Road in Black Rock — well, Fairfield Road, St. Michael, I mean that side Fairfield Road, because I think there is a Fairfield Road somewhere else — an old man of 79 years of age. He is an old age pensioner; he has no other source of income; he used to work as a tailor at C. B. Rice, but neither his fingers nor his eyesight now will allow him to sew on a button on a coat. He gets a tax bill. He goes and pays it, because they tell him that if he does not pay it that — he has been getting relief all these years — he will have to pay all penalties and what have you, not only the penalties, he loses his discount. One hundred and one dollars, I think the amount was.

The week before he received this tax bill — there is some confusion with his line marks now, and he produces his plot and sale; the people were encroaching on his boundary — he did not have \$100 to pay the surveyor to get what he calls his landmark. He had to go and borrow \$100 to pay, especially when he heard the threat from the honourable Member for St. Thomas, the right honourable Minister of Finance, that they are going to sell out people houses — to do what, Sir? — so that people will get good title; an injunction from Mr. Reynold Weekes.

There is a tale by Charles Lamb of Chinese people who never used to eat pork, and one day they had a fire in the village and some young pigs got burned and some little boys stuck their fingers in the crackling and it tasted so good that they ran and told everybody that, when you have roast pig, roast pig is one of the nicest things to eat. And all of the villagers started burning their houses in order to get roast pig. That is what the honourable Member is doing burning down the house to roast the pig. 4.40 p.m.

In other words, in order to get a title, you sell out somebody's house; and the only sale that he has referred

to gives rise to speculation, because when he mentions that a lot in Sandy Lane was recently sold, I heard, just by accident, that the person who is not a poor person, who is, I believe, a friend and former colleague of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, bought the thing and within two hours somebody had been ringing him up and offering him another \$60 000 on what he bought it for. Is that what we want?

A lot of these people are Barbadians living abroad in the United States and so on. They may send money here to their families to pay the tax, the families may not have paid it. I know of cases in which although several letters had been written by a land owner also in the Sandy Lane area, year after year, despite the fact that the correct address was sent at least twice a year where the tax bill should be sent, they kept on sending them to the address which was on the conveyance of the land. I would not want to call the name, I could supply the name. The gentleman lives in Philadelphia and recently there was litigation in respect of the same spot of land. Fortunately, the gentleman kept asking the Collector to send him the Demand Notice, because he wanted to pay his taxes, and they said they had sent it to the address already.

These are the kinds of things, because there are lots of little variations in the business of identifying the property, getting in touch with the owners and that kind of thing. If you are going to introduce legislation now to sell out land, where you already have the power to distrain on goods and chattels, even on a chattel house on the land, you want to go further and sell out the corpus itself, you are going to create all kinds of problems.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the day. The right honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition, was addressing the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Opposition, and I think I have the authority to speak on behalf of the Opposition, on this matter is a very simple and straightforward position.

Last year, 1981, we had elections, and the people were told in writing, in the Manifesto, and on public platforms that the economy of this country was booming, that Barbados had this fantastic reputation abroad, and they borrowed the words of the Conservative Party, which were used during the sixties when they wanted to get elected, that they 'never had it so good.'

Shortly after the elections, the jack hammers that were daily assailing my ears outside my office, saying they were building a \$70 million building for the Central Bank of Barbados, those jack hammers fell silent. Shortly after that, work came to a standstill at the new Bridgetown Post Office in Cheapside, and, one by one, projects closed down all over this country, and we heard about tightening our belts, and the Governor of the Central Bank and the Prime Minister, himself, disclosed that things had been deteriorating and had been bad six months before they even began the propaganda of never having had it so good.

Propaganda is one thing, but the facts and realities are different, because the man in the street knows, and the lady who goes to the supermarket, that, with the unbridled increase in prices in this country, where people going into the supermarkets day after day are confronted from one day to the other with inordinate rises in prices, and that housewives, when they get to the checkout counter, have to put back things on the shelves, because the money which day before yesterday would have afforded them to accommodate that particular basket of goods, 48 hours later they have to put back things on the shelves — it is in the context of that that we have to look at this.

It is no high principle; it is corrupt and crooked and dishonest for anyone to come in here and say that there is an automatic policy that Members of Parliament, which I think includes the Other Place and the officers of that Place, must automatically get increases at times like this when now the Government has admitted that the country has never been in a worse position, when the National Debt is over \$800 million, when the debt charges alone, servicing the debt of this country, is over \$100 million; before you spend any money on education, any money on school meals, any money on the health services of Barbados, despite the levies imposed by the International Monetary Fund, the Health Levy, the Transport Levy and all these fancy levies, which are in direct contravention to the Constitution, which says that all money must be paid into the Consolidated Fund; it is in that particular context that you come now with the ever rising cost of Parliament to this country, the ever rising escalating cost of Parliament, to tell Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Leaders of the Opposition and back benchers that there is an automatic equation between the revision of Public Officers' salaries and the remuneration which must be paid to Members of the House. I say it is dishonest.

I used an expression earlier today in another context, robbery with violence, on the collection of taxes, and I say it is rank dishonesty for people who make pronouncements such as were made here on the floor of the House in 1976, saying that they were not going to come for increases in 1977, 1978 or 1979, when they

got the power, to come in here today and say it is an automatic thing. We could not be companions to that kind of rank dishonesty, chicanery, trickery, roguery.

You cannot go spitting into the face of the man in the street in Barbados forever and think that you can get away with it. We cannot do that kind of thing, the people would look on us as the biggest bunch of hypocrites and vagabonds in the history of mankind, and I want to make the position of the Democratic Labour Party clear on this. Only a perverted Government could come in here with an Resolution of this kind, people who have no respect for integrity and honesty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position of the Democratic Labour Party is that we are not voting for it, we are not accepting it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not catch up speed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do not catch up speed? Speed is a drug, I do not take speed, Sir. I do not even know what it looks like. I know they used to call the honourable Leader of the House "Speedy Gonzales", but that is the only speed I know about.
4.50 p.m.

I am saying it, Sir, I am not apologising for it, because I feel very strongly on this. The position of the 10 Members on this side is that we are unalterably opposed to the granting of salaries or any other kind of increases, and I want to get this message across loud and clear. I do not normally shout inside of here, but I feel very strongly about it. We are annoyed.

I only mentioned parenthetically that at least we, all of us, including Your Honour the Speaker, were not treated even with the courtesy of the scant few meetings that the Public Service unions were granted, but I am not really complaining about that, because if you are opposed to something, you are opposed to it.

I say that it is perverted, it is dishonest, it is corrupt, it is unspeakably tainted with corruption, and all of those who associate with it have got to be deemed to be corrupt, and unconscionable as well. Do not make any mistake about that.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I have to make an objection to that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Man, what are you objecting to?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On the question of your saying that people are corrupt and all of that. I do not know. I must take objection to that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On that? But there is no such motion in here. There is no kind of motion on that. "On that" is not a voice of nothing, man. You idiot, sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not have any right in here anyhow. You are too dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, on what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker the honourable Member has made mention of the fact.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Any person who can be associated with what is before the House is deemed corrupt; and if this is a Government measure, he reflects upon all who are on the Government benches.

Mr. SPEAKER: I support this, but the honourable Member must rise on something.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: A point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must first state this, you have risen on a point of order; and I do support your contention that the honourable Member must withdraw it.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Sir. Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to know withdraw what Sir? You see, according to the Rules of the House, if an honourable Member objects to something, you must draw the Speaker's attention to what it is you want him to withdraw, and I feel very strongly on this.

When you satisfy me that I have broken the Rules of the House — the honourable Member — I will withdraw, but you have to tell me; and I am not going to withdraw something that I do not know about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that. Do not travel so fast as to what you will do and not do, and what's not.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know what I will do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not create a lot of unnecessary bother in the place. You made reference to this Resolution, bringing a Resolution like this, and you went on to say about whoever was associated with this could only be

corrupt and all of this. That is what you said — we could refer to the notes and tell you — and it would certainly reflect on the.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But look who is calling somebody nasty or cynical! Well, what is Barbados coming to that he can sit down and call somebody nasty, a man that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Withdraw the remark and let us get on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know what I am being called upon to withdraw. I honestly do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, please. Will the honourable Member take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now why should I take my seat? I am on my feet debating.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Don't send him out, please.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute, honourable Leader. Let the Chair rule.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When we talk about human rights, representatives in Parliament do not have any rights. Let me go to Jamaica and talk about human rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member please take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will I be able to rise again and say that I want to say, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not question the Chair. Will the honourable member.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Chair cannot be asked a question now? I thought the Chair was there for guidance. What do you mean by do not question the Chair, Sir? The Chair is there to guide honourable Members. I hope you are not threatening me with physical violence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, now you are standing I will take my seat.

Pause

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, you can deal with that? What is the honourable Member threatening me with?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will deal with you.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are going to deal with my corruption?

Deal with Brathwaite next door to you who cursed the mother of the Prime Minister. Deal with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Leader please take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not have the right to be here then, Sir. You have not given me the opportunity to do anything at all. I must sit? Nearly every week I come in here, you are telling me, "The honourable Member must stop speaking," and then when I go outside, you ask where is the honourable Member, you are calling on the honourable Member. What kind of foolishness is this? What has Parliament in Barbados come to now?

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe you will learn this afternoon.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Learn what?

Pause.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What are you telling me now? You will do what? You are running this House? Are you running inside here? You are the Speaker now?

Asides

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been in here before any of you, and I will be here after — 31 years.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What idiot? Who are you calling an idiot, Tom?

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You go to Jamaica and you talk about human rights and we do not even have the right to speak in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the honourable Leader of the Opposition.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Does the honourable Leader of the Opposition do what?

Mr. SPEAKER:.....admit at this point that he has used words which merit his withdrawal?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Merit my withdrawal or the withdrawal of the words? I want to get it clear. I do not admit that I used anything that is not justified and which is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: They will be verified by the tapes some time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Whatever the tapes verify, I do not accept that that it is unparliamentary.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting stands suspended for 20 minutes.
5.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Just before the suspension, I had occasion to call on the right honourable Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. John, to withdraw certain remarks which, in the view of the Chair, were offensive to the dignity of this Honourable House. The honourable Member sought to know what was called upon to withdraw. Speaking to the question, the honourable Member said and I quote:

"If you are opposed to something, you are opposed to it. I am saying that it is perverted. It is dishonest, it is corrupt, it is unspeakably tainted with corruption, and all those who associate with it have got to be deemed to be corrupt, and unconscionable as well."

I find those words to be offensive, and I now call on the right honourable Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those words.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make my position clear. I would not be associating with any form of corruption and, no matter what your ruling, I find it impossible in my conscience to withdraw what I said. I find it impossible. There is no democracy in this Parliament, there are no human rights, civil rights — nothing at all. I do not want to go any further, but I feel very strongly. So if you can send me to gaol, you send me to gaol.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must withdraw from this Honourable House for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Right honourable E. W. BARROW left the Chamber.

Members of the Opposition rose in their seats and protested.

Mr. SPEAKER rose and all members of the Opposition left the Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I should like to reply to one simple statement made by the right honourable Leader of the Opposition when he said that the members of the staff of Parliament were not being looked after.

I should just like to clear this up that I have had discussions with the Acting Clerk of the House who informed me that he spoke with the Shop Steward, if I may use that term, the Chief Reporter of Parliament, a Mr. Whittington, who has informed him that he had written to the Union seeking the union's proposals to come before the Debates Committee, and up to the time of speaking to the Acting Clerk of the House, no proposals had come from the Union to the Debates Committee, therefore we were unable to handle that aspect of it.

That is about the only contribution I would wish to make on this occasion. I would not go into the Leader of the Opposition who talked about corruption, when he, himself, was drawing two salaries in Barbados, one as Leader of the Opposition and his pension, and when he was written and asked to repay the money, he wrote back and said he was not going to pay one blind cent.

Leader of the Opposition and his pension, and when he was written and asked to repay the money, he wrote back and said he was not going to pay one blind cent.

I do not really want to go into all these things. On one occasion when the Income Tax Commissioner called upon him to pay Income Tax for the occupation of Culloden Farm, he brought a Bill in here changing it so that he would not have to pay.

I am very sorry it has reached this point where they have had to leave, but there is going to be another occasion to know who is corrupt from who is not corrupt on the floor of this House coming from me.

As far as the \$108 per month is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. You know the old proverb "Hard ears you won't hear, hard ears you will feel." The Prime Minister is the Managing Director of the largest business firm in the country, and he is giving the directors of the largest firm in the country the same money that he is paying to the messenger.

There is no way at all in this country that the Chairman of any Board of Directors be it Barclays,

Shipping and Trading, the Nation or the Advocate News, any of them at all, when they get a pay rise, it is the same amount of money that they give the man at the bottom; and the blows which have been shared today by the aging, rambling Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Finance deserves them.

I fought him tooth and nail on this \$3.35 a day that he is setting out to pay me, US\$1.67 a day, and I am on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and a "B" class painter is getting \$3.50 an hour, and this Minister of Finance is paying me \$3.35 a day.

Sir, at this point I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I say no more at this point. There is going to be a lot of time to deal with him.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SENATE AND
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION
AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS)
ORDER, 1982

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4.

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1982.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passage of this Resolution, I would only say for the benefit of the Press, again, that they are mistaken in thinking there is any increase in entertainment allowance for any Member of the House. Neither the Prime Minister nor anybody has had any increase in entertainment allowance. We have had the same increase in travelling allowance the civil servants got and the same increase in salaries as the civil servants got.

The Resolution we have just passed referred to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. The one now before the House refers to the Senate and Members of the House of Assembly.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this, I have collective responsibility in Cabinet, and I have to go along with my Cabinet colleagues, but I am going to voice this opinion again.

The civil servants have been given a 31 per cent travelling allowance to drive from their homes to their office, pick up the children from school and carry them back. I am getting the same 31 per cent increase to go from my office to my home, to pick up my children and pick up my wife and then go to St. James and St. Peter and talk for you, Mr. Speaker; so I have to use more gas.

I am telling the Minister of Finance not to bring me along with the civil servants. I am no civil servant. I am intransigent, otherwise you are going to expose your Ministers to the problems that you have in other countries. If a civil servant is getting a 31 per cent increase, give me more. I am the civil servants' boss; that is what I am.

I want to make my position very clear. This is a fight I had in Cabinet with them and I am letting him know in no uncertain terms on the floor of the House. I am not afraid to let anybody know that if I am doing a job I am to be well paid for it.
5.40 p.m.

A lady, a few days ago, came to me to sell me a ticket for the Soroptimist Club. I gave her a \$10 bill and she brought back ten tickets. Not \$1, not \$9, she brought back ten tickets and I am sure not one civil servant has not bought ten tickets.

I am calling on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance again, do not think that I am going to die in this country like Victor Vaughn, who had to beg his bread, neither am I going to be treated like Anderson Morrison who sat here as a Minister of Government and now the Leader of the Opposition has him out there buying ham cutters. It will not work with me.

I am making my position abundantly clear. I am going to be properly paid for a job that is well done, and when that job is not properly done, the electorate will say, "You are to go" because they are the shareholders.

I am not making out a case, \$108, \$108. But what is this at all at all, at all? Imagine, \$3.35 a day, US\$1.67. But Louis, what would I tell Jennifer Smith now when she sees me from Bermuda? What would I really tell Senator Jennifer Smith? An independent senator.

Sir, I was just in Nassau, and I ran into nine Barbadians doing a course at the University in Bermuda, a Hospitality Course. They did not call on my colleagues, you know, to take them to dinner, they called on me. They said, "You, the Minister, must take me to dinner." And I entertained nine persons, eight young ladies and a man, and then turned round and paid for them to see the Cabaret. It cost me US\$308.

(Aside)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not want to hear you Mr. P.M.

You are offering me US\$1.67 a day — not even an hour, a day — and it is undignified for me to come in here to defend the Government on this. The Opposition should not be walking out; they should beat you with a bull pistol for bringing this sort of nonsense before us. I mean, \$108 an hour is a different ball game. One hundred and eight dollars a month? Am I a maid?

Sir, I do not mind the hypocritical arguments put up by the Opposition — I am sorry they have gone out — because the things you hear them saying outside, "Man, I cannot understand this \$108?" He was present, Sir, the honourable Attorney-General was present; you hear them talking about this \$108. "What have you all done at all?" This is the sort of language you hear behind closed doors; "What have you all done at all?" I remember a police was nearby and Emmanuel Joseph was there. Hear them quarrelling outside about the \$108 and hear them come in here talking about it is unconscionable and hypocritical. It is hypocrisy on the Prime Minister's part, not on their part.

The Leader of the Opposition was drawing two salaries in Barbados, one, when he retired, as Leader of the Opposition and his pension, and the Ministry of Finance wrote him and asked him to repay it and he said, "Not one blind cent," and has all the money in the world, and you are talking about somebody is a hypocrite and dishonest and corrupt. A man who refused to pay back the taxpayers of this country their money? I am sorry he has gone outside this evening. He talks a lot of bogus nonsense, getting up in here wobbling, rambling and aging, before he keeps himself quiet and let me respect him, talking about somebody is a hypocrite and dishonest.

Now that his Government, a Government that has been founded with hypocrisy, by starting with Douglas Lynch, a white conservative preaching socialism in this country. That is how they were founded, and he is talking about hypocrisy, talking about \$100 a month that they used to get, Douglas Lynch could have bought all of them at the time.

Sir I second this Resolution. Put the question.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If no other honourable member wishes to speak, I would just say a few words in defence.....

(Asides)

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Got \$80 000 in back pay and would not give the Government their taxes)

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is why he did not come in the House because he did not want to hear that he has never paid taxes on the property, for over ten years.)

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Honourable Member makes a point which I think must be defended in a friendly spirit. The Government really took a moral stand on this issue. If we have asked people to hold strain, everybody has to hold strain. It is a simple matter like that. We do not intend to get any less increase than the others and we do not ask for any more.

The honourable Member mentioned entertainment. I have recently returned from a journey to a distant country, I went with my wife. I had one evening to entertain our Counsel and his wife, my wife, a civil servant; we went to, I believe, a not cheap restaurant, the biggest steak I have ever seen in my life — if I tell my colleagues I could not finish it, they would understand its dimensions — we then went into one of the best known nightclubs in the Western Hemisphere and I had to pay entrance; and when the bill came to me at the end, it did not only have on the party I was with, but it had on two police guards and a driver as well, who, of course, followed us into the place. Apparently, it is the custom in that country that when a visiting dignitary is being protected, he has to pay for the police to go wherever he goes, and the driver — and the driver — although our Counsel drove us in his car.

I give it, partly, as a joke. But the fact is that entertainment is also increasing, and just as the senior civil servants are not getting an entertainment allowance increase, so the members of the Government do not feel themselves in a position to have an entertainment allowance increase either.

I have just got a bill — if honourable Members feel that the salaries that Ministers get is all sport — from our Commissioner in London. There was some confusion over my bill the last time I was there at the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Conference. I said, "Alright, leave the bill, let the High Commission pay it and I will pay it subsequently."

It came to £384 which, I believe, is probably beyond what I could have been allowed an extra night in a room that the Government said I should stay. It would have been cheaper, in fact, for the Government if I had stayed than if I came back to Barbados and went away again, whatever the situation is.

Honourable Members, certainly those in Cabinet, find themselves called on to spend the allowances that are given to them. An entertainment allowance, for

example, is not for buying brandy. An entertainment allowance — because we have never had housing allowances, unlike the senior civil servants — is for covering the sofas in your living room and putting in a carpet so you do not disgrace yourself if you live in your own house and you have to invite people to come to your house in the course of public business.

We have been accustomed in Barbados to treating ourselves very badly at the political level. There is absolutely no way, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever known of any Prime Minister of Barbados who would carry 46 people to a conference in the Caribbean or charter a 707 airliner to carry an entourage to Australia. I do not believe it would be easy to get back in the House if I carry 70 or 80 people to Australia, many military officers, to salute me wherever I go, doctors, masseurs, cooks, valets and the lot. I say not a word.

I see some African countries, you see them written up big in the newspapers, countries like Malawi, Gambia, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, none of those have the Government revenue of Barbados. The Government of Barbados is in a better position than any of those countries to carry on style, yet, you will find in those countries that the Presidents do not have one Rolls Royce, they have two. They do not travel abroad without military officers behind them attending on their every movement.

So, Mr. Speaker, we really deserve better of public opinion than the Opposition is trying to put on us. And I am saying this deeply and sincerely — this is not any debate in point — nobody has any right coming in here and refusing to withdraw the words, "dishonest and corrupt", when applied to a man outside far less a man in here; and I am the only person it could have applied to, because I was the only one who spoke and associated myself with the Resolution, although I suppose, in theory, the front bench could all be collectively tarnished by it.

5.50 p.m.

I think it was a deliberate effort, and I am characterizing it as such — and if I don't see it in the Press, I will make a statement to this effect and let them sue me if they like — I think it was a deliberate effort to make trouble in this country, to make a political point, disturbance.

And I want to say something else, which I don't normally say. When I arrived in this country yesterday afternoon, I was met at the airport by a Special Branch Officer, who said that he and the Head of the Special Branch wished to give me certain information, and he told me the information was in relation to the parliamentarians' salaries, that they had information to the effect that demonstrations and difficulties were intended in respect to those salaries.

I have never before got in here and reported information that was given from security and Special Branch sources. But after what I have seen in here today, I cannot doubt that, from the wild old man in the red tie outside to the wild old man in the blue shirt-jac inside, who have both had to be put out of here today, that was a conspiracy afoot to disturb the peace, order of good government in this country as it comes into the 16th Anniversary of Independence. I have no doubt about it.

This day will go down in the House that Eric Sealy and Errol Barrow both had to be put out — the right, honourable, learned and gallant Member for St. John. I say no more, Sir.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE FIXING OF RATES
OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE
POSTS OF PERSONAL STAFF TO THE
PRIME MINISTER

Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the fixing of the rates of salary and allowances of the posts of the personal staff to the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In so seconding it, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief note, Sir. The right honourable Leader of the Opposition and Member for St. John made it very clear that salaries for Members of Parliament should be abolished as far as he is concerned. That is the Leader of the Opposition.

For those who do not understand how this can be done, or how it can be introduced into Parliament, I am going to make it very clear, Sir. The Standing Orders provide for a Member of Parliament, with the exception of the Ministers, Sir, to bring a Private Members Resolution before this House as long as you, Sir, is satisfied that it is in order.

Therefore, since the Leader of the Opposition has made a call today for the abolition of salaries for Members of Parliament, I am going to invite him to bring in a Private Members Resolution, and, as Leader of the House, Sir, in agreement with you, I am going to invite CBC Television for that one special day when I am going to have all Government Members Business relegated to No. 13, which is the dust basket, and allow the Private Members Business to take precedence whereby the Leader

of the Opposition, the Member for St. John, former Prime Minister of Barbados and Premier of Barbados, and a former member for St. George — I want to say for the researchers, for the historians — let him bring in a Private Members Resolution in here, and he can word it as simple as this here, Sir,

"Whereas Members of Parliament shall not be paid any form of remuneration for their parliamentary services,

"And whereas I, Errol Walton Barrow, former Minister, former Minister of Finance and Planning and Prime Minister of Barbados do hereby wish to repay to the Government of Barbados and place in the Consolidated Fund all monies paid to me from 1976 to 1982,"

— he has to pay back every cent —

"Be it resolved that this House calls upon the Government to immediately take steps to have such remunerations abolished.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to bring a Resolution to that effect into this Honourable House, and I, as Leader of the House, I am going to seek your permission, Sir, to bring the television cameras in here so that we can have a national debate. I thrown down the gauntlet to him tonight; let him bring it in here, let him bring in a Resolution calling for the abolition of Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries', and parliamentarians' salaries, and I am going to give this Resolution a national debate on television, Sir. That is what I have to tell him. He must put his money where his mouth is. He is what you call a double-barrel hypocrite.

I would like to lead on to this here, Sir. This is a review, Sir, of the CARICOM Heads of Government Meeting — I am quoting from the Nation, Tuesday, November 23 — this is what a journalist wrote, Sir, and liken this to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you drawing the attention of the Chair

Hon L. S. CRAIG: Yes Sir, I am going to make it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:..... to the complaint?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is not a complaint, Sir. I am quoting something, Sir. I am going to make it a document of the House. This is a journalist at the Heads of Government Conference:

"I was seeing the Caribbean's first woman Prime Minister, Mary Eugenia Charles of Dominica, for the first time, and she was impressive, and as she responded to the welcoming address by host Prime Minister, Edward Seaga of Jamaica, I was left with the impression of a strong-willed lady

politician, one not afraid to speak her piece, no matter what the odds be."

And then that journalist, Sir, who attended the Heads of Government Conference, this is what he said about President Burnham, that I now liken unto the Leader of the Opposition:

"Guyana's President, Forbes Burnham, claimed the privilege of the ramblings of the aging to deliver a rather lengthy and, needless to say, rambling statement which disappointed."

That is exactly what happened in here today, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition claimed the rambling aging, Sir, to make a needless, lengthy statement which was disappointing, as he has been in the past year, Sir.

I beg to second the resolution before this Honourable House, Sir.

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

MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Order No. 6 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Cap.116.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment is to delete the word "Minister" that appears in section 2 of the relevant Act, Sir, I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE LANDLORD AND TENANT (REGISTRATION OF TENANCIES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Order No. 7 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, Cap. 230A.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS. This Bill proposes to make the Commissioner of Inland Revenue the functionary responsible for the collection of Land Tax instead of the Collector of Taxes.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1.

Order No. 1 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. Amendments to this have been circulated, I suppose.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83, No. 6

HEAD 25 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE FOOD
AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The amendments only relate to Part B of the Resolution.

This Resolution, Sir, which seeks to provide for a sum of \$173 805, falls under Head 25, Current, Sir. In moving that this Head stands part of the Resolution, I am to make the point, Sir, that the Government, at the time of the preparation of the last Estimates, made a conscious decision not to make any provision then for a sum of money for the operation and the functioning of the Oistins Fisheries Terminal, the reason being that it would be unwise to tie up a large sum of money when it was not very clear precisely when the complex would have been finished, and, in any event, it was felt that it could only have been finished late in the Financial Year.

The position is, Sir, that the complex is now completed and we are hoping to have it operational by December 15. To that extent, Sir, we are seeking this sum of \$173-805 to effect that end. Basically, Sir, this sum will cover the additional supervisory and general staff, keepers, watchmen, cleaners, maids and so on. It will be necessary to have in order to have the facility functioning and the statutory obligation of the employer, Government, which fall as a result of employing workers, such as the Health Levy, Transport Levy, National Insurance Contributions and so on.

In addition, Sir, there is a small sum for utilities and other small sum for the travel of the Superintendent of Markets, I think, for the facility until the end of this Financial Year.

I would just like to make the point, Sir, that in the past Oistins was operating on a very small complement of staff, and essentially it was a two-shift operation. We are now hoping, Sir, to have Oistins functioning as a three-shift operation.

With those remarks, Sir, I beg to move that Head 25, Current, stand part of the Resolution.

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

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

HEAD 28 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL

SUBHEAD 5 – PROCESS SERVING

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 28 stand part.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with the process servers in the Courts, and I would like very much to draw to the Minister's attention that that service is not working, absolutely not working, and there is an urgent need for an indepth investigation into the process serving service attached to the courts of this country.

We have already had a situation where one of them has gone to jail for collecting people's monies and not paying it into Court, forging Magistrates' signatures, but it has gone worse than that. The situation is that there are a number of documents in the courts which have been filed and have not been served, and you are getting a situation where matters go before the courts. There are no returns of serves on the documents, the defendants are at court with documents in their hands, and the magistrates are sitting upon the bench not knowing what to do.

6.20 p.m.

Documents are being lost daily. People are telling you "I know there is a document out for me, but he cannot get it served." Day after day attorneys-at-law are walking down to the courts and walking back, and some attorneys have cases on their books as much as nine and ten months now, and they have never yet come before the court for hearing because you often hear that the document has not been served.

I am saying little this evening, but I am throwing it out to the Minister that there is urgent need for an indepth investigation into the process serving in the courts today. I hope he takes it seriously and that something is done urgently, because we are going to reach a snowball position where people will now avoid the courts and take things into their own hands. That is the situation I would not like to see.

As I said before, one of them was charged before the court, and this is not the first time. I have just had an incident two weeks ago in which I have had to pull sums of money out of my pocket to pay for a member of my constituency when he has alleged that he has already paid the money to the process server, but it is not recorded anywhere in the Court's books and a new process server has come out ready to arrest him for non-payment of money.

Investigations like this one will take some time, but I believe the Minister can act now and try to correct what is genuinely a bad situation which has arisen. I do not know how it has come to this point, whether we have recruited the wrong persons, whether we have not trained them sufficiently or whether persons are there with a dishonest mind, or persons are there who do not want to carry out the service.

In the old days, you had policemen who were transferred to what was called the Writ Servers' Department and who carried out their duties. You could complain to the Commissioner of Police if you found anything wrong in that service. I believe there is also a serious need for some close collaboration between the Police Department and the Process Servers Department now.

Many lawyers have had to resort to the old marshals of the court in order to get documents served. That is provided for where the Supreme Court is concerned. Where the Magistrates Court is concerned, you cannot do that.

If the Minister thinks it is going to be difficult to make an immediate correction to what is happening, I think the alternative is to amend the Magistrates Court (Jurisdiction and Procedure) Act, to allow the attorneys-at-law to employ their own persons to serve the documents if he wants the court to keep on working, because I am sure it is not going now.

I, myself, had several cases. I have been walking down to the courts for nine months now and cannot get cases come on. People are calling saying the defendant is bragging that he has not been served, and you are walking down there every month, and that is where I fear that something is going to happen shortly unless active steps are taken to correct the situation now.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I am sure the honourable Member for St. Joseph is not speaking of a situation that is new or dramatic. For as long as I have been associated with the courts, these difficulties have been arising. It is not the first time. I only know of one single case where a process server was found guilty of a criminal offence; he spent the money that he collected and did not pay in. Only that one I have known of in the past six years, but I certainly know of others before that period, and indeed for a long period of time, so even though I do not want to condone that kind of behaviour, it must not appear in this House as though this is a novel department from what is normal.

There have been a lot of difficulties in respect of marshals and writ servers in the past. I know very well of a number of writ servers who have collected people's money and not paid it in, were put before the court and dismissed and so on.

This is an old problem and we are trying to get to the bottom of it. But human nature being what it is, you cannot expect that we are going to make everybody in this country honest whether they are process servers, lawyers, politicians or anybody else. That is a situation that we will have to live with for a long time.

Now, the honourable Member is directing the question to the Minister, but he does not stipulate which Minister, because there is currently a fairly untenable position of a split of responsibilities between the Attorney General and the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has taken unto himself from September 1, this year, responsibility for the Judiciary and he has left the Attorney General responsible for the residue, whatever is left.

In the circumstances, there is a great area of responsibility, a twilight zone, where the Registrar is responsible to the Prime Minister as the accounting officer to the Judiciary, and, on the other hand, is responsible to the Attorney General in other areas, and until such time as this area is resolved, there will be continued difficulties in the area of jurisdiction, I am talking about ministerial jurisdiction.

As a member of the Government, I take the points made by the honourable Member for St. Joseph. They are of concern to the people in the Government and we certainly would like an input in these matters from the people who run the Judiciary.

I would like to see the Chief Justice of Barbados, who is administrative head down in the law courts, putting recommendations on how we can improve this situation and telling us the areas of weakness so that we can address them. We cannot do these things unless there is a feedback to us of the difficulties and the proposed remedies.

When these things are done, I am sure that action will be taken, and taken expeditiously, to make sure that there is a proper process server department in Bridgetown, because we know the tremendous importance to the people of Barbados that justice should be done in as efficient a manner as to make people to continue to have confidence in our system of administration of justice.

We do not like these difficulties, but we are anxious, indeed we are desperate, to put things in place, and I give the assurance to the honourable Member for St. Joseph that we shall continue to look at these matters and hope for a resolution of the difficulties before very long.

I beg to move that Head 28 — Ministry of the Attorney General — stand part.

The question that Head 28 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 34 — Ministry of Education — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the money that is required under this part of the General Resolution is money needed to meet the expenses for a number of accounting aides, whose posts have been abolished and who have been transferred as clerical officers to other parts of the Service.

At the time when the Ministry of Education was responsible for selling bus tickets to school children to travel on the Transport Board buses, it was necessary to have a number of accounting aides in the Ministry who went around to several locations throughout the country selling tickets and collecting money on a regular basis.

The Ministry of Transport and Works has not taken over the responsibility for the sale of bus tickets to school children, and, therefore, the posts of accounting aides were rendered redundant. But, rather than put them out of jobs, the Government decided that they would transfer them to other departments in the general Public Service as clerical officers. As a result, they suffered a minor diminution in salary, and this Resolution is to provide funds to keep their salaries at the level it was at the time they were accounting aides at the Ministry of Education.
6.30 p.m.

I beg to move Sir, that this do now stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83 No. 7

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Subhead 8 - Oistins Fisheries Terminal.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I should like at the outset, Sir, to seek the support of the Committee in amending the Resolution before us, Sir, in the following respects:

Firstly, Sir, I would like to delete the sum of "ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THREE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND THIRTY SEVEN DOLLARS" as mentioned in the Resolution, and substitute therefor "ONE MILLION THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVEN DOLLARS".

Secondly, Sir, I should like to amend the details of Head 74, in particular Subhead 8, Item 1 - Structures. I would like to delete \$889 882 and substitute \$939 882.

I should further like to add a new Item 3, covering Plant, Equipment and Furniture and Other Expenditure, to the tune, Sir, of \$67 700.

I would also like to add a new Item 4 under the Subhead covering Contingencies and Other Expenditure to the tune of \$11 770.

In addition, Sir, I should like to amend the Addendum by adding the following words, Sir; "The additional provision of \$129 470 is also being sought for expanding the ice making and storage facilities and for providing a fork lift vehicle for transporting ice and fish along the jetty and in the terminal."

Essentially, Sir, this supplementary covers four heads, Sir. Firstly, the structures; secondly, professional services; thirdly, equipment and furniture and the amount covered by the amendment, Sir, which, broadly, falls under equipment, but which specifically deals with the expansion of the ice making capacity at the Oistins Fisheries Terminal.

The work at Oistins Sir, which has been going on over the last two to three years is now virtually at an end, less the retention money, Sir, of about \$112 000. A large sum is still outstanding to the contractors and, in part, this supplementary provides for that.

In addition, Sir, there are certain professional fees due of approximately \$130 000. These fees were necessary, Sir, because, in the course of the re-development of Oistins, detailed work had to be done in relation to the Scarborough Tenantry Development, the Oistins by-pass and also the drainage system in the entire area.

It will be necessary, Mr. Chairman, for the new court at Oistins and also the New Police Station to be equipped, and a sum of approximately \$45 000, Sir, has been earmarked in this Resolution for furniture, fixtures and fittings.

With respect to the sum of approximately \$123 000, which we have added to this Resolution by way of an amendment, I am to point out, Sir, that when the development at Oistins was contemplated, in particular the Fisheries Terminal, it was not then anticipated that the ice boats would have caught on at the rate at which they have caught on, and so provision was made, Sir, for two, two tonne ice machines at Oistins providing us with about four tonnes of flaked ice per day. In truth and in fact, Sir, we have ten of the ice boats in operation, we are expecting another five in the course of the next season, and the ice requirements are much larger than the capacity at Oistins could provide.

In addition, Sir, the traditional supplier of ice in Barbados, Evelyn Roach, has, for one reason or another,

Sir, decided against continuing, according to all reports reaching us, and so, Sir, it does appear as though, for now, it is going to fall to the Government to provide enough ice making capacity for the fishing fleet equipped with ice carrying capacity for the next season, starting, perhaps, in another few weeks, Sir.

So, we have taken the decision to use a 15 tonne plant which belongs to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, lying down, Sir, unused at Colleton, St. John, we decided to press that into service. We have taken up the offer of a 20 tonne insulator to be used under the ice making equipment in order to house the ice as offered to us by a private company in the fish processing business, and it is expected, Sir, that that is going to cost us about \$50 000 to put it into operation.

In addition, Sir, it would be necessary to buy a truck to move around the complex, moving fish from one place to another and so on, Sir. That explains, Sir, this additional sum of \$123 000, for which we have sought the leave of the Committee by way of an amendment to the Resolution.

With those remarks, Sir, I beg to move, Sir, that Head 74, as amended, do now stand part of the Resolution.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83 No. 7

HEAD 80 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Government has committed itself to the institution of a National Information System, Sir, and I believe that the Ministry of Information and Culture has, as its main purpose, the co-ordination of all areas of information, archives and the like, under a central directorate that would make it possible and available for our scholars and members of the public and so on to be exposed to all necessary information for their own information and for research, Sir.

The developments that are in train, Sir, to ensure that not only the citizen has a right to this information, but that such information is readily available for every individual of this community. The plan, also, is to have the whole idea of books as vehicles of knowledge for reading of school children and the general public as a matter of priority.

Further, Sir, the Archives, as a repository of all the history and the traditions and knowledge of this country, Sir, should be there in a form that is easily

manageable and easily available to record for posterity what has been happening to this generation and generations before it.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the International Development Research Centre of Canada has agreed to contribute over BDS \$400 000 to the establishment of this directorate, and this money will be paid from time to time into the Consolidated Fund.

This offer of this contribution has arisen since the start of this Financial Year, and no money appeared in the Estimates for the current year to meet the expenditure and this Supplementary, therefore, Sir, is to bring in the first amount of money that would take the Ministry of Information and Culture through to the end of this Financial Year. In the meantime, funds will be paid in from IDRC into the Consolidated Fund from time to time, as instalments become due, Sir. This money is just for the rest of the Financial Year.

6.40 p.m.

(Asides)

Hon. L. R. TULL: This money, as I said, is just for the rest of this financial year. I am being heckled on my left about my feelings about the development of the Information and Culture, Sir, and it is the sort of topic that one can talk about for the rest of the evening on. But since everybody is anxious to go, Sir, I beg to move Sir, that this stand part of the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 80 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, that brings us to the end of Government business today, and I must confess Sir, that you, Mr. Speaker, had a rather trying time in the Chair. All of your skills were brought to bear, your patience and everything. But I must concede, Sir, that when defeat stares me in the face and I am defeated,

then I have to accept defeat. I was out-foxed and out-gunned by the Leader of the Opposition today, Sir. He said what he had to say and ran away. I tried holding him; I was out-foxed and out-gunned. From a quarter to one, Sir, until 2 o'clock, and then from 4.45 until he found nothing to say — and then he struck, Sir, with a bow and arrow. I had no way of stopping him. He was still able to get away — out-foxed and out-gunned, but I shall live to fight another day.

I beg to move, Sir, that this House now stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 1, 1982, at 12 o'clock noon.

The question that the House now stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 1, 1982, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 6.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, November 16, 1982.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1982.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG:

The Annual Report of the National Assistance Board for the period April 1981 to March 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG:

A Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1982.

A Resolution to approve the lease of land at Prescod Boulevard to Mill Reef Company Limited.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Resolution Re Memorandum of Understanding between Barbados and other Commonwealth Caribbean governments re military co-operation.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTION

QUESTION No. 16.....Mr. Craig.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1982.....(Order No. 5).....Mr. Adams, Mr. Barrow, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION.....Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION No. 16.....Mr. Speaker re Reply. (Reply laid).

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE NOTICES OF ARREARS OF LAND TAX (BY Dr. R. C. HAYNES) d.r.....Mr.

Sandiford, Mr. Craig, Mr. Adams, Mr. Greaves, Mr. Barrow (f. c. p.)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ORDER No. 5.....Mr. Barrow, Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION.....Mr. Speaker.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ORDER No. 5.....Mr. Speaker, Mr. Craig,

SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) ORDER, 1982.....Mr. Adams, Mr. Craig.

RESOLUTION RE FIXING OF RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES FOR PERSONAL STAFF OF THE PRIME MINISTER.....Mr. Craig.

MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982.....Mr. Tull.

THE LANDLORD AND TENANT (REGISTRATION OF TENANCIES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982.....Mr. Adams.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83, No. 6 (\$173 805)

(1) HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS - \$167 937 Dr. Cheltenham.

(2) HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - \$684.....Mr. Bolden, Mr. Tull.

(3) HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - \$5 184.....Mr. Tull.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83, No. 7 (\$1 253 437)

(1) HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS - \$1 124 102.....Dr. Cheltenham.

(2) HEAD 80 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE - \$129 335.....Mr. Tull.

ADJOURNMENT.....Mr. Craig.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas).

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John).

BOLDEN, C. L. (St. Joseph).

BRATHWAITE, L. B. (St. Andrew).

CHELtenham, Hon. Dr. R. L. (Christ Church East)

CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North).

GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North).

HINDS, His Honour W. C. B. (St. Peter).

SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South).

TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South).