
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 11, 1985

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10:15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)

His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)

Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Planning and International Transport)

Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A., (Econ.)

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A., (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.)

Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs)

Mr. P. M. Greaves, B.A.

Mr. M. A. King, Q.C., LL.B.

Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.

Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.) (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.B.

Prayers were read by Rev. I. Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, June 4, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes for the meeting of Tuesday, June 4, 1985, be taken as read.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections or observations, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received Message No. 6/1985 from His Excellency, the Governor-General to the Honourable The House of Assembly. It reads as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The House of Assembly that he will be absent from the country during the period 15th June to 5th July, 1985, on a private visit to the United Kingdom.

His Excellency further has the honour to inform the Honourable The House of Assembly that under the provisions of section 29 (1) (a) of the Constitution, Her Majesty The Queen has designated Senator The Honourable Sir Arnott Cato, KCMG, to perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of his absence.

H. W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

Government House,
BARBADOS.
11 June, 1985.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of the following—

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$200 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 1, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Crab Hill, St. Lucy for the purpose of providing recreational facilities.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of providing a playing field and an agricultural science plot for the Speightstown Boys' School.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael, for the purpose of re-locating the Headquarters of the Transport Board.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 177 164 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government, to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 2, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that we are going to take lunch at 12.30 p.m. until 2.00 p.m. and after 2.00 p.m., we shall go into Private Members' Business.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is as much as I would like to say at this point, unless Your Honour may wish to so direct.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can someone please second the motion.

Mr. J. G. ODLE: I beg to second that.

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Order No. 3 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the International Business Companies (Exemption from Income Tax) Act.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES (EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, this Bill tidies up the administrative practices that have taken place with respect to the granting of additional concessions to international business companies by way of allowing them duty free concessions for equipment, and also relieving them from the specific *ad valorem* stamp duties which have been increased subsequent to the coming into operation of the Act.

The Government has an Advisory Committee on international business companies and other legislation dealing with the service industries in existence. That committee is representative of the practitioners in the multi-disciplinary area which is in existence in Barbados, the Accounting Association in Barbados, the Bar Association, the Association of Chartered Secretaries or the Professional Company Secretaries together with representatives of the Ministry and other interested parties. From time to time, recommendations are made on the need to amend legislation which provides the inducements for international business companies. One has to be careful, however, that one does not accept too readily the suggestions put forward by this body, and it has been the practice of the Government to observe the working of the legislation in particular areas before there is ready acceptance of the suggestions, and the reason for this is quite clear.

The international business companies operate, to a large extent, against the background of benefits flowing from Barbados which are recognized in the country of origin of the shareholders of the company. We have a very favourable tax agreement with some of these countries, and while we wish to give the maximum benefits to the international business companies in Barbados in relation to these companies, we must be careful that in doing this we do not provide such a regime in Barbados that would incur the displeasure of other countries whom we get international business companies from. There is a delicate balance.

10.25 a.m.

These amendments are amendments which we feel will clarify and make clear from the outset to the proprietors of international business companies the level of extra tax concessions other than Income Tax that the Government will give.

There is also the question of the integration between the international business companies and other offshore legislation, namely, the utilisation of banking institutions in Barbados. We wish to encourage the international business companies to use the offshore banking institutions in Barbados, and we want to make it clear,

just as in the manufacture of goods, that there can be in a free trade zone trading between two companies which are both eligible for similar concessions. We want to make it clear that any interest or dividends received as a result of the utilisation of these facilities will not be subject to the taxation. In short, we are seeking to create a zone of freedom of manoeuvre within the regime so as to encourage the maximum utilisation of the financial institutions in Barbados.

There are other amendments that the Committee would like us to make, but we have not reached the stage where we can make those amendments with a degree of certainty that they will not impact unduly heavily on some of the double taxation agreements that we have.

That is the general background for this law. I think I can say quite safely that the international business companies, as a part of the offshore regime in Barbados, have been quite successful. This machinery, since it was amended in 1979, has been the essential machinery which has been used to deal with that class of employment activity which we are encouraging, namely, the processing of data. It is a very moot point whether the processing of data in a country is a manufacturing activity or not, and we have had many legal opinions saying that the harmonisation of the fiscal incentive regime which we have on our law, and which is the major bit of legislation one uses to attract manufacturing activity, is not applicable to the processing of data. So the International Business Companies Act, now that it is amended, particularly since 1979, to allow the contraction by offshore companies of services in Barbados has been the instrument that the data processing companies have been using.

The record of these companies is good, and it is now quite clear that with the utilisation of modern telecommunications systems and the integration of the telephone with the satellite and other means of transmission of voice and data, provided you have a regime in existence which is flexible, we stand as good a chance as our competitors in the Caribbean and in other parts of the world who are of a similar time zone. The accuracy factor in Barbados has been well recognized as being well above the level, and although some of our costs may be higher than the costs in comparable areas with whom we compete, we have been able to attract some worthwhile companies.

The last point that I would mention in respect of this is that the Government will continue to keep under review and to pay regard to the recommendations of the committee which is continuously monitoring this matter. We feel that we now have a flexible regime in existence which will help us to continue to expand in this sector.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Bill, I would like to say that I think the Government has been showing foresight in liberalising the regime which permits international corporations to carry on business activity in Barbados which impacts outside of the CARICOM area. A recent check with the Central Bank shows that there were some 325 international business companies registered under the International Business Companies (Exemption from Income Tax) Act, and of those I would expect that a large proportion is active and is carrying on their operations in a wide diverse sector of business activity.

I recognise that prior to the renegotiation of the double taxation agreement between the United States and Barbados, we did lose a few of the companies which were apprehensive of the deadline for the cut off of the treaty arrangements, some of whom re-located in Panama, mostly, and in the Netherland Antilles. I understand from most of the practitioners in this field, both in the accounting field and in the legal field, that some of these have come back into Barbados and others have been re-locating here. I am particularly pleased that recently we have started to attract international shipping companies which have taken the benefit of the double taxation arrangements between Barbados and some countries, particularly the Dominion of Canada, and have begun to locate their headquarters in Barbados for the purpose of conducting their international business and trading and management of ships. Only a few days ago, one of the significant Canadian companies re-located here.

I believe that there are certain fundamental conditions which must pre-exist if we are to promote this type of business. The first is that people look to a country that is stable, stable in its institutions, in its democratic system, and stable, too, of course, in its judicial system. They expect that if they come to Barbados there will be an appreciation of the investment which they bring and that they will have the opportunity to move that investment freely out of Barbados and that they are given the opportunity to maximise the investment without, of course, from a Barbadian point of view, detriment to our economic and financial structures.

But it is not only the stable environment of our institutions and our democratic system of Government which is attractive. I think that, to a large extent, it is the attitude which we ourselves manifest to people who are either visitors or immigrants to our shores and doing business here. They must be satisfied that the Government officials and the average Barbadian with whom they come into contact are people who are friendly and who are efficient in a business sense. They wish to know that the immigration authorities, for instance, attend to their applications promptly and that they do not have to pass money to anybody in order to achieve the status that they want. I believe that Barbados satisfies

this criteria. They wish to know that the Customs officials are efficient. They wish to know that the professional people with whom they deal in business, the accountants, the lawyers, attend to their business promptly and that there are no kick-backs in the society, as some other countries demand of this. Those of us who practise in this field are always pleased with Barbadians when we hear the commendation of the international business investors for this aspect of Barbadian life.

10.35 a.m.

I am not saying that we cannot see a greater efficiency in some aspects of business organization in Barbados. Indeed, we should constantly be seeking to rationalize the regulations, as well as the procedures under which businesses must operate, if they are to operate effectively. We do not want a position, for instance, where it would take something like six weeks to form a company. I am happy to say that, today, you can form a company in a couple of hours in Barbados, having regard, particularly, to the improved procedures brought about by the Companies Act of 1982. The company formation procedure has been simplified to the point where anyone can obtain forms from the corporate section of the Registry and even form their company themselves.

The cost of the formation of companies has also been kept within reasonable limit. I know it is fashionable to look at the fees charged by attorneys-at-law, but one can be well satisfied that in this regard there has been great self control in the legal profession in encouraging the formation of these companies.

I am also happy to say that the corporate section of the Registration Office is functioning extremely efficiently and answering queries extremely promptly. I understand that it is an area that is being computerized, and I think that this will go more and more to improving the efficiency of the corporate procedures which we have here.

Likewise, I was pleased to hear from one investor commendation for the Exchange Control Authorities and the Central Bank, and the prompt manner with which they deal with applications between them. It is possible, once all of the information is sent to the Exchange Control Section of the Central Bank, to obtain any necessary permission and approval within twenty-four hours. In this regard, Barbados is a developed country, very conscious of the need for investment and the need to create the proper climatic conditions for investment. We have seen a trend, therefore, a consciousness on the part of Ministers and on the part of officials such that the procedures and business atmosphere necessary for encouraging this type of investment has been improving from time to time. I believe that these amendments are only part and parcel of that overall atmosphere.

Likewise, such companies need to operate within a certainty about the taxation regime which affects them. And so, it is necessary for them to recognize that the double taxation treaties which we sign with their countries of origin, particularly with their shareholders, are favourable. In this regard, the Government has a certain limited, but important, number of double taxation arrangements with the major countries to whom we look for this form of business, in particular with the United States of America and with the Dominion of Canada.

I would urge the Government, however, to keep under constant review its double taxation arrangements. I believe that the Caribbean Community could give greater impetus to this form of business, by providing at the Community Secretariat a pool of expertise in the field of double taxation and taxation arrangements. It is an esoteric field, a field from which most people would run, because the moment the word, "taxation" is used, most people become mesmerised by the arrangement and believe that there is an intellectual difficulty ahead of them. In actual fact, if you observe the way in which business is conducted, even on the streets of our country, one would recognize that it is not as esoteric as it appears at first sight, and I would like to strongly suggest that Barbados particularly takes the initiative in beefing up the CARICOM Secretariat where double taxation treaties and treaty negotiations are looked at.

I am particularly unhappy about the taxation arrangements within CARICOM. Although there has been a treaty negotiated in many respects, the treaty between the MDCs and LDCs is really not used, and if used, is not used properly. I am not even sure that the treaty is in effect. I believe that CARICOM can do a lot for ourselves and the OECS countries and Trinidad and Tobago, and in this respect for the Bahamas, although that is a complete tax free regime. It can do a lot for the countries within the Community if it would look at the areas in which we should be negotiating double taxation treaties.

I have in mind particularly some of the countries in the Far East, places like Japan, and some of the countries of the European Economic Community with whom we could have a favourable relationship and from whom we could draw this kind of business. I trust that the experience gained in the renegotiations of the Barbados-US Double Taxation Agreement will now be put to good advantage in this regard. I think that the Government and the various private sector organizations which collaborated in that exercise ought to be congratulated, and people like the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) who led the negotiations on behalf of Barbados in coming to a Treaty that I think respects the different positions and perspectives of our two countries and yet, at the same time, have given a working and viable arrangement within which to conduct businesses between our countries.

In this regard, I think the Government in negotiating such treaties must look at the sort of definition sections very carefully. Some of our treaties, for instance, would encourage us not to discriminate in relation to Land Tax. In others, there is a restriction, and this form of discriminatory treatment can itself run business, including international business, if some organizations feel that, although they are foreign enterprises, they are more unfairly treated than other organizations.

I believe as well that the time has come when the Government could possibly, in conjunction with relevant private sector organizations, both professional and otherwise, look at an overall Act, one composite piece of legislation, dealing with the whole range of offshore business. In this regard, the precedence set in Antigua is one that the Government may look to. It is not that we have not got in place some of the necessary legislation but a lot of it is scattered in individual....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member wants me to declare an interest. I had the good fortune to preside over the committee that established that bit of legislation in Antigua. It was not my final work but I did have some input in it, although a lot of the draughtsmanship was due to Professor James Ryan, who is well known to this House and to legal people in the Caribbean.

I would suggest that we should bring together the International Business Companies Act, the Act dealing with shipping, the Act dealing with offshore banking and the Act dealing with other incentives being given to people doing business here and place them all in one composite piece of legislation, with its uncomplicated regulations attached thereto, and simplified business forms, in order to make it easy for anyone to see where we are, and so that they would be able to do business here more readily.

10.45 a.m.

The third aspect which I want to stress is the promotional aspects of our offshore business and our international business companies. I am aware that the Government has designated, I believe, the IDC as the institution which will look after this business. I think that we cannot have the promotion of offshore business or business of this nature scattered between two, three and four different Government enterprises. There must be a single institution with primary responsibility for looking after aspects of co-ordination of the various aspects of the international business of the business sector, and that organization must be given the personnel, the expertise and the resources not only to ensure a continuing review of the various legislation procedures, but also to look at the positive and dynamic promotion of the offshore business sector.

The Honourable Prime Minister spoke of the fact that we have been attracting to Barbados various international business organizations dealing with the new "Information Age," information technology or informatics, as it is called. I think Barbados stands a lot to gain in this regard, with its high standard of education and its reasonably literate population. It offers tremendous potential and it has a good resource base from which to launch into this sector of business activity.

It is possible that within two to three years, with dynamic promotion, we could create an additional six to eight thousand jobs in this field, once the regime is proper. Perhaps I am being over-enthusiastic, but it is not unknown in places like the Netherlands, in particular, that this level of activity has surfaced and, most recently, in Panama. The honourable Member should look and see where in the Netherlands Antilles this sector is a high source of employment. I am not only citing international business companies, I am looking at the whole area of offshore business. Likewise, one could make the same point in relation to the Bahamas, the Cayman Islands, or Bermuda. So although the figures may sound very optimistic for a three year period, they are figures which are realisable once one goes about properly setting up the background criteria and situations in which companies must operate.

I think that one has to have a constant intervention at the major seminars in which people are treaty shopping will be attending. In this regard, I believe that some of the officials should become members of the International Tax Planning Association. I think there are probably no more than 12 Barbadians who are currently members of this organization. I can testify to the benefits of it. One has constant exposure to people who are experts in this field. One has a pool of knowledge, either by way of seminars or pamphlets, always available to you, and an analysis and forecast of the things in the future.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is hinting that he is either a member or something I do not see his name, Sir, on the membership list. If he has become a member, he would have had to become a member in the last month or so, because I do get the membership list, being myself a member of that organization for sometime now, and I do follow very closely the list of members. If the honourable Member is not yet a member.....

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He is an expert, I see. If he wishes to join the organization, I can assure him that I will put him up for membership. We like to encourage people in this area because I think it is beneficial to the country as a whole.

With respect to this particular Bill, I am happy to see that the exemption from certain taxes and the incentives being given are now being widened. In particular, I am pleased to see that these companies will now be able to import free of duty certain material and equipment as defined in the Act which is now before the House. This is an area of complaint that we frequently heard about, and although every application had to be processed by the particular Minister, and the specific exemption given, now we know that the procedure will be simplified in a manner in which it was not simplified before. I am pleased, too, with Clause 5 of the Bill, the clause which seeks to exempt from withholding tax payments in respect of interest, rent, management fees, and royalties by one international business company or another, or to a non-resident person. This will enable the necessary cross-fertilization of business activity between ourselves and other IBCs, properly associated or related to the resident IBC and using the possibility of more than one treaty shopping area to the benefit of the enterprise.

Nowadays it is possible that a lot of transactions being conducted to Japan, billions and billions of dollars, can be transacted outside of Japan, and we find that the two countries most connected with them could possibly be the Cayman Islands or Netherland Antilles. One has to be sure only that the monitoring of this regime will not lead to any undesirable characters. In this regard, I am very pleased with the Exchange of Information Treaty arrangement with the United States. I think it offers an opportunity for control without necessarily offending against the principles of confidentiality and secrecy, and it is possible for us in renegotiating treaties to pay regard to our need to preserve our own environment from characters who may want merely to launder money or business enterprises without necessarily conferring a proper benefit on the company at large.

I believe that a review in the United States and other places of international business activity in Barbados has been extremely favourable. I have heard no unfavourable comment about the companies' operation in our offshore legislation in the manner that I have heard the unfavourable comment coming about companies operating in other jurisdictions. I believe that the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and their Judiciary Committee, are extremely conscious of jurisdiction where this type of practice may obtain, and I really trust that the atmosphere which operates here and which has been created will be preserved in the future to the benefit of the island as a whole.

10:55 a.m.

I believe that both sides of the Chamber should readily support this Bill. I think it is a piece of legislation that came before the House for the first time in 1965 and has subsequently been upgraded and improved, if I may say so, by successive Governments, and particularly the amendments made in 1979 and now have gone

some considerable way to improve the regime which existed since 1965.

I recall the formation of this Act in 1965 when some of us then at the Bar — the Honourable Prime Minister, myself, Mr. Douglas Lynch, Mr. Clifford Chapman — were most concerned with this sort of regime, and, in fact, when the measure was discussed between some of us who were interested, all the assistance was given at the time of the formation of the drafting of this Bill. At one stage I believe that the draft came down from an English barrister which did not seem to meet very much with what was needed, and this was said, but this Bill goes back a long way. Many of us have been operating under it for a long time and giving advice and rendering services not only to our own private advantage, in that we are paid most of the time for giving such advice, but conscious of the necessity of improving the business atmosphere under which real economic activity can take place in our country.

I commend the Government on the measure and give it my wholehearted support.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member has somewhat broadened the scope of the debate. However, one does not need to enter into a full debate on the entire offshore sector of Barbados. What I would say is that if words were dollar bills, then the Barbados Labour Party would have created billions of dollars for the people of this country in their discussions on the offshore sector since 1978. If words were jobs, then we would have no unemployment in Barbados when one judges the amount of words that have been spent or uttered in this area over the years. Indeed, I have almost had a kind of *déjà vu* flash back a little while ago, because I distinctly recall in 1979 the honourable Member for St. Thomas, sitting in exactly the same seat....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Thomas is there.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, sitting over there. That is what I am saying, sitting in that same seat.

My recollection is clear, a strange *déjà vu* phenomenon. He was sitting in that same seat in 1979 when the amendments to the Offshore Bank Act were brought into Parliament. I think the honourable Member would recall the debate on that day, and indeed he himself may have reflected and must have cast his mind back and said, 'well, nothing has happened between 1979 and 1985? He did not miss a single day from this Parliament in respect of the general tenure of the debate and the contribution which I heard from the previous two Members. It is as though the world has remained static in respect of offshore banking and the development in that area.

However, there are one or two points I would like to address myself to. Firstly, it is important to recognise that the International Business Companies Act still forms today the main backbone of the contribution of the entire offshore sector to Barbados in terms of overall benefits, and it is important to reflect that that piece of legislation was put on the Statute Book by the foresight of the Democratic Labour Party some 20 years ago. Despite all the talk of other areas of offshore activity, it still remains the main contributor to the Barbados economy in respect of that offshore regime which we are trying to develop.

This Bill is one of a series of amendments we have had in this House in relation to the whole area of legislation either creating or changing enactments relating to offshore activity. Repeatedly, one has made the very fundamental point that recurrent alterations in the legislation in themselves generate lack of confidence in potential investors in the offshore area, and indeed creates problems for those people who have to deal with all these bits of legislation. I am willing to concede that situations change from time to time and, therefore, it will be necessary to make amendments to make the legislation more attractive at any given point in time, but I think the other side must recognise that the failure of effective harmonisation of the various bits of legislation going back six years, as we on this side recommended at that time, has been a problem in relation to attracting business.

I know of probably about two to three hundred million dollars in business that could have come to Barbados which did not come because either the people, say, in the offshore banking sector in Barbados were not quite sure of particular provisions at a given time, or they were not sure of the outcome of enactments before Parliament at the time and therefore could not give an unequivocal commitment to the person wishing either to pass the investment through Barbados or to do business in Barbados at that particular time. It is important to remember that in this area of business one is often dealing within a time framework of an hour or two hours. A certificate of deposit becomes due, let us say, in Japan at this point in time, an enquiry is made as to the desirability of a transfer to Barbados of a large sum of money, and if the person at the other end of the telephone cannot give an immediate answer, or cannot respond with an immediate telex, then the business goes elsewhere. It is as simple and straightforward as that. So the failure to harmonise the various legislative instruments has been a major inhibitory factor in the potential rate of growth of this sector of the economy.

There have been other factors, and the major factor lies in the area of promotion. There can be no doubt that this problem has not been solved because the right inputs have not been made into it. Repeatedly, we have pointed out that the Central Bank of Barbados

should not be the agency for the promotion of this type of business. I think the Government is now about to make an even worse error if they should appoint the IDC as the agent for the promotion of this kind of business. I say this because, having looked at the entire matter, it is quite clear that the kind of skills that you require are principally specialized accounting, legal, banking and secretarial skills. That is the kind of combination that you need to have in order to gather information and to provide ready dissemination of information to those people who are involved in this kind of business.

11.05 a.m.

Let me give you an example, Sir. Let us have a hypothetical situation where the honourable Member for Christ Church West, through a corporation, wishes to transfer \$100 000 from the Cayman Islands to the offshore bank, the Royal Bank.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member seems to be debating another aspect of financing Barbados which is not very much related to the IDC. I know the honourable Member for Christ Church West has carried the debate way around financial matters. I would rather stick to the Resolution which is before the House and not go off on an excursion of debating a whole area which is not, technically, before the House at the moment.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am simply responding to matters raised in the debate by the two previous speakers. I have raised no new matter. I am dealing with the area of promotion, which has been raised by the previous two speakers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The previous two speakers did not specifically dwell on one aspect of the matter. It seems to me that you are dealing with one particular area of the matter rather than the matter which is the subject matter before the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of this amendment, by certain relaxations with respect to the tax provisions applying to international business companies, would be to make these companies more competitive and, therefore, constitute a core factor in relation to the further promotion of this effort. This is one of the fundamental reasons for the amendments before the House.

The point I am trying to make is that you can make all the tax concessions that you wish to make, but unless you have an environment in which the new tax regime can be communicated to potential investors, then the amendments are, in fact, useless. This brings us to the purpose of the amendment, which is to enhance the international business company activity in Barbados through the area of promotion, which, I think, is very germane to the potential value of the substantive matter which is before the House at this moment. I believe that it was in

recognition of this that the honourable Member for Christ Church West raised the whole question of promotion in the context of dealing with this amendment. This is the prime purpose of the amendments.

I would like to say that the honourable Member for Christ Church West has remained silent over the years in this Parliament on the very matters which he raised, despite the fact that he had available to him; as early as 1979, a study done by Dr. B. A. K. Rider, a confidential memorandum on certain aspects, a well known expert in this field. Indeed, I cannot understand why the honourable Member for Christ Church West did not assist the people of Barbados at an earlier stage in dealing with what are essentially the contents of that memorandum 1975, when he had it available to him and on his desk in 1979.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order: I wish the honourable Member would make this memorandum which he is talking about a document of the House, if he wants to say it is a memorandum. I certainly do not recall any memorandum of Dr. Rider. I would say that Dr. Rider was a lecturer in law at Corpus Christi College, a sister of the College of Christ which I attended at Cambridge, and is an expert on international fraud and the control of international fraud. If the honourable Member would recall, he would recall my talking about the increase in white collar crime and the fact that steps were being taken to control this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am pleased that the honourable member has recognized the name, barrister-at-law, President of the Barbados Institute of Securities, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, Consultant to the Commonwealth Secretariat, well known investigator in the field of offshore activity.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now sure that the honourable Member will now make that a document of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I would make this a document of the House. It is a piece of paper. I am delighted to do so, Sir.

To continue, in order that these amendments may be properly utilized, it is very important that the Government should act on my advice, not Dr. Rider's advice, in recognizing that a major scandal could do a great deal of damage to the reputation of Barbados and, indeed, the Central Bank, and for this reason, I, not Dr. Rider, would advocate the removal of the Central Bank from routine supervisory jurisdiction.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will now make the document from which he read a document of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. The honourable Member will now make the document from which he read a document of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No problem at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will make that a document of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: With the greatest pleasure, Mr. Speaker, I shall make it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I complete my readings from it, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: You may now complete your readings.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. "Confidential Memorandum on certain aspects of Offshore Banking Act, 1979, by Dr. B. A. K. Rider."

I do not wish to go through the whole range of activities which were identified would arise from amendments of this kind which we are dealing with today. Dr. Rider referred to such areas as criminal banking facilities, use of facilities for non-criminal but unacceptable activities, a haven for hot money, fronting operations and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the honourable Member tell me how he and Dr. Rider relate to the International Business Companies Act which is before the Chamber.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir. The International Business Companies Act can be manipulated in order to accommodate this kind of activity. I am pretty familiar with this whole sector.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know how it operates.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not me.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have spent a long time in this business.

I hope that a proper agency would be established now in order to deal with the further development of this sector, in order that there can be some progress if one recognizes the kind of resources that should be made available to it.
11.15 a.m.

I am concerned that these amendments are not enough to deal with the problem of stunting of growth in the area of international business companies' operations in Barbados. I believe that more positive legislative steps could be taken which might address itself to a wider area of problems impacting on growth in this area. Specifically, I refer to measures which could probably make Barbados somewhat more attractive than the counter-attraction created by the homely domicile development of the same type of atmosphere in which international business companies can operate within the mainland of the United States as one major competing factor which has stunted the growth of international business companies in the area. In other words, what I am saying is that between 1965 and 1979 an international environment existed which led to the rapid expansion of this sort of business. Between 1979 and today, that international environment has changed, and no doubt that international environment is reflected in these amendments today, and one of the principle factors has been the fact that within the mainland United States a whole series of havens have been created to make it less likely that companies would wish to use this particular environment outside of the United States.

In many countries, one has seen the operation not only of international business companies but also a situation where the allied growth of captive insurance business has taken place hand in hand. Indeed, arising out of the Monte Carlo Conference on Re-insurance, which I had the honour to attend about 13 months ago, dealing with this specific area of marriage between activity in the area of captives and in the area of international business companies, there can be no doubt that with the increasing demands of re-insurance to ensure that their risk has adequate and reasonable origins, in other words as a counter action influence to the spreading and miniaturising of risks which have formed the basic factors which led to the growth of that parallel book-related business, that reversal in that situation is adversely affecting the development of international business companies.

I now turn to the question of revenue, which is very pertinent to these amendments, because they are all in fact tantamount to a reduction in the amount of revenue up front that the country would derive from the activities of international business companies in Barbados, and the tradeoff, presumably, must be in the area of expenditures, the area of employment and in the area of the attraction of additional capital into Barbados, once potential investors become more familiar with the positive aspects of the country. I believe that that must be the background thinking behind it, because up front there is a loss of revenue and one is hoping to recoup at that end. It was therefore pertinent, and I think proper, that the honourable Member for Christ Church West dealt with the question of job generation from the offshore sector. He has now doubled the expectations, in 1979 it was 3 000; now he says 6 800. I would like to submit,...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation: The honourable Member is misquoting the honourable Member for Christ Church West. What I said is that if this legislation is properly promoted and there is a sufficient environment, there are possibilities, as happened elsewhere, like the Netherlands, Bermuda, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, that this type of activity can attract employment in that range. If the honourable Member is fair in his debate, he would not quote me as saying I said 6 800. I said between 6 000 and 8 000. Secondly, the honourable Member must realise that I am speaking in the context of what has happened in other countries for the future with a proper regime.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am very grateful for the elucidation. It would seem that the honourable Member's thinking on the subject is not very different from mine, that is, when you look down the road, and if there is proper handling of this sector in Barbados, then there is a possibility that job creation of the order that he is talking about might develop. But it is important not to tell people that because a legislative instrument comes before the House, 3 000 jobs can be created overnight, as was done in 1979, because, far from 3 000 jobs being created, there has been a net loss of jobs within the very sector which was under discussion in 1979, a net loss of jobs between 1979 and today 1985. I can concede that if the offshore sector in Barbados were to develop along the lines, say, of London, if it were to develop along the lines and at the rate at which it is developing in New York or in Miami, not to mention the traditional sectors, whether it be Indonesia, Singapore, the Bahamas, the Cayman Islands or any of the traditional centres, surely there is an opportunity for job creation, and job creation of a kind probably relatively appropriate to the kind of education which we offer in this country at secondary, at University and at professional levels. That can be conceded, but having said that, you have to get out there and fight for the business. It is not good enough to have defective legislation so that you have to come to the House probably about 15 times in about six years in order to effect some harmonisation. It is not good enough to have the Honourable Minister of Agriculture waste time in Washington trying to conclude a double taxation treaty only to discover that your domestic, legislative regime is defective to the point that you cannot take full advantage of the double taxation treaty, and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture knows that what I am saying is true.

There is one member of the Barbados Labour Party who is no longer a Member of this House who has developed some expertise, I think, over the years in the legal aspect relating to this kind of activity. The Government would be well advised to seek his opinion in one or two areas. Then you will discover the major holes in the

legislation in Barbados and why it is that so much business has been turned away from this country over the years.

We heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West refer to the whole question of the exchange of information which has permitted this country to screen investors in this area, and I do not wish to misquote the honourable Member. The question of freedom of information is a two-edged sword in relation to this whole area of activity, as we all know, and the main impetus behind that has been the drive in the United States, in particular, and, indeed, with co-operation most recently from the British Government, in order to deal with certain developments in the Cayman Islands and in other resorts in the Caribbean area in particular. One may recall the court ruling in one of the states of the southern United States affecting the Bank of Nova Scotia in Cayman Islands not so long ago.

11.25 a.m.

These steps have important implications for international business companies in Barbados, because, as I said, whereas freedom of information may assist you in the very difficult task of screening, so clearly set out and defined by Dr. Rider, nevertheless, it could inhibit certain types of investment. My memory may be wrong, but I am not so sure whether there was any Act of this Parliament which permitted freedom of information in respect of bank operations with the United States or any other country. It may be on the Statute Book, but I am not aware of it. Certainly, it was not passed during my period in Parliament, I have never heard it referred to. But if it is being done, it is my suspicion that there should be some sort of legislative approval with that step.

I do not think that I need put too much emphasis on the question of undesirable aspects of developments within the international business companies sector because perhaps, of all the various segments of that sector, the international business sector, although it can be infiltrated by the way, nonetheless, it is susceptible to that sort of thing. It would probably be incorrect to put the same emphasis on that as if I were discussing other aspects of the offshore banking situation. However, I should point out that, despite all the screening, we have had our problems here in Barbados, as we know. We have had our problems where a corporation involved in offshore activities has attracted the attention of the bank. I believe, due to the incompetence of the Ministry of Finance, the court was able to override.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the International Companies Act.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I am referring to?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No sense of relevance.)

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the International Business Act. In any case, the honourable Member has used the thirty minutes allocated to him in the Standing Orders.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I have all day.

(Aside: First speaker!)

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you the first speaker? Continue. Continue until tomorrow, but make sure that you continue on the Act that is before the House.

Aside.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He cannot help it.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Of course, I would never deviate from an Act that is before this Honourable House. I would never do a thing like that, because if I had done a thing like that, it would definitely be against the Rules.

There is one final point relating to time zoning, which I believe was mentioned specifically by the Honourable Prime Minister. I believe that if we look at our telecommunications infrastructure in relation to facilitating the activities of international business companies and our position on the globe, and with the recent satellite and information storage in the transmission of communications and information, we should be in no worse position than a place like Singapore, which, by virtue of its endowment in a specific geographical area, has had a peculiar advantage between 1965 and today. But it is interesting that, with the developments of new technology in communications, satellite communication and storage information, Barbados can be in an equally competitive position.

I believe that I have covered most of the points that have been raised without getting into a substantive debate on the whole area of offshore business. But I think

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: it is important to recognize the fundamental point,.....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: that these activities are all inter-related and that amendments, and I trust that these amendments do harmonize with other aspects of legislation in this area and to recognize the fact that the lawyers in Bridgetown — let us face it, the lawyers who are dealing with this business have been complaining that this is a problem when they are dealing with their clients,

but the problem with the Members on the other side is that they never listen to anybody.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You, at least.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Some of us have a little experience in this area, and a little more experience than many over there. But they would never listen!

I have made the contribution I have made in the interest of Barbados, without stressing the negative aspects of this area. I have tried to see how we could deal with the existing situation and how we can improve it, against the background of the realities that operate in the international financial world of today.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM (Christ Church East): Mr. Speaker, I can promise you at the outset, not to join the last honourable Member, who just spoke in wandering far and wide in the whole area of the offshore business sector. There are a few points that have been made, however, which I think need to be answered and in particular, I think I need to put the Government's contribution, the development of the international business companies and some aspects of the offshore sector, in proper perspective.

The first point I wish to make relates to the need from time to time for amendments, such as the one we are discussing now and others. Barbados came, generally speaking, to the offshore sector relatively late. The hey-day of the offshore sector in many countries was really the early Sixties and a little before. That was the period when international trade was at its height and when there was a perception that the offshore sector could have been left to small developing countries, the prosperity of the developed countries was such that they were not really competing with the developing countries.

There has been a relative drying of internationally mobile capital since the late Sixties and Barbados is now competing with the United States itself, with West Germany and with many of the countries in Western Europe for this type of business. From day to day, the situation changes. The Bahamas update their legislation in flag ships of convenience, captive insurance, in the whole area of international business companies, two or three times a year. Bermuda does the same thing. The Isle of Man has been doing the same thing and many states, in the United States itself, they have been doing the same thing. Therefore, we really cannot stand still. This area has got to be the subject of continuous monitoring and review, and from time to time we have got to make sure that we do not lose our competitive edge and, to that extent, we have got to come back to Parliament from time to time to make sure that we can compete on equal terms with the competitors in the region and, indeed, in the world.

This brings me to the point that even though they have been saying that it was the Democratic Labour Party that put the International Business Companies Act on the Statute Book in 1965, that in itself was not enough. No one wants to take that from them, that is a fact, but if they had revised the legislation before 1979 much more could have been achieved. It was not until we came to office after 1976 and revised the legislation in 1979 that this sector began to grow. It was there on the Statute Book since 1965 and very little was happening. So the point I am making is that it ought to be appreciated from all sides that this is an area which is extremely dynamic and an area in which we have got to amend the legislation and restructure our incentives on a regular basis in order to maintain our competitive edge.
11.35 a.m.

The second point which I wish to make relates to putting the expectations in relation to job creation in some perspective. I think that is an area which needs to be approached with some balance. When the offshore banking legislation was introduced, the Right Honourable Prime Minister, our blessed memory, gave a forecast of that sector creating something like 3600 jobs. The truth is, only a very limited amount of people in the community benefit from this offshore sector, the accounting firms, some of the lawyers, not many, some of the banks, very, very few white-collar jobs were created, and the country gains revenues mostly from the formation of the companies and the fees paid to the Registrar. It would be wrong, therefore, to expect that even if there is a hundred fold increase in activity in the captive insurance area, the management of insurance companies sector, or even in international companies, generally, that there would be any dramatic increase of jobs. I think that that point needs to be put in perspective.

Having said that, we ought to appreciate that a great deal has happened within the last year in Barbados in relation to the international business sector. The fact that this country concluded an Exchange of Fiscal Information Agreement with the United States has helped us considerably. Immediately, we qualified as headquarters for Foreign Sales Corporations, and since last December more than 200 FISCs have been established in Barbados. When the United States made the decision that they would no longer collide with the rules and they would force the Domestic International Sales Corporations, DISCs, to become FISCs, that is to go offshore, Barbados immediately qualified as a headquarters and we were able to get some of the business. Not all of the companies have been relocated, and I think it is very important that we continue our promotional effort with a view of getting a few hundred more of these foreign sales corporations.

This brings me to the point about promotional activity. The honourable Member who last spoke does not, I think, fully appreciate what has been happening in

relation to the promotion of Barbados as an offshore centre. In the last year we have got considerable coverage in the *Financial Times*, the *Institutional Investor* and the *Wall Street Journal*, and there have been at least four promotional tours in this entire area. This is not to say that more cannot be done or should not be done, but I think it is fair to say that Barbados is known in the area.

There is also an aspect of promotion that is not known to the general public, and that is that the overseas companies of the accounting firms here, like Coopers and Lybrand in the United States and in England, do a lot of the promotion of this activity. The banks themselves do a lot of promotion of this activity; Barclays Bank in the United Kingdom on behalf of Barclays in Barbados, Nova Scotia in Canada on behalf of Nova Scotia in Barbados. So there is a large area of promotional activity carried on for us by institutions, activity which the general public does not know about.

My position has changed in relation to the need for a separate parastatal organisation to promote this activity. The more I reflect on this matter, the more I come to the conclusion that there is no magic in setting up a new parastatal in order to promote this Act. Other Members of the House have had that view before the others have called for the establishment of a new institution in order to promote this area of offshore sector. I think what is needed is effective co-ordination of this activity under one Minister. I can see nothing wrong with the Central Bank of Barbados being responsible for some areas of activity, for the Industrial Development Corporation promoting some areas of activity, particularly the international business companies such as we are now discussing, and other areas of Government being involved in other areas of activity, but I think that there should be co-ordination and we should avoid duplication of activity, with tours and missions overseas, which is likely to be wasteful and non-productive. I very much feel that, having reflected on this matter now for three to four years, there is no magic in the creation of a new statutory corporation in order to promote this particular area.

The particular amendment before us adds flexibility, scope and new opportunities to this area, and I think all of us in this House should welcome the flexibility and the expansion that has been added to the international business companies.

Our environment in Barbados is a good one, and we ought not to join anyone in knocking it. Barbados has a very sophisticated, intellectual and physical infrastructure. Those who are concerned with these matters are happy with the quality of services they get from the accountants, the banks, and the lawyers. It is also true that we are on the frontier in the use of the computer and the satellite, and the combination of this new technology of the computer and the satellite will ensure that Barbados will

be able for many years to exploit the whole area of data processing. I think that is a particular area which we need to promote more vigorously, and I have every confidence that in the years ahead that is what precisely will be done.

I want to correct a statement that was made by the honourable Member who spoke last. He gave the impression that the Exchange of Fiscal Information Agreement, which Barbados concluded with the United States and which has had the benefit of making sure that Barbados qualifies for convention benefits under the C.B.I. legislation and qualifies to be a headquarters of FISCs, collides with either our judicial process in Barbados or with our sovereignty. The truth is that we bargained very hard indeed to ensure that the Exchange of Fiscal Information Agreement which Barbados got was not much different from one which was on the Statute Books, and which had existed before, between Barbados and Canada. Barbados has got what is called a classical model, the Treaty of Exchange of Fiscal Information Agreement between Barbados and the United States which follows the classical model and does not collide with our sovereignty in anyway, in my view, or with the due process provisions in our own law. I think we need have no fear about the likely effect of the Exchange of Fiscal Agreement which Barbados concluded with the United States of America.

11.45 a.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this Bill, but, reluctantly, I have been drawn into the debate by the opening remarks of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), who accused me of speaking in 1979 on the Offshore Banking Act and making statements about offshore banking legislation and international business companies.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir: I did not accuse the honourable Member of speaking on it, I just said he was present and sitting in that same place. That is all.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, this whole House got the impression that I had spoken on the Offshore Banking Act of 1979, sitting in this place as the then Member for St. Philip North, and I want to set this Record straight.

That debate took place in here on Tuesday, 3rd July, 1979. The first person speaking was the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams, who was the then Member for St. Thomas sitting over there. The next Member

who spoke was Mr. St. John, "I beg to second that," a Dr. Haynes, the Right Honourable E. W. Barrow, a Dr. Haynes again, and the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams. When it was in Committee, a Mr. Taitt. I am reading from the debate, beginning at page 2551 and continuing right down to page 2597, where the question was put, the Bill was reported and on the separate motions of the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams, seconded by Honourable H. deB. Forde, the Bill was read a third time and passed. The next Bill dealt with that day was the International Business Companies (Exemption from Income Tax) (Amendment) Act, 1979. Mr. H. B. St. John and Mr. Ezra Alleyne were the only members to speak on that Bill, and it was passed.

If the inference was that I spoke on the Offshore Banking Act was given in here, that inference is not only misleading but untrue. It is an untruth of outstanding international proportion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I believe that all honourable Members would recognise that I did not say so. I said he was sitting in his place.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member has accused me of telling an untruth, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, this debate has been discussing another in the amendments of the International Business Companies Act and I wish to first take the points made by the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham). I think that, for the very first time, in my recollection of a debate in this Honourable Chamber, concerning this matter of the old offshore regime, as it is called, we have had a clear statement from an honourable Member on that side, that could be described as the unvarnished truth, about the benefits that can come from this offshore regime. The honourable Member for Christ Church East has done this House and Barbados a service today by having the courage to say what we have said from this side of the House, and what needs to be said to the people of Barbados, that the offshore regime cannot, and will not, bring large numbers of jobs in the hundreds and in the thousands. We have been the beneficiaries of a lot of propaganda, designed to give certain impressions to impressionable persons, which, in the final analysis, does more harm to this country than any of the structures that are brought forth from time to time about bringing down Barbados. It is inherently wrong to suggest to the people of Barbados at any time that, by the stroke of a pen or the passing of a piece of legislation in this House, they are going to be relieved of their untold misery by the sudden appearance of thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in a peculiar way, I am probably the only individual in this House at the moment who has had the unenviable task of going out and trying to persuade persons who were not Barbadians to come to Barbados to invest their money and to set up businesses on an on-going basis as part of my duty and responsibility. Anyone who has been engaged in that activity would tell you that it is the most difficult job in the world if you come from a country the size and reputation of Barbados competing literally with all the other entities in the world. You have at least 50 States in the United States, along with the municipalities within those States, that are engaged in the business of trying to attract investment, trying to attract industry, trying as best they can to improve the quality of life in their respective communities by inducing those persons that have capital to come and share the capital and invest it in their countries, to say nothing of the provinces in Canada and other developing, and not so developing countries around the world that engage in this activity on an on-going, never-ending basis. Yet, from time to time we have had the colossal arrogance in Barbados to suggest that the mere appearance of Barbados at a convention or on the international scene will result in thousands of people boarding planes to come down to Barbados to invest their money. The fact is, that is not true. Barbados has to take its place with the rest of the world while competing for very scarce private funds for investment purposes.

We have heard today about the 1979 amendments, but an examination of what actually happened in 1979 will show that we did no more at that time than to impose a regime of taxation so as to allow the double taxation arrangements to function more effectively. Again, by 1979 — and this is by way of clarifying the Record — there had been in Barbados 115 companies registered under this Act. That number of 115 would therefore have been registered under the Act since it was passed in 1965. The truth is that moving the tax incentive to 12 per cent in 1965 was considered a revolutionary act for a country the size of Barbados, but it was not the first country that had done it, nor was it the last. What we were doing then, and what we continue to do now, is to look at what our neighbours do, look at what other people do, and try to extract from what they have done what we consider to be in our very best interest.

11.55 a.m.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East said that the Democratic Labour Party had not improve the Act. I think that, on reflection, he would recognize that the improvement of the Act of which he speaks followed a pattern of review of the whole area of incentives for investment purposes which started to occur in Barbados, and, indeed, in the Caribbean Community, around the period 1970-1972, because it was recognized then, and it ought to be recognized now, that we, as part of the

Caribbean Community, must have a co-ordinated approach within the Community; otherwise, many of the efforts which we make are going to fall to the ground. It was in that context that we had, perhaps, the most important piece of incentive legislation passed in the last 20 years, the Fiscal Incentives Act. That Act was passed in 1974, and the reason we passed that Act, after long, laborious and detailed negotiation among the Member States of the Caribbean Community, was precisely to prevent and preclude these small Caribbean States from competing with each other to give away their birthrights.

Basically, what has tended to happen is that attempts to exploit us, have been made by those in the developed countries who perceive us as not having enough human resources in these new and esoteric areas to be aware of loopholes in the laws which are passed and loopholes in the methods which are used, which would allow those exploiters to benefit substantially. It is as a direct result of the resolve of the Caribbean Community members back in the 1970s to come together and join in an effort to preclude this exploitation by facing off one against the other, that we have had the harmonising approach to the question of fiscal incentives and what I would recommend to the Government is that we continue to have a unit not only within Barbados, because that, in the end, must happen — because if the Government is reviewing its activity, sooner or later it must become aware of the necessity to co-ordinate its development activity and its promotion activity, whichever Government is in power — but that we need a continual monitoring throughout the Caribbean, within the context of the Caribbean Community.

We need to have set up a monitoring team that would ensure that we continue to operate as a unit outside of the Caribbean. We would have much more force in the area of promotion if the Caribbean Community, as a whole, could be seen as an arena within which those foreign investors who have money to invest and those foreign investors concerned with the offshore regime would be able to find a place. As to where they actually locate within the Caribbean Community is not that important. What is more important is that they start to recognize the region as an area for fiscal business development, and one that is free and clear of the usual difficulties that have been associated with the laundering of money.

One of the reasons why the offshore business developed in the Caribbean and the sub-Caribbean region had to do with the necessity to launder monies. I do not intend to spend any time explaining what is meant by "laundering money," except to say that it was a way for those persons who acquired large sums of money unlawfully and who, if they used the normal channels of communications, would have been more easily detected, who had to find ways and means to get rid of their monies and then have it returned to them in what may be called "a legitimate manner." The whole offshore

regime, therefore, was created for purposes which did not meet the ideals which Barbados would have for its own development and, therefore, in our quest to develop a regime of our own, we are bound to run afoul of certain rules and regulations, for example, in the United States. It, therefore, became necessary for us to agree to sign an agreement or a treaty which now puts Barbados in a peculiar position, *vis-à-vis* the United States, in that we have committed to transmit certain bits of information to the United States under certain circumstances, and, in that respect, Peter and Paul, if you would pardon the analogy, may be painted with the same brush.

What I think the Government should do, as we have asked them before, is to make the agreement available to this Parliament. Instead of our having a view of it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Which agreement? The International Business Companies Act Agreement?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, if you would bear with me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been bearing with you now for the last twelve minutes and we have not got to the international business companies yet.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really regret that you have not been able to discern the international business companies, because it seems to me that your perception of the International Business Companies Act is the Act itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Act is before the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Act that is before the House is dealing with the whole regime of international and offshore business companies.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I do not agree.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have to abide by your ruling then. In this House, your agreement is all that counts.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree. There are certain other Acts which deal with offshore business. If you are telling me that the International Business Companies Act deals with the total offshore business, then we have no need for the other Acts.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That may very well be so, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, then, we will discuss that when we reach them, but when we are discussing the IBC, then we should deal with the IBC.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I submit, with the utmost respect, that that is the narrowest possible interpretation of our approach to this particular amendment. But, as you are the Speaker, I would have to abide by your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given quite a lot of latitude in debating the Bill, but, as I have said, for the last twelve minutes I have not heard you dealt with that Bill at all.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not call the name, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now dealing with another agreement which is something.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I submit, with respect, that the honourable Member for Christ Church East, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the Prime Minister himself all alluded to an information agreement between the United States and Barbados. That is the agreement I am talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: They alluded to it during this debate, so, if I allude to it, I am merely following in their footsteps.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not preventing you from alluding to it, but I ask, "when will you get to the Bill?"

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour pleases.

As I was saying, it would be very helpful if the Government, instead of having us every time we are going to debate international business casting aspersions on the information agreement between Barbados and the United States, could let us see that treaty. Then everybody in Barbados would know what precisely are the terms agreed to between Barbados and the United States as that agreement relates to international business. The point I am making is that it is because we on this side are not privy to the agreement that has been reached between the Government of Barbados and the United States that we continue to speculate on what that agreement is as it relates to international business.
12.05 p.m.

I would say that the international business community in the United States is being persuaded now, even now by the President of the United States, not to invest outside of the United States, and a whole new regime of tax incentives by the United States Government has recently been sent to the United States Congress with a view to having the President of the United States hold power to offer to municipalities and other areas of the United States tax incentives, to, in fact, share with them revenue in order that they may have a tax-free haven for a number of companies, especially those banks that have tended to have offshore operations. In that context, if Barbados is to compete even half way effectively in the international community, then Barbados has a responsibility to not only have the right kind of agency, but to have the right kind of people.

It is my judgment that, as the honourable Member indicated, it really does not matter which Ministry or which agency is responsible for promotion, although I have a particular prejudice against the Central Bank being involved in promotion, because the Central Bank is the agency of final decision in many respects and really ought not to be out there offering incentives and making

promises, if you will, whereas it is going to be operating as the arbiter to some extent. That is my personal administrative prejudice against the Central Bank being engaged in promotion of a certain kind. I think the Central Bank should be lending its weight to the promotion effort by way of its provisions and by way of what can be said of it, but I do not think myself that the Central Bank should be engaged in the actual promotion. What I think is very important is the quality of persons who are chosen for this very difficult job of promoting the offshore regime for Barbados.

I hear that the IDC is now going to be the agency designated to look after this business. I think recently we heard that they had a staff of some 76 persons, and it is interesting to me that that staff of 76 persons may not have on it more than a few specialists in the business which the IDC was designed primarily to do. It seems to me that promotion is the main job of the Industrial Development Corporation which, I understand, will be administering this Act. It always used to administer this Act, and it should continue to administer the Act, so I do not think there is an innovation there. What I think, however, is that the level of expertise in regard to promotion has needed for some time to be upgraded, and I am not sure that the qualities of persons who have been coming into the IDC fall within the quality that is necessary for this kind of specialised promotion. Had I the opportunity or the responsibility for directing that aspect of our development, I would be inclined to review entirely the methods which we have been using for promotion.

The honourable Member quoted some media places that have mentioned Barbados in recent times, but, Sir, he did not allude to some of the negative publicity which we have been receiving in the same *Wall Street Journal*; publicity which is based on a short visit to Barbados perhaps by a journalist for three or four days, after which a most important and influential article is written in which Barbados is portrayed in a very negative light. I think that the offices overseas, whether they are consulates or missions or promotion offices, have been portrayed to the people of Barbados for some time as looking after the economic interests of Barbados, and I believe that the time has come for us to stop making that the object or subject of utterances, and in reality a change should come over the promotion and the thrust of the overseas offices which Barbados has.

I believe that enough effort has not been made at honing our people into the high quality promoters that they will have to be if we are to benefit from the kinds of legislation and the kinds of ideas which we put in place, and which we say should assist us in making the quality of life in Barbados better. I think we have tended to spend too much time on words and not enough time on action. I believe that the Government may have put

itself into a bind by having made certain promises which it now finds itself unable to keep, and I think it is most unfortunate that the honourable Member for Christ Church West, even in his most careful elucidation, left the impression of 6 000 to 8 000 jobs emanating from even the most careful application of a regime following that in Netherlands.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation: The honourable Member, like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, is concerned about my projection of the potentiality of the offshore sector to generate employment. With respect, my analysis differs from the analysis of both honourable Members or from that of the honourable Member for Christ Church East, and that is the point I am making.

It has that potentiality, as is shown by other countries, but you must go about setting up the framework to achieve the potentiality, and it is a mistaken view of people that it merely generates employment for a couple of hundred people. The track record of countries who have promoted it properly will bear out the fact that it can generate the number of jobs of which I have spoken, and sometimes in excess of that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now that is his second elucidation, and I am still saying that it is unfortunate that the honourable Member has left, even with the most careful elucidation, the idea that there is some framework which we can create that will bring out of this kind of legislation 6 000 to 8 000 jobs in the medium term — I am going to be generous and say in the medium term — or even in the long term. The kind of infrastructure he is alluding to was dealt with most effectively by his own colleague, the honourable Member for Christ Church East, when he pointed out that the heyday of the development along those lines was in the early Sixties or even going into the early Seventies, before the first economic and oil crisis passed. In those days, there were no competing agencies within the developed countries themselves. The developed countries have now made it attractive for the investors to develop in their own homes, and what is more, the unions in the developed countries are saying to those multinational corporations, which hitherto would have gone into places like Bermuda, the Bahamas and the Netherlands, 'you must preserve jobs in our home town first before you go off to those esoteric places', and a combination of fiscal incentives by the Government and pressure by the unions add up to competition which no amount of careful pruning and careful structuring could result in the sizes in which the honourable Member speaks.

That is not to say that one would disagree with the establishment of the regime. One just disagrees with the promises or the ultimate projections being made, because, the lives of ordinary Barbadians are intertwined with the

kind of perceptions and aspirations which are advanced for them. We think that if we are nearer to reality, we are in the process of assisting the development of the country, rather than to leave people with impressions.
12.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the point has been made. I do not think that anyone from this side could possibly disagree with legislation which had its roots in the thinking of the Democratic Labour Party. All that we ask for is a realistic appraisal of what is possible, and that no attempt be made to give the wrong impression to the population arising out of amendments to legislation, which has been beneficial.

He said there were 115 in 1979. I do not know how many there are now. I heard the honourable Member say there are 200 FSCs that have come in. I would rather see that, because I think he may have been mistaken, but even so, when one examines that, it might mean that we did not get an increase of more than twenty or thirty jobs for those 200 FSCs, because the tendency again is for the same legal firm to handle a large number of the FSCs. Hence, the mere fact that an FSC or ten or fifteen might come to Barbados will not necessarily make any difference in the movement of employment, one way or the other.

We all have to put our hands to the plough, and in that context, we on this side are goint to support any measure which comes here that will assist in relieving this massive unemployment problem which we have in the country. But all we ask is that in so doing, the mischief to be corrected is seen in proper perspective, and the benefits to be got are not separated from the burdens which come with these efforts and these measures.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have had an interesting and useful debate, in that, once again, the Opposition has put forward views with respect to the offshore regime in Barbados which are not, or have never been, the view of the Government.

International business companies in 1976, prior to the amendment in 1979, could not operate in Barbados in a meaningful way because the then law stated that you could not hire services in Barbados. You were able to do business from Barbados but you could not hire services in Barbados. The interpretation of the law was such that if they hired an office, they might have been able to get away with that, but if they decided to set up a staff, bring in a computer or things of that kind, they were guilty of trading in Barbados, and the Act specifically prohibited that. So the operations in Barbados were hobbled by that law. We have to amend that law to say that an international business company operating in Barbados could hire services for or on account of that company or any company that it was associated with.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Where?)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The removal of that hobble opened the door for the utilization of the benefits of international business company legislation by a number of agencies. The first that we were able to attract were people who wished to set up their headquarters in Barbados, and they had two companies, one a Barbadian company which dealt with CARICOM and, secondly, an associated company which dealt with the rest of the Caribbean and the rest of the world, so that the Barbadian company could sell services to the other company. That is how we have been attracting headquarters' business such as the international distribution network of Shell and the international distribution network of Texaco.

Following upon that, we then tailored our promotion to attract businesses with the potential to hire people for data processing as the advancement of our telecommunications system allowed us. There again, you started to get international demographics. You also have a number of others who are in existence under the international business companies legislation, and the largest employer in that area is Caribbean Data Services.

It is therefore incorrect to say that the pre-existing law was insufficiently flexible to permit this variety of operation. I specifically made mention of the fact that there is a great area between what is a manufacturing activity and what is a service activity, and by amending the law, we remove all doubt.

There is no doubt that Barbados, from the very outset, put in many provisions in all of the laws, including the international business companies legislation to ensure that we were not a centre for laundering money. Some of the fast build-up of some international business centres arose out of the fact that they came into existence to launder drug money. That is a fact of life. Ask anybody who has studied some of them in the Caribbean and in those parts of the United States mainland that border on the Caribbean. But, today, there is a sort of an international consensus that we should move towards international convention in which all accounts above a certain amount in any banking system in any part of the world should be disclosed to the authorities. That is the measure of the tools that, increasingly, Governments are recognizing that you need to have if you are to fight the drug barons.

The Government of Barbados makes no apology to anyone because the Government of Barbados is not interested in that business, and we will be the first to sign such a convention. Do not let us fool ourselves on that. We are not selling ourselves abroad as an agency or an area for this type of activity. We say that we have people who have a type of education which makes them

eminently suitable to do data processing, international businesses and things of that kind, and that is the type of people that we wish to attract.

If we are underestimating the impact of this regime, have a look at the telephone directory and see we now have at least six of the Big Eight firms in international accounting in Barbados. Check that. We have done a survey of the impact. Check also the type of work our people have been exposed to in financial management, in company secretarial work and in liquidation in receiverships. Look at the accounting firms, see the buildings they are building. The only people who could afford to build those classes of buildings before, as professionals, were doctors.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: And lawyers!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But today the accountants are rivalling them. Look at them. Pass along Bay Street, which I hope one of these days, before I die, to see being an area which is developed as a business centre and a service centre for businesses. Look at the development in Hastings. Look at the many international accounting firms, and I can say as a matter of fact because I have been told so by the international accounting firms who have associated firms in Barbados, that they have expanded the number of people they have in their secretarial departments, auditing department, and things of that kind by at least 150. We are also trying to ensure that, both at the Community College level and at the university level, we are producing graduates in business skills, in Auditing law, Company Law and Revenue Law, so as to tailor our educational system to the potential needs of the type of employment that these people are generating. Jobs are being generated in the accounting, auditing, legal and in the multi-disciplinary approach, in marketing, in the telecommunication field and in the data processing fields. All of that arose since these amendments, so I do not feel that we should feel that we have not been successful. I am very proud of the fact that we have those people here in operation, because many of those people are earning money at the level that they could not have earned money if we did not have this regime. One of the things that we must recognize is that in this area of activity, the whole world is a global village. Today, with the electronic banking, you can transfer funds by the mere pushing of a button, and we have to get accustomed to that.

12.25 p.m.

On the question of promotion, I have heard so much talk about this promotion. I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He made a statement in here once that the problem with Barbados is that they have too many institutions. He said you do not need anymore institutions, what you need is workmen, you want people in the institutions to do the work. We have got too many already, so I have never been persuaded that

we need another institution to promote this. What is needed is co-ordinating action between the several institutions who are involved. But, of course, this is a very small society. We have things called "I men." Everyone is an "I man." We have a lot of "I men" in this country, people have to project themselves as though they are responsible for everything. It is part of the psyche of Barbados, they always talk to you not in terms of what they are doing, but what I can do.

We had a committee called the Committee for Co-ordinating Development in Barbados, and we have an offshore subsection of that, because it is part of the promotion in Barbados. We are running co-ordinated publicity campaigns by the Tourist Board, Export Promotion Corporation, the private sector, accounting firms, the Central Bank, and the I.D.C. That is how last year we made what I would call a great impact in a number of areas, because in April we were in the *International Business Week*, as we were in this April again, and we had only about three pages last year but we had about five pages this year. We were also in *Forbes Magazine*, in the *Wall Street Journal* and in the *Institutional Investor* in December. When people were starting to deal with the Japanese banking system, the Japanese had one thing when they first started, they had the *Institutional Investor*, they had the whole profile of Barbados, they knew about Barbados because of the quantity of the advertisement that we had done. We will expand and increase on this.

The professional people themselves, who are making the money out of this, are the best promoters that we have. For instance, if you look at a firm like Touche Ross, with 700 offices around the world, they have a booklet on Barbados that you can go to Sydney, Melbourne, or anywhere in Australia, Canada and the United States and see all about the Barbados offshore regime, and that is duplicated by Pannell Kerr Föster, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. and by Morris Ward and their associates and by the other one that has just come here, Haskins. This is the league that we are in, and the Big Eight accounting firms in the world, who have to advise the companies on these matters, are aware of us. So do not tell me what we need is institutional framework. What do you want to have another Managing Director for? To do what? To walk about saying that this is his organization! We do not need that. We have too many of them already. We want the work done and we need a co-ordinated approach, and it is at that level of co-ordination that, at long last, we were able last year to get it instituted. We need some more money to help promote it, we know that, but the Government can only get as much money as we have our ability to attract from taxation. So, therefore, as we get more money, more money will be spent on the promotion of it.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say that we must listen to these people

and carry out suggestions that they make. I want to say this. Experience has taught us that everytime a lawyer, accountant or a businessman make a suggestion to you, do not rush to carry it out, because the suggestion may be based on his own peculiar circumstances and the advantages that they bring will be peculiar to him. We are operating in a difficult area, and we have to be careful that by amending the law to suit a factual situation that is useful to one country may not nullify benefits which another country will get, and with which country you have a better chance of doing business than the other. For instance, there is no question about it, that Canada, as far as international business companies, are concerned has the most favourable double taxation treaty. We would be fools to amend the law so as to nullify the Canadian benefits on the promise of American benefits. You do not do these things, you have to be careful. Sometimes you have to be aware of these people who come to you.

We have set up and we have good contact with a group of people, as I have said at the beginning, who formed themselves into an advisory committee. They are very well respected and well-known. There are representatives from Coopers and Lybrand, from R. S. Kirby, Touche Ross, the Bar Association in which there is one doctor, and another former Member of the House. We have specialists in these areas, and the other area is that it is serviced by the Ministry of Trade. The international business companies were always under the Ministry of Trade and I do not understand how it is that people feel it has left. For what purpose?

All the points that have been raised are being answered. We will continue to promote. Perhaps there is one point that has come out very clearly in the debate, and that is that the Opposition now recognizes that today's recessionary conditions in the world, from the United States down is trying to compete with the little developing world in giving tax concessions. You check some of the proposals before Congress now for tax concessions and you will see. As to the European Economic Community, check what Ireland gives, what Belgium gives, what United Kingdom's Government gives itself. Just check and see what has happened to DeLorean Motor Company, and what has happened to the Fan Jet, and you will see the millions and millions of pounds. Check and see what has happened in those areas that we have to compete with that, and we will compete by the quality of service, by our climate, by the fact that they can do business here and they do not have to pass their hand to nobody, and by the fact that we have good professional services.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended.

I have been given a bit of advice from the Clerk on a matter which did not come down on the Notice Paper, and that is to inform the House that Question 22 is ready. It was not on the Order Paper and before we go to lunch, I propose to deal with that particular item, because it relates to a Private Member's Resolution, which I believe may be discussed sometime today. I will give the Opposition all the elbow room to discuss all of whatever they would like to discuss.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would rather you take that in the normal stride if we are going to Private Members Business at 2 o'clock. We will begin with Questions, and after that we are going to Private Members Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. Will it be all right if I inform the House that the appropriate question is now ready, Sir?
12.35 p.m.

I beg to inform the House that Question No. 22 will be dealt with at this time, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you just giving notice that it is ready, or are you going to deal with it at this stage?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am giving notice that it is ready and I will deal with it right now, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may give notice that it is ready and we will deal with it when we resume at 2 o'clock.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All right, Sir.

I want to give you enough time to talk whatever you feel like talking. Do not say you did not have enough time. I am trying to get around the Speaker to accommodate you, because I will eat you raw in here today. I have a message for you.

It is now 12.40, Sir, and I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.10 p.m. That will give us enough time to get to Queen's Park and back.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
12.40 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

When the sitting was suspended, it was agreed that we start Private Members' Business at ten minutes past two. We may now proceed with Private Members' Business. First we have Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that the Reply to Question No. 22 is ready.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Question No. 22 reads as follows:

"To ask the Minister of Transport and Works:

(1) Is the Minister aware: (i) that there is a dire need for road improvement in Second Avenue, Green Hill and Johnson Land in the said area of St. Michael North? (ii) that when it rains, persons living in those areas experience great difficulty in getting out to work, school, church or market?

(2) Will the Minister state what are the plans of the Government for constructing proper roads in these areas?"

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, regarding Question No. 22, this is the answer:

"Maintenance work will be carried out on the roads in question."

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Supplementary No. 1, Sir. How soon will that maintenance work be carried out?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, as soon as possible.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: To ask of the Minister of Transport and Works, on what date will these works commence?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a date so set by the Minister, Sir.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I asked the Minister of Transport and Works, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any member of Government can answer supplementary questions. Substantive questions are directed to Ministers, supplementaries can be dealt with by any member of Government.

If there are no more supplementary questions, that brings us to the end of Question Time. It is now Private Members' time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN
THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR THE CON-
STITUENCY OF SAINT MICHAEL WEST
CENTRAL AS A MINISTER OF THE
CROWN AND CALLING FOR HIS
REMOVAL FROM OFFICE AS
A MINISTER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we begin on this debate, I must make a statement. A request has been made to me to have this debate televised. Standing Order 78 reads: "The Speaker may grant a general permission to the representative of any journal or broadcasting or television station to attend the sittings of the House under such rules as he may from time to time prescribe for that purpose. If the rules are contravened or if the journal or broadcasting or television station publishes a report of the proceedings of the House which is, in the opinion of the Speaker, unfair or inaccurate, permission may be revoked."

Taking into consideration the nature of this Resolution which will be debated today, I thought it best not to permit the televising of this debate, for the simple reason that this debate may generate accusations which may be against the law and which may generate further accusations and incensed feelings in this country. For that reason I have refused to allow this debate to be televised. Those who are particularly interested in having a first hand account of the debate would obviously be within the Chamber, and those who are interested to know what went on can read the relevant debate in the Proceedings of this House, which is better known as Hansard.

That is my ruling.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I made the request and it is with profound regret that this debate will not be televised. However, I stand by Your Honour's ruling. Your very brilliant trained mind and almost a decade of parliamentary service would have allowed you, Mr. Speaker, to come to such a conclusion, but speaking for myself as an individual — and I believe I can speak for my colleagues on this side — it is regrettable. But we accept Your Honour's ruling on the premise of your years as a parliamentarian, your trained mind and the outstanding job which you have been performing as Speaker of this august Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is my duty not only to protect the high dignity of this Chamber, but to protect the public in general from any unfounded allegations which may be made under parliamentary privilege and which persons outside might not have immediate access to the television to rebut. Therefore, it is for that reason that I stick by my ruling.

The honourable Member may start the debate.
2.15 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House approve the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central holds the office of Minister of Transport and Works and is responsible to this House for the expenditure of public funds by the Ministry of Transport and Works.

AND WHEREAS in accordance with public policy the Honourable Member for Saint Michael West Central in his capacity as Minister of Transport and Works is charged with the responsibility 'inter alia' of providing roads specifically to serve the interests of tenants on plantations.

AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Transport and Works constructed a road out of public funds on private property namely Trents Plantation in the parish of Saint Lucy ostensibly to serve the interest of tenants on Trents Plantation.

AND WHEREAS HER MAJESTY'S LOYAL OPPOSITION warmly approves the provision of roads for the tenants on Trents Plantation and on other tenantry lands in Barbados.

AND WHEREAS the Ministry of Transport and Works has constructed a road on Trents Plantation far beyond the limits necessary and essential for the legitimate use and requirements of the said tenants and in such a way as to facilitate the development of Trents Plantation for the private use and benefit of the owners of and other persons interested in Trents Plantation.

AND WHEREAS the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has an interest in Trents Plantation and has never declared such interest to Parliament.

AND WHEREAS the extension of such road on Trents Plantation beyond what is necessary for the use of the said tenants was financed from public funds and thereby constitutes unlawful expenditure of public funds for private purposes and an abuse of ministerial office and of public trust.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House expresses its lack of confidence in the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown and calls for his removal from office as a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we go any further. I wonder if both sides would consider Standing Order 29(2), and Standing Order 30(7), the question of the right of reply, and I also want to draw Members' attention to the fact that each Member is entitled to 30 minutes in this debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise at this point to state that the Resolution, being critical of the Government, the Government will have the final reply.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, provided I have the right to reply prior to the final reply, I have no problem there.

Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1983, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson), as a private citizen, bought some 57.3489 hectares of land, 141 acres, 2 roods, 34 perches of land, known as Trents Plantation, at the parish of St. Lucy from Fairfield Investments Ltd., for the sum of \$198 000. There is a tenantry on that plantation which the honourable Member bought comprising some 25 houses or so, and this tenantry is a plantation tenantry within the meaning of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act of 1980.

On February 1, 1983, this is the month after the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central acquired the plantation known as Trents, the honourable Member became Minister of Transport and Works in the Government. By virtue of the constitutional doctrine of ministerial responsibility, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, as Minister of Transport and Works, has responsibility to this House, to Parliament and, ultimately, to all the citizens of Barbados for everything done in the name of the Government of Barbados which effects his Ministry, the Ministry of Transport and Works. He is clearly accountable and answerable for what has been done, either by himself or under his authority in the Ministry of Transport and Works, and, by the conventions of our Constitution, he has to accept, constitutionally, the consequences of what has been done by him or under his authority in his Ministry.

The question of how public funds, which have been appropriated for the use of the Ministry of Transport and Works, are spent is a matter of ministerial responsibility. So, too, is the question of how the Transport Levy funds are spent, because Your Honour will recall that, by virtue of Section 7 of the Transport Levy Act, withdrawals may be made from the fund for the purpose of defraying the cost of improving the public transport and the construction or maintenance of public roads, upon the directions being issued by the Board, acting on the instructions of the Minister. Wherever the expenditure of public funds by the Ministry of Transport and Works, are concerned, the Minister, in my opinion, is clearly accountable to this House, to Parliament and to the nation as a whole.

During the time that the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has been Minister of Transport and Works, his Ministry built a road out of public funds on Trents Plantation. The initial purpose of the road was to provide access for the tenants who lived on the plantation

tenantry. With that, we have no quarrel, we have no quarrel with providing roads for the tenants who live on the plantation tenantry itself, but, contrary to what I call the pre-emptive propaganda which has been put out by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation yesterday evening, propaganda which, in my opinion, distorts the whole position which we are making in a most insidious way — the issue of which we complain is not that the tenants of Trents Plantation have been provided with a road, we have no complaints about that. In fact, we highly commend the Minister for providing the tenants of Trents Plantation with that road because it has always been our position — and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, when Evelyn Greaves, no longer a Member of this House, was the representative....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, I rise on a point of order: There is no such Evelyn Greaves unless notice was given to you, Mr. Speaker, that his name was going to be called. If he is referring to Senator Greaves, he must be referred to as a person in the Other Place or Senator Greaves, unless he has informed you, Mr. Speaker, that he was going to mention his name in debate. I draw that to your attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only thing I would say to that is that the honourable Member has mentioned the name of Evelyn Greaves without having given notice of his intentions to speak of a person in his official capacity or of his conduct and character. I am sure the honourable Member is aware of the Standing Orders.
2.25 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, when the former representative of the parish of St. Lucy, now in the Senate, was a Member of this Chamber

Mr. SPEAKER: Now that is much better and that is the correct parliamentary method of doing it.

Certain words spoken by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central at this stage were ordered to be struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. M. A. KING: The former representative in this House was always vociferous in his call and demand for roads to be provided for the tenants of Trents Tenantry and other tenancies in the parish of St. Lucy. Indeed, if one looks at the circular letter which that former representative sent to his constituents prior to the 1981 general elections in this country — and this document I wish to quote from and will make it a document of the House — he said on the first page of the letter,

"Should I be ashamed for asking for improved tenantry roads at Mount Gay, Trents, Hannays, Gilkes and Coconut Walk?"

clearly a response to submissions that he was only concerned about making a lot of representations about

tenantry roads — and then over the page at 6 under "Roads" he said,

"I will continue to fight for the construction of roads in the following tenancies: Mount Gay Village, Ellis Tenantry, Checker Hall, Trents, Hannays, Gilkes Village, Rock Field below Cave Hill, Coconut Walk."

So there can be no question that the Opposition's position has always been that we were most anxious that the tenants of Trents Plantation should be numbered among those for whom proper and decent roads should have been provided.

The Trents Tenantry Road which has been built not only provides access for the tenants on the plantation, but it does a couple of other things. It links the road which comes from Trents Hannays to the Swampy Town Road at the other end. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that, but as one comes into the Trents Tenantry Road, as I call it, from the St. Lucy Secondary School site, off to the left of that road there are what I call two branch roads which converge at a point some 150 yards or so in the distance, and right in the apex of that convergence point, there is one house. Along this additional stretch of road, these two roads I am talking about which come off what I call the main tenantry road, along that stretch of road which I estimate to be somewhere in the vicinity of about 300 yards or so, there is one house which can possibly qualify as a tenant house, so what has happened then is that the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has taken the road into this area.

Let me say this at the outset: with the house in that position, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central in my submission, had two options, he could have done one of two things. He could have taken the road to that house and turned back, made a turn away there so that you have access to the road just as the Waterworks has done, because water services go to that point and turn back. But instead of that, the honourable Member took the road right around and traversed another 150 yards or so in an area where there is no part of the tenantry, where there are no houses and, in my submission, in an area which could provide only for the development of the plantation for his own private use.

Alternatively, what could have been done is that the house in that position could have been brought to the services. It is not unusual to bring the house and put it where the services are provided, because expenditure is a thing which has to be justified in every case, so we have to consider whether it is justified in taking that kind of expenditure to one house that distance away when you have other alternatives. We have a situation then where you either come to the conclusion that the whole of that additional 300 yards of road is totally unjustified,

unnecessary and not relevant for the use of the tenants on the plantation, or if you say that you had to take the road to the house, that one house which is out there, then there is, for certain, 150 yards of road which is totally unnecessary and irrelevant. Whatever yardstick you use; there is 150 yards of road which is totally and entirely irrelevant to the use of the tenantry.

Essentially, what we are complaining about is the extension of the road opening up lands which are not necessary for the use of the tenants and which are not necessary for the development.

There are a number of other matters which have to be considered. It is to be noted that the area over which this access road, as I call it, has been built has not been declared a designated tenantry by the Minister of Lands under section 3 of the Tenancies Development Act, 1980, because under that legislation the Minister of Lands has the authority to declare certain lands as a tenantry and to provide roads and necessary services where they do not then exist. We are dealing then with a situation where there were no houses in that area needing the kind of development, there was no designation of the lands as a tenantry by the Minister of Lands, and yet you had a road at public expense being taken into that area.

In our view, what that road essentially has done is to open up for development an area of Trents Plantation which is owned by the Minister of Transport and Works. It is not at all necessary for use of the tenants, and has opened it up for the private development of the Minister himself. Clearly, that is a conflict of interest situation, if ever there was one!

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: It has to be my opinion. It is a clear conflict of interest situation because you have a Minister of Transport and Works who is responsible for the work done in his Ministry, who has engaged in providing roads on a tenantry which is owned by him, on his plantation, and we have seen no situation where the Minister has declared his interest to Parliament or to anybody else, and, clearly, the conflict of interest rules require that if a Minister is engaged in any activity out of which he can derive financial benefit by the use of public funds, he has an obligation to declare that interest.

2.35 p.m.

When the Minister came to this Parliament with the Estimates of Expenditure for his Ministry and the question of roads came to be considered, at some time, surely, the Minister, if he knew that his tenantry was being developed — and he must have known that, we cannot take it that he did not know that — was under an obliga-

tion to come and tell this Honourable House what the position was, that funds were being used from the Ministry of Transport and Works' Vote to provide roads to a tenantry in which he had an interest as an owner. I say that in the absence of that, the Minister has not been frank with Parliament, that there is a conflict of interest situation and that he failed in a duty to disclose an interest which he ought clearly to disclose.

It is in that context that we say that where the Minister has provided and opened up the development of his own property out of public funds, way beyond what was necessary for the use of the tenants of the plantation, we say that that, in the circumstances, constitutes unlawful expenditure of public funds for his own private purposes. We say that it is an abuse of his Ministerial office and of the public trust which resides in him as a Minister of Transport and Works.

What strikes me in this whole issue, as it comes to be considered, is the massive propaganda which has been put out in this regard.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: By you all!)

Mr. M. A. KING: The journalists of this country, in my opinion have an obligation to report facts objectively.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: True!)

Mr. M. A. KING: True, that is perfectly true, I do not think anybody can disagree with that. It is open to the journalists of this country, like anybody else, to go down to that road at Trents, to look at it, to analyse it from their own personal point of view and come to a conclusion as to whether they feel that we are misrepresenting the position or whether the Government is misrepresenting the position. And I should like, at this stage — I believe that some Members of the Government side may have seen it — to make an appeal to all the citizens of Barbados, not only the Members of Parliament, all the special interest groups in this country, the church, the professional associations, the National Organisation of Women, the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Chamber of Commerce, I invite them to go to St. Lucy, traverse that Trents Road, to look at it objectively, see where the tenants houses are, see where the road has been put, see where this extra road, of which we complain, is being located and determine, objectively, on their own assessment of the position, whether we are misrepresenting the position and accusing the Minister wrongly or whether, objectively, they feel like we in this Opposition. I am sure that if honourable Members on that side of the House look at this matter objectively, they cannot come to any other conclusion than that the Minister has overstepped his limits.

I remember that when the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) first dealt

with this matter, I think it was in the course of his reply to the Budget, he said that there would be no cover up.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Absolutely none!)

Mr. M. A. KING: Of course, and he said he would have the then matter investigated.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have!)

Mr. M. A. KING: And that if he found that there was anything amiss, presumably, he would take the appropriate action.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Perfectly correct!)

Mr. M. A. KING: I believe that at the time the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central made that statement, I genuinely believe that he did not know what the position was. I believe he made that statement in all sincerity. I am sure that once he has seen it, because I am sure he must have gone and seen that road, he cannot be happy about what has happened, and I am inviting the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, who presides over Cabinet, not to allow himself to be caught in a situation where he finds himself having to defend the indefensible.

We know that in situations where motions of no confidence are being moved in Ministers, there tends to be a tendency for Governments and for Cabinets to close ranks and to back the Minister one hundred per cent. But one has to be cautious about things like that, because you have to consider, in your own interest, that that same sort of attitude and approach can be your own undoing. Sometimes you find it may be best to get off the ship early o'clock. And I am saying that once the public understands the gravity of the situation — and I think that what has happened last night on Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was an insidious attempt to prejudice the public's mind against what went on. It was, in fact, irrelevant, because when you have tenants — presumably tenants — coming on the television and saying one after the other, "We thank God and Johnson for the road" when you heard that sort of thing — but that is not inconsistent with our position, we are glad the tenants have the road, but what was not addressed in that television programme was the fact that there was this extension beyond what was necessary for the tenants. And what was not put clearly to the people was that we were complaining that the Minister in helping the tenants was helping himself also. That is not right, and I think that the sooner a stop is put to that sort of attitude and that sort of dealing with public funds, and dealing with public policy, the better for all of us in this country.

We all have a say in seeing that the public finances of this country are spent and used effectively, to the best

advantage and in the way in which they should be legitimately spent, so I am making this plea to honourable Members on that side as well not to defend what is clearly indefensible, because all of us in this country have a say in seeing that our country is run right, that our public finances are properly accounted for Babel, as we are inclined to hear of in other areas of the Caribbean and gradually creeping into the body politic of Barbados.

It is important that we recognize what the issue is and that we isolate that issue from all the rhetoric which can creep in. I am sure that there has to creep into this debate all else that the Minister has done. That is not relevant. What is relevant is the Trents issue and what we call the abuse of power and influence in relation to that issue. In my submission, there can be no doubt that there has been this excess of road provided at the Trents area, an abuse of power, and we are saying that in those circumstances the Minister must lose the confidence certainly of his Cabinet colleagues, of all colleagues, and he must lose the confidence of all of us. We in this House must express that this House expresses its lack of confidence in the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown and call for his removal from office as a Minister of the Crown.

2.45 p.m.

Applause.

Asides

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, that Member caught your eye. You caught his eyes. Get up Sandy!

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Asides.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to second the motion as moved by the honourable Member who just sat and to repeat a few facts. The honourable Member during his presentation

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): If the honourable Member will give way. In a matter of this kind

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir: I should only like an assurance from Your Honour that this debate will be conducted without these harangues and interruptions from the Honourable Leader of the House

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Is that old nuisance talking of haranguing in here, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, will the Leader of the House please take his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to talk about Turners Hall and Pickerings and you today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that I made my point, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I object to that statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But this is the conduct that I am complaining about, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I object to the statement from the Leader of the Opposition. I intend to conduct this debate as I have always conducted debates in this Chamber and I will not have anybody accusing me of allowing this House to get out of order, and I do not need any warning, please.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North please continue.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: The Resolution was read by the mover, and he has established two pertinent facts: one that Trents Plantation is owned by the Minister of Transport and Works or he has an interest in it, and, secondly, that on February 1, 1983, he assumed the role of Minister of Transport and Works in this Government.

There comes a time when one has to seriously take one's responsibility as a Parliamentarian, the sacred trust that is placed in them by the people, and to understand that in putting a case, you put the case as factual as you see it. It is my intention to put the case as I see it, without rancour, and ask the Members of this House to examine it, and come to the conclusion that we know that should be right to come to on this occasion, that it was a misuse of funds.

I want early o'clock to introduce as a document of Parliament an aerial photograph, a big one, which I number "1", which I am going to use

Loud Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

The honourable Member should lay the proper foundation of the documents he intends to use so that reference can be made to them for accuracy and otherwise. I think the honourable Member is well aware of how documents are introduced in this Assembly.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to use two aerial photographs showing the Trents area. One of them has been coloured to illustrate the points that I propose to put to Parliament, and I now lay the first one, Aerial Photograph No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the reference to it?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, the aerial photographs were taken on Monday, and it is shown on the top of the aerial photographs

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. How are we to know what this is? That is the first thing.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I am going to explain that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: This document just has "24" marked on it. Before I can allow the honourable Member to use it or introduce it in the House, he must give specific details so that the document can be clearly identified. There is nothing marked on it. It does not say where it is, when it was taken and by whom it was taken. There are several things that are necessary for introducing documents into Parliament. If this comes into the House, tomorrow morning nobody knows what it is.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This aerial photograph was taken.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, wait a minute. Let us have the proper foundation for the document so that we can know what we are dealing with.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Go ahead, if the honourable Member can satisfy me as to the requirements.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This aerial photograph was flown on the 4th June, 1985 for Democratic Labour Party by a firm of photographers in Barbados on my instruction.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: We still have to know a little more than that. It is a question of verification of a document.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: of an area including the St. Lucy Secondary School, in the top left hand corner the road leading to Trents....

Mr. SPEAKER: Taken by whom? We have to know.

Let me make it absolutely clear. If the Member gets up and reads a document, he has to quote the author of the document, the subject matter of the document and the page of the document before it can be produced, and I will not have a photograph introduced with sketchy definition.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: The photograph was taken by Willie Alleyne Associates for the Democratic Labour Party on my instructions.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what date?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: On the 4th June, Sir, 1985.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you. Now we can proceed. And what does it show?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: It shows on the top left hand corner the St. Lucy Secondary School, it shows painted in a firm line part of the new road that goes through the Trents tenantry connecting the Swampy Town area.

Mr. SPEAKER: Were those roads part of the photograph?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: It shows in a broken line the section of the road that the Democratic Labour Party is contending has been built either through gross negligence, inefficiency, or in an effort to attempt to benefit the owners of Trents Plantation.

Mr. Speaker, I will now make this photograph a document of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and more so for Your Honour's instructions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me see the copy of the document, please. The coloured marks were inserted by someone else?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: They were inserted by me.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am trying to get at is this. If you are going to produce a document, it has to be the work of somebody, or it has to be a document produced by somebody and added to or detracted from or doctored by. That is what I have been trying to ask from the beginning.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Sir. The pictures were flown by the source I illustrated to you, and

the colouring to illustrate the case was done by Franklin & Franklin, Land Surveyors.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I want to get. Thank you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order: I rise for a clarification from Your Honour. You have in your hand a document, a photograph alleged to be of some part of Barbados. Are you, Mr. Speaker, in a position to determine if that is St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. John or Christ Church, since it does not necessarily say what it is? I thought a map would be able to do it. We are taking the views of the Member for St. Philip North. You are in no position to say that is St. Lucy, St. Peter or St. John. You are only accepting what he is saying and I am asking for Your Honour's ruling. That is all I am requesting from you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Philip North has said that he is producing an aerial photograph which was taken on the 4th June, 1985 by Willie Alleyne Associates, and the document presented to me has coloured markings on it which he said were produced by Franklin & Franklin, Qualified Surveyors, for which I believe he is taking sole responsibility for the document which is produced to Parliament. It is left for the Government either to criticise it, deny it or say whatever they want to say about it. As far as I am concerned, it is now produced to Parliament and it remains a document of Parliament.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, let me at this point declare an interest, since the firm of Franklin & Franklin has done some surveys in some of the tenancies throughout Barbados, although we have not done any in this particular one.

The Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, 1980-53, describes a tenantry as, (a), a plantation tenantry, (b), an area of land that is subdivided before or after the commencement of this Act into lots for letting as sites for chattel buildings to be used as a dwelling house whether the land is vested in the Crown, in a statutory board, or in any other person, but does not include land adjoining the foreshore. In the First Schedule of tenancies, in St. Lucy we see Trents mentioned as a plantation tenantry. In the Second Schedule, Part I, we note that there is a special price for plantation tenantry land, and that is that it should be a dollar for every square metre of land, but in no case should that price be less than \$300.

Following those rules, Trents Tenantry has approximately 25 qualified tenants, and these are persons who have been living there over the last five years and qualified to be treated as tenants, and therefore are entitled to their parcels of land at a price of a dollar per square metre. The rules make it very clear that, in order to qualify as a tenant, you have to have a dwelling. It is

therefore then correct to say that the vacant parcels of land enclosed by that network of road on which there are no houses cannot allow any person to be qualified under those sections as tenants, since they would not qualify as qualified tenants according to the Act. It is therefore true to conclude that any buildings or any subsequent occupation of those individual parcels of land would have to be with the agreement of the owner or owners of that said plantation.

The Opposition is contending the following: (1) that it would have been prudent and efficient of the Government in the case of Trents Plantation where there is a single house, or was a single house with its curtilage at the apex of the dotted section, to have removed that house over in the right hand corner and so relocate it along the existing road, or the road that was built connecting into the Swampy Town road. It would have had two advantages (1), it would have provided that lady with the customary services provided by the Government, a wall toilet and bath and improved habitation, and, (2), it would have allowed the Ministry of Transport and Works to have foregone the expenses of building the section of road which leads from the road connecting Swampy Town to that and, subsequently, connecting the other area.

3.05 p.m.

If it was not thought advisable to do this since the lady might have been there for a long time, the second alternative would have been to construct a marl road coming from the T Junction to the house and putting a turn bay for that lady. That is not unusual in this type of development because you would notice on the photograph display that there are two houses that are being served by a marl road, so a precedent has been set where two of the people have been served with a marl road. The second alternative is that if it is thought then that the lady should have been served by a paved road, the shorter of the two stretches of road which is about 400 feet could have been built and a turn bay put to accommodate the lady. We note that the Water Works Department accepted this argument in the routing of the water and the water goes down along that road and serves the lady. That is the very most that the Opposition could allow but what the Opposition is contending is that there is now a stretch of road, approximately 600 feet, that is then linked up that is serving absolutely no purpose.

The lady could have certainly gained access to the main road if you had provided that road with a turn bay. Even if we figure that we were not going to use a marl road, let us pre-suppose that the road was prepared for her, there is still the contention as to why that stretch of road which is approximately 600 feet of road, should have been built. It has absolutely nothing to do with the connection into Swampy Town because the connection into Swampy Town is over on the left hand side. We are not talking about that, we are saying that it is good

planning that the main spine road could have been connected into Swampy Town. We are saying that, at the very worse, a paved portion of road, approximately 400 feet, coming off from the T would have been built to that lady's house and a turn bay put there so that she would have ample access on to the main road or on to the road at Swampy Town, and we are therefore contending that the stretch of road, which is 600 feet, is absolutely in excess of what is fit and proper for this development.

The land rises in a west to east direction from that road and really commands a lovely view over the remainder of the St. Lucy valley and it is ample and very suitable land for residential use. It is our further contention that any persons who subsequently are allowed to use that land cannot qualify to purchase it for ten cents per square foot, are not qualified tenants and, therefore, would come under the private arrangement of the owner or owners of Trents Plantation and, as a result, it would mean that the owner or owners would benefit from any such a division.

We notice that, also to illustrate the point further, the cultivation line is very clear. If you look at the photograph, you will see a parcel of land that has recently been cultivated and that section has been left out as part and parcel of the tenantry and there is an existing house that is now under construction. It is very obvious that the net result is that lots will be cut off both sides of the shorter road, 400 feet, and one side of the longer road, 600 feet, and that approximately 120 000 square feet of land has now been made easily accessible to tenants in the future. This has nothing to do with the inner portion of land, which could easily be another 200 000 or 300 000 square feet of land, which could easily be divided with some of the strips of road from the existing road.

The road is serviced with a water main, except on that parcel which I have illustrated, and using the illustration that the National Housing Corporation now has fixed a minimum of \$2.75 per square foot for any lot that they are now developing, and using the fact that it takes approximately \$1.25 to develop a parcel of land, I am saying that it is reasonable to say that a price of \$1.50 per square foot would be a very cheap price offer for those lots of land that are now open and there would be a terrific increase in value of those portions of land to be accrued by the owner or owners. So the contention from the Opposition is that at least there is 600 feet of road opening 60 000 square feet that could not, under any stretch of the imagination, have been necessary for the use of any existing tenants at Trents, and that is the case. We have absolutely nothing against the existing tenants being properly serviced, have nothing against the connection of the roads to Swampy Town, but we are taking serious objection to that 600 feet of road and, to a lesser extent, the 400 feet. It would have been more

prudent to relocate the person and therefore save the expense to the Government.

I heard the Honourable Prime Minister in his Budgetary Proposals say that any Ministry or corporation must demonstrate to his Ministry that they are exercising efficiency and caution with the expenditure of Government, and that he would not allow his Ministry to foot bills from any corporation or Ministry that does not show that type of management in their affairs. I am saying that in this particular case, it is certainly very bad planning, certainly mismanagement, and that, in the same light, the Ministry of Finance must certainly take objection to the construction of that particular parcel of land.

It is also to be noted that, to illustrate the fact of allowing the shorter 400 stretch, there are now two buildings under construction, one is a wall building and one is a wood and wall building, and it is fair to assume that at some time in the future all of those lots will be taken by prospective purchasers. The Opposition's view is, then, that certainly, in the worst position, 600 feet of road that has taken up, 60 000 square feet of land at approximately \$1.50 per square foot, should not have been built, and in no way would it have detracted from the services of the tenants, which we are glad that proper roads have been provided for them.

The Government and all Members of Parliament must decide whether or not they would sit over such use of funds in a situation where there are 193 tenancies in this Schedule, some 19 000 tenants waiting for such road ways. Maximum efficiency must be instituted to allow all the other tenants in St. Philip, in St. George and in all the other parishes to benefit in the same way that the legitimate tenants of Trents Plantation have benefited.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): This is the second occasion upon which this matter has engaged the attention of this Honourable House. On the first occasion, the House was misled by the speaker who spoke, in that at that time the allegation was made that the Minister of Transport had used Transport Levy funds as a slush fund for the purpose of enriching himself. At that time the information was supplied to me and I immediately gave the House the benefit of that information, which clearly demonstrated that that vicious attempt at distortion in order to create political advantage was exposed. Now, here again today, we have the Opposition once more trying to distort, to express in such a manner as to create political mischief the facts of this matter. 3.15 p.m.

The truth of the matter is that honourable Members on the other side have no liking for the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, of the Government's scheme to bring to rural Barbados the benefit of urbanisation. From the beginning, let us make it clear, we divided with you on

our conceptions of what is proper rural development. You did not want the plantation tenancies to be developed. I have read every speech that you made during the course of that Bill and your conception was that people should perpetually be tenants. That is not our conception. We want them to have roads, we want them to have water, we want them to have lights, we want them to have community centres.

I say in here, as I said everywhere else, that I do not care who owns it, Drax Hall, Drax Anthony Murray, Jesus Christ or Vic Johnson, they are not to take advantage of the Government money and have any private exploitation of it. But let us make it clear; the policy in relation to the development of tenancies was not set by the Minister, it was set by the Government long before the honourable Member was a Minister, and that is the point. The honourable Member, like the honourable Member who is a druggist or like the honourable Member who spoke who is a surveyor, is entitled to be a participant in or a beneficiary of Government's policy. This policy is not made for one person. That is not the kind of party the Barbados Labour Party is.

You talk about disclosures, let us now start talking about disclosures. I have heard the honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes) on many occasions talk in this House on the National Health Service. He has never thought that it is within his duty or part of his duty to disclose the fact that he is a beneficiary of the Drug Plan and he draws money from the Government out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: On a point of order, just to correct the honourable Member: I am not a member of the Drug Service, I have not applied as yet, so I think it is incorrect to say that I am drawing funds. I am not, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He draws a salary from the polyclinic which is paid for out of the thing. Do not tell me!

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: On a point of order! That is not correct. I draw no funds whatsoever from the Government Service.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have been assured from the information from my side that you do. I also have in my possession that the honourable Member, as part of Franklin and Franklin, has drawn \$106 000 for surveying plantation tenancy lots, so honourable Members on the other side must understand that there is a fundamental distinction between the Rules of the House in here....

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, can we have some order in the House on both sides?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Barbados Labour Party Government, as a matter of policy, you cannot deny that fact, campaigned on and went to the electorate and said that the Government of Barbados was going to use public funds for rural development. The Government of Barbados settled that, and it therefore does not lie in the mouth of any honourable Member, legally or otherwise, to come in here and say that the mere coincidence of the fact that an honourable Member is a plantation owner, his tenancy or any tenancy that he has an interest in cannot earn any benefit from.....

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is what you are saying, because when I go to Canefield Tenancy, I see a road built in accordance with Government's concept — do not let us fool ourselves, your ideas about what you want for the country is different from ours — and from Porey Spring right into Canefield. I pass over road that is well made up, well drained and in between the last house and one at the beginning of the other is nearly half a mile, more than half a mile. When I go to Hopewell, I see that, from the public road into the tenancy itself, however you approach the tenancy, you have to go at least a quarter of a mile or more. When you go into Drax Hall, you will see on the Jump and others, the large number of roads that have been put in. You will see that a large amount of road has to be paid.

Certain words spoken at this stage by the honourable Member for St. John and the Honourable Prime Minister were ordered struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Honourable Members on the other side cannot blow hot and cold. You cannot twist the Rules in here. You want to castigate one side when you yourself are a participant in Government policy. Listen. Foursquare Tenancy, eight lots, \$10 175; Foursquare Tenancy, 19 lots, \$5 752; Foursquare Tenancy, 10 lots, \$5 752; Bentley, 30 lots, \$12 005; Frenches and Harlington, 37 lots, \$11 827; Apes Hill, 53 lots, \$16 940; Hothersal, 12 lots, \$5 101; Mount Pleasant, 16 lots, \$7 735. Then we come to Bakers, Buck House, Braggs Hill, Lammings, Coffee Gully, Redland and, Drax Hall. In Drax Hall, the honourable Member was responsible for surveying twenty-two lots. He did not deliver the plans because he said that he would not deliver the plans until he got his money. Bother about the road — they do not bother about the road!

3.25 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear the point of order.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: If the honourable Prime Minister would check, he would note that I am not.....

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

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Philip North were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You were on the roll on 21/7/81, 28/4/82, 1/6/82, 24/9/82, 13/12/82, 7/2/83 and 18/2/83. Do not come telling me that you are not on the roll this year. You drew the money, and you drew so much that you do not have to be on the roll now! Do not come telling me that!

I do not blame the honourable Member because of the fact that the policy of the Government is to develop the tenancies to the highest possible standard and we believe that we owe it to these people who burdened in the past to see that those people who live there now, live under conditions which we can all be proud of.

Applause.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have a philosophical difference. You can canvass your point of view before the electorate. We will be canvassing our point of view before the electorate.

There are a number of legal heresies. First of all, under the law of Barbados, all land cannot be developed unless there is Town Planning permission. And if you have plantation land, you cannot subdivide the land without plantation tenantry.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not dealing with you man. I am not dealing with you at all. The law and you do not agree.

The basic position is that no plantation can subdivide land without planning permission. Do not let us talk foolishness about that is wrong.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That does not apply!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Oh Lord! The simplicity of the honourable Member is such that he does not see how

what I am saying knocks the validity out of his argument, because you cannot argue that this land is not part of the tenantry land, in which case it would have to have planning permission. What are you talking about? You say it does not apply. If you are saying that it is not part of the tenantry then, it means that the exemptions contained in the law do not apply with respect to that part of the land.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You are right now.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Therefore, for you to have any kind of point, you would not bring in here the speculation, which you have done.

There is no benefit, absolutely no benefit, to any owner of this land without planning permission. And I specifically checked these facts, and if you were honest debaters on the other side, you would have gone and checked the facts with the Town Planning office to see whether there was any validity to your point and whether the owner of Trents in fact made an application for Town Planning permission to subdivide this land.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Absolutely none!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, I checked the facts. No application has been made for the subdivision of this land, absolutely none. Absolutely no application has been made. What benefit are you talking about? Are you talking about a potential benefit? You do not come in here and make unprovable allegations in a Resolution. What benefit are you talking about?

I have repeatedly said that the Government policy has been, for a long period of time, ever since Cave Hill developed, that where public expenditure has been spent on land, the Land Development Duty Act comes into operation.

Before us last week, there was a specific Order which brought Parish Land in St. George, I believe, under the terms of that Act. It is not the Ministry of Transport that deals with that, it is the Ministry of Housing that deals with that. When they have carried out their assessment about tenancies, they come up to Cabinet and say, "Look, public expenditure has taken place in here. We feel that if planning permission is granted for subdivision of this land, there would be a benefit, and the Order goes on." So what is the honourable Member saying? In the absence of a planning application, you have absolutely no justification for thinking that the honourable Member would act like how you would act. That is all that is wrong with you all. You are arguing about future conduct, bearing in mind that if you were the person, that is how you would act. You cannot operate upon that basis. Do not come into this House on a false foundation. That is

what you have done. You have come in here on a false foundation, in my opinion.

I listened to the honourable Member for St. Philip North. We do not believe in moving people, not when they have lived there for all the years. We prefer to put the services to the people. Put that in your pipe and smoke it. Why should we move the old lady and her family who have been living there? The facts have been told to us, the facts which you should have investigated. If you had done that you would have found that they were agricultural tenants in those lands, non-resident tenants. You forgot that part of the law which says that the agricultural tenants also have a right to purchase the land that they have been working. You forgot the parallel law. You also forgot that, too. You would have to have access to the rent roll.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You go ahead. Of course, you all are not going to suffer. It is Evelyn Greaves who is going to suffer.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Who is Evelyn Greaves?)

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is Evelyn Greaves? There is no Evelyn Greaves in here.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If you do not know, you cannot suffer, Sir.

The position is that this development is a development that is in consonance with the policy of Government. The honourable Member did not put Trents in the Schedule. That is a very material fact. It is a very material fact that Trents was put in the Schedule of plantation tenancies before the honourable Member was the owner thereof. The law was passed in 1979 and it was there.

The honourable Member did not say that there are two tenancies at Trents, Trents A and Trents B. There are two tenancies at Trents. You do not know. You should investigate your facts. The honourable Member for St. Lucy, who knows his area, made it positively clear that there is a Trents A and Trents B, and not a thing has been done to Trents B.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You can talk what you like, man. I keep telling you that facts and things like that are not part of your game. We are nothing to do with that.

There is Trents A and Trents B. I have checked the social survey done by the Ministry of Housing.

Aside

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You can talk what you like, but there is Trents A and Trents B. The Ministry of Housing says that there are two tenancies at Trents. You were only born in St. Lucy, you do not know anything about down there. The position is that Trents B has not been touched, absolutely not.

A full investigation will show that there can be no justification for the assumption upon which this Resolution is based, namely, that the Minister deliberately used public funds for the purpose of enhancing his property.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Right.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You can say "right?" Of all people you are talking about, "right!" You never even know what wrong is, far less right.
3.35 p.m.

The position is that the development is in consonance with the Government's concept, and no planning permission has been applied for. I am positive that the developers who drew the plan disagreed profoundly with the views expressed by Franklin and Franklin as to how they would develop it. They do not have a monopoly, no one has a monopoly on development. In any event, they are land surveyors. They are not landscape architects, they do not know anything about cutting up land. They know about butchering land, not cutting it up. There is a distinction between a land butcher and a landscape architect, a big distinction. One has to think of aesthetic development. They see the area. They get a feel for a community. The problem is that you want tenants all the time. The more I listen to the honourable Members on the other side, the more I am convinced that they want tenants all the time. That was their policy. You were never to own that land; never to own it!

They forgot another thing. None of them have been able to prove in this House that by putting that road through there, the Government paid the honourable Member one cent for the land that was used in the pathway of the road. Do you want to talk about benefit? Talk about that! And I have many applications on my desk for land owners in Barbados who say when you put the roads through their land, you have to pay them for the price of the land. It cuts both ways.

The honourable Member, if he was fair to the development, would have found out what is the square footage of the land that was occupied by the tenants, because under the law you are only under an obligation to sell a particular amount for the house plot. Why don't you find out all of the facts? The other side is not interested in the facts. The other side is interested in creating an atmosphere in Barbados for political advantage. They started it in the Budget. You tried so

hard in the Budget, and you failed. You tried in the by-election and you failed. You tried today and you are going to fail again. Whenever you try on this issue, you are going to fail.

I can say clearly, that no advantage has been gained. The Government has not been called upon to pay a cent to this particular land-owner, as we have not paid anybody else. We have applications, though. You would be surprised to know that there is a number of landlords who own tenancies and are saying that they want compensation for the land through which the road runs. You would be surprised to know that.

I contend that once public policy was formulated, made and was well known, no Member of Parliament here is under any obligation as set out in this Resolution. He is not under any obligation because there is nothing of any particular peculiarity which means that the honourable Member's particular direct pecuniary interests are affected, absolutely nothing. You cannot have your cake and eat it. You cannot say that you do not have to disclose that you work for the Government under the same scheme and draws \$106 000. You have not put forward any Town Planning applications. It is wickedness for an honourable Member to get in here and say that 600 000 square feet of land can be sold when no plan has been put to the Town Planner. The honourable Member knows that his conception of a development might not be the same as the Town Planner's. The honourable Member knows these matters and he gets in here and tries to give the public the impression that he will be able to get \$1.50 a square foot. What do you call that, Sir? That is a streak of wickedness that I did not think the honourable Member had. It reminds me of an old friend I had and is now dearly departed. Everyday he used to have a feasibility study on land, and the more he looked at the feasibility study, the more he had to pay for profits, and he used to walk about everyday and draw a different one. That is only a far-fetched matter. There has been no differential in this tenancy. The same Ministry of Housing that serves every tenancy surveyed this tenancy. So what is the differential?

I will tell you this. I have a 1/24 interest in a 1/5 interest in Malvern Plantation, which has eight tenants. Do you mean that under the Tenancy Act they are not to get the conveyances? What foolishness are the honourable Members on the other side saying? Do you mean that it will be all right for Lionel Ward, Fairfield and Mount Gay, it is all right for Drax, Andy Murray, Ian Robertson and it is alright for Mohon at Canefield or C.O. Williams

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is reminded that we do not want names in here today.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is all right for all of the plantation owners to be beneficiaries? The thing is, they

do not feel that they are beneficiaries. The truth of the matter is that the Plantation Tenancies Act was such a revolutionary piece of legislation that it took this Government a long period of time to persuade the plantation owners in Barbados that it would be to their good and advantage, and to the social and economic betterment of the people of Barbados if all of us would make a sacrifice, and that is that the land owners would put in the land at that fixed price and the Government would put in the services — a perfect partnership. The honourable Member is not to be a participant in that because he is Vic Johnson of the Barbados Labour Party, that is all they are saying. He must be segregated from every other category of plantation owner. Maybe there are some on the other side who think that he had too much aspiration to become a planter, and that that class of planter is reserved only for those who were in it before. Maybe that is the reason. He is to be treated differently from all other persons. The Government must insist that he is bound by the burdens of the Tenancy Act. He is not to have any compensation for the land that is taken up in building the road, but at the same time any road that is more than a centimetre than necessary, he is to be castigated on the ground that he has got a benefit.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings the honourable Member's time to a close.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am the first speaker for the Government. Can't I have that? All right, I have the right to reply. I obey Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Speaker, I rise here to oppose this Resolution. I would say that my task is not a very hard one today, because when the mover of this Resolution could get in here and commend the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works for giving the people at Trents a road, I can truly say that all of us are saying the same thing this afternoon.

I regret — but it is your ruling and I agree with you — you should know best — that we did not have the camera in here this afternoon, because I am sure the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party would be frustrated as they listen to that weak start from the other side and they would not be encouraged to support what the Opposition are saying this afternoon.

They brought a map inside here this afternoon. I am glad to see the map and I hope it is published so that everybody can see it. The honourable Member is talking about a piece of road. A country like Barbados with our revenue this year at around \$625 million, a big country, and you are talking about a piece of road 600 feet, not as far as from here to Nelson! You come in here to waste people's time with a Resolution of this nature? I call this ridiculous!

I am surprised that the honourable member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) got into this, because if there are any gentlemen on the Opposition side he is one of them, but when he says there is not a Trents A and a Trents B, I wonder if he was born, raised and grew up in St. Lucy. We have Trents A, which is the one where we have the road, and we have Trents B, where Mr. Alvin Thomas, the famous well digger, lives. It is a place where I will be letting the honourable Member know that this Trents B does not have electricity. I think there are two districts in St. Lucy without electricity, Trents B and a place called Spring Garden. The people at Trents B worked for the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works, and I believe it is his bounden duty to make sure that those people can plug in their fridges, too. I hope this afternoon he will move with all haste and serve those five houses in B.

It is the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to put water, light and roads all over the island of Barbados. Trents happens to be one of those areas. It really grieves me. Do you know why? I challenged the honourable Member, because the two of us happen to belong to the same denomination, and I told him if I was not in the church over 35 years I would leave the church because he did not see to me as well as I expected him to see to me. I got on my knees and begged to get things for the people of St. Lucy.

We have roads and water all over the eleven parishes. We had a road built at Cherry Grove, St. John, one road built at Drax Hall, St. George, one road built at Kirtons, St. Philip, we had roads built in St. James South, and you have never heard a Resolution coming into this place, but nothing for the parish of St. Lucy.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Leader of the House and the honourable Member for St. James South please allow the honourable Member for St. Lucy to conduct his debate?

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Trents has 34 houses and it has 134 residents. This morning those people you saw down there with those placards, all those members who came down to Trents a few Sabbath Saturdays ago, they can say they saw those same faces. Those are the same people who were chasing them out of Trents. This morning we did not bring people from St. Michael or Christ Church to come in here, we brought up the same residents from Trents to come in here and decry the actions of the Democratic Labour Party.

Do you know what worries me much? The members of the Democratic Labour Party do not remember that St. Lucy was one of those parishes in 1961 that voted for

the Democratic Labour Party, and even when the whole country in 1976 turned, they said give us another five years and we tried them another five years by themselves. But, thank God, they have found the message, they found the light, and they begun to walk under the light.

Trents Road was actually finished sometime in December, and not one soul from the Democratic Labour Party had one word to say as far as the road was concerned. But as soon as the by-election started in St. Thomas, it seemed as if St. Lucy was the base for the Democratic Labour Party to spring out to do a lot of naughty things. When the by-election started in the parish of St. Peter they were too scared to go into St. Peter, you know, they came down to Checker Hall and made a splash in Checker Hall for the by-election in St. Peter. I want to let the members of the Democratic Labour Party know that they lost round one, they lost round two, and they are going to lose round three.

The members of the Democratic Labour Party know their feeling as far as tenantry roads are concerned in this country. I always like to respect that goodly gentleman, I believe he has done well in this country; I am speaking of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition said in this Honourable Chamber, and I saw it in print in the *Nation* newspaper — and I have it home still, I should have brought it here today — the time when the late Prime Minister approved the loans so that those poor people who could not purchase their lots could go and get a loan where they could purchase their lots, the Leader of the Opposition said that was wasting the taxpayers' money and putting more in the hands of the plantation owners. I disagree with that. There is no plantation owner who likes the idea of selling his land at ten cents per square foot.

I am sorry the Minister of Housing and Lands is not here this afternoon, but I want him to investigate, because there is one plantation in the parish of St. Lucy where the father of the former Member for 1971 to 1981 collected the rent from this place called the Cove, and the tenantry is Harmony. Harmony has 19 houses, and up to today there is another plantation by the name of Pickerings, I do not know who are the owners of Pickerings, but they are the only two plantations that up to today not one surveyor has gone to yet, and I want the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands, I am demanding him, to have a thorough investigation and let me know what is the delay about Harmony and the people at Pickerings.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I can give the honourable Member....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To a point of elucidation, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member can only elucidate his own speech, and the honourable Member has not yet spoken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But the honourable Member has agreed to give way, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: But there is no rule which would allow you to elucidate something. You cannot elucidate another Member's speech. You will have to wait until your time comes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Even if he makes a mis-statement, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you get up to speak you will have ample time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: All right, okay. I will not waste any more of the honourable Member's time, Sir.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the people at Pickerings need roads, too. But I cannot start to beg the Minister to give me a road at Pickerings, because the surveyors have to come in first and do their work, and the same goes for Harmony. 3.55 p.m.

One of my constituents told me that the former Member of this Parliament for St. Lucy, he and his brothers plan to buy the plantation tenantry because his father collects the rent. I spoke to the owners and they talked to me. They said, "Mr. Brathwaite, we sold Cove Plantation for a long time and I do not see why we cannot sell it, this is the law of the land, and then they can sell it how they like." I told them I think the best thing they should do is to go and get the Laws of Barbados and that would direct them, because I know when this law first came into vogue, there were five houses, and Harmony has in 19 houses. So I told them, "you have found yourself in a trap. You are trapped and you cannot get out of this net. As far as I am concerned, as long as blood stands in my body, you will have to go through the same exercise as all of the plantation tenancies in this island."

When you think of the district called Trents and the conditions that those people lived in for years, sometimes the doctor cannot get into that place, the hearse could not get into the dead; they had to lift them out to the main road. If there was a fire, the fire engine could not get in to that place. No one could get in to that place. There are people in that area who work trucks and have motor cars. On evenings, you saw those people leaving their cars up the road by the school yard and walking

down to the district. Today, those trucks and cars can drive straight alongside the people's homes.

I believe that when the Democratic Labour Party came through there that Saturday, they thought the people of Trents would be the same people as in the 1970s. They thought that when they told the good people that something is a stick, they would believe it is a stick. But since then, those people can understand which God they serve and who is with them, who is taking care of them, who is trying to improve their state of life.

I always call on some of the members of this Party to be careful. All the education you have and you do not allow God to lead, you become as nothing, and when people reach the stage where they feel that they are Gods by themselves, it is a very serious position. They planned to come to Trents on the Sabbath Day, when myself and the Honourable Minister were at church. Do you know what a member from the Democratic Labour Party phoned at about 8.15 a.m. and told me? He said, "I will be down in your constituency today. My body will be down there but not my spirit. I am ashamed to know that a party that ran this country for 15 years and represented the parish of St. Lucy for 20 years could fall to such a low ebb."

That was not all. I respect churches. The Democratic Labour Party, those were the first people who dis-endowed the Anglican Church. Now, they prefer to yell and to say, "Oh, the undertakers are so dear". It was not so before the church was disendowed, you did not have to pay to dig the graves, you did not have to pay the reverend. Things were much cheaper, so we know the stand of the Democratic Labour Party as far as the church is concerned.

Do you know the thing that grieved me? They left St. Lucy and went to where the honourable Member worshipped and walked around the church. The pastor had to threaten them outside, 'Bring them over here and let me get at them and call them up for their bad behaviour'. Those things worried my mind, because when you see the day comes in this country when we do not respect law and order and the churches, this would be a very bad country. I would not like to live in it.

I heard that certain Members were there, not saw them, because they even said that I went up there, but you know that if even you heard it, Mr. Speaker, you would not believe that I went up there on that particular day. But there are certain Members that were up there, and I was very shocked and surprised, because those people were born and raised up in religion, and it was shocking that they would travel all the way from Christ Church and St. Michael on the Sabbath Day to harass us in St. Lucy. But one thing made me proud. We had six members from the parish of St. Lucy that was in the

group and neither one of those people lived close to Trents. There were two from Nesfield, two from Josey Hill, one came from Half Moon Fort and one from the top by the corner. It really made me proud when the people chased them and told them to move from there. Without the help of Senator Hall, I am sure the Democratic Labour Party people would not have been able to enter on the same road, and it made me feel very confident in, and as satisfied with the nice people of St. Lucy.

I have to make this point. All I would say this afternoon is that there are some people who just set out not to tell the direct truth, they come along with something that appear like the truth. Your Honour will remember that the mover of this Resolution said that there were only 25 houses down there. Well, I have counted them over and over again, and right now there are 38 houses. I am only going to say 34, because this is Trents A that I am talking about. I am not bringing in Trents B, which has another number of houses, to this part of the road. But there are quite a lot of those tenancies and you would expect those kinds of things.

I am not worried. I am not perturbed, because as far as the parish of St. Lucy is concerned, in getting things it is a new St. Lucy. I can actually see, as an artist can see in front of him, if God spares my life in the next 10 years, what that parish would look like, and all that is worrying the members of the Democratic Labour Party. I, myself, do not know how I got it done but it was done. I promised my people in the parish of St. Lucy that if in the first three years I did not see some improvement in the parish of St. Lucy, I would resign. I can live without that salary, that salary does not mean anything to me. Indeed, if they move a Resolution in here to forbid salaries in the House of Assembly, I am going to vote with them, because I am quite satisfied to do the little I can to help this country. My aim here is not for money, my aim in here is to see that the same nice things you get in the parish of St. John, the same you get in St. Michael and Christ Church, let me get some of the action too, for St. Lucy. The people at Trents pay taxes, too, and I do not see why they cannot have nice things like anybody else.

Do you know what is worrying the members of the Democratic Labour Party? As I have said, I, myself, do not know how I have done it, but you can look around and see the change. I am satisfied and my people are satisfied. We had to go into Bromefield too. Everybody knows Bromefield. Everybody from that side knows Bromefield. The first year I ran, I got 100 votes and my opponent got 10, so you would understand Bromefield. Bromefield has roads, Husbands has roads, too, and there is no problem as far as Bromefield and Husbands are concerned. Those places belong to Mr. Lisle Ward, a very wealthy man, but Trents belong to a poor boy, so you will see.

4.05 p.m.

I wonder how the members of the Democratic Labour Party can come month after month trying to destroy that goodly, honest brother in this Honourable House for any dishonest act. The only persons who know about these dishonest acts about him are the members of the Democratic Labour Party. A few months ago they were talking about the BMC, the next few months they were talking about the buses, and now today they are talking about roads. As far as those buses were concerned, I never said anything about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with buses.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I am very happy and satisfied with the performance of the Minister of Transport and Works. I am sure that he is a Minister of integrity and he is a person that we on this side would be happy to be with. What is worrying the members of the Democratic Labour Party is that I have done more in four years than the Democratic Labour Party did for the 15 years they were in power.

Honourable members on the other side said that the former member asked for this lot of things in 1979. Why did he wait for 1979 to ask for these things? We wanted roads before 1979. I would not wait until this Government came into power to ask for these things.

Asides.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I thought it was something he said in here, because the time that that individual was to get up in the House of Assembly and ask for things in his constituency was from 1971, when the Democratic Labour Party was in its glee and in its kelter doing things. You could hear of things being done in St. John, St. Philip, St. Michael and St. James, but he waited until you are out and is trying to fool the people, but he cannot fool the people of St. Lucy any more. The time for that has gone.

Mr. Speaker, think about the bridge in Pie Corner. That was done under the honourable Member's jurisdiction. There was a young man who lived next to the bridge and the people at Little Bay when it rained could not get in or out. I would like to give this little joke about that. Whenever the big rains come, they call it the Roy Brathwaite Bridge, but when it is dry and you can drive over it, they will say it is fifty-fifty. I am accepting the bridge, because in the first speech I made in Pie Corner I said it was not fair that the nice people of Pie Corner and the children, when it rains, could not get back home from work and school, and that is why from the time I was there I was hounding to make sure that we got a bridge in Pie Corner that the people could get to and fro. I would not say it was a direct mistake, but the bridge should be a taller bridge and you cannot blame this Government or me. I am not an engineer. I

would say that the engineer at the Ministry of Transport and Works built the bridge a little low. They did not cater for the amount of water that comes down there, and sometimes the water overflows the bridge when you get six inches of rain or rainfall like the one we had last year. But it is much better than it used to be, so you can say that the people down there are quite satisfied with my performance up to now.

Going back to the honourable Member for St. Philip North, I remember that when we debated this Bill in the Other Place about the Tenantry Act where we had to build the roads, that honourable Member got up and said that the poor people of this country would have to pay tax. I got up and said "Good dear, my friend, do not be so ridiculous as to try to fool the poor people of this country, because my people would rather pay tax than to pay rent." When you pay rent, you have to pay rent weekly and at your death your children cannot own the spot, they have to move. But the policy of our late Prime Minister was that he would have liked to see all wall structures in the island of Barbados, and he said he wanted to create land ownership where all the people would have water-borne systems.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that my parish has improved tremendously, because the poorest person is trying to have their waterborne system where they can get their own thing. I was doing a little bit of work last Sunday, and when I got to a chap's home he said, "Mr. Brathwaite, I would like you to commend your party for the work they are doing. I have my tax bill and I had to pay \$22, but a man passed and would like to do business on this same spot. I gave \$800 for it, and he offered me \$22 000 for it, but I said, 'No money can buy this spot.' " So you can see the goodness of the Barbados Labour Party and the things that we are doing as far as the working class people of this country are concerned.

Another honourable Member said that the late Prime Minister talked about moving the sales for this same Tenantry Act. The sale has the same qualification as my sale, which would cost about \$1 000, plot and sale, but for this particular Tenantry Act we have a cheaper sale.

I heard an honourable Member, I will not call his name, but he is looking at me now, say that he would make sure that none of the lawyers on that side take part in that exercise and that they are not going into that at all — they went to learn their profession and paid money to learn and they are not doing any cheap work. So any of you in the Gallery who own tenantry land, or who have tenantry spots laid out and there is a little delay in getting your plot and sale, you will know that it is not through this side, it is that side which would not help with the work for the working-class people.

I was very heartened this morning to read in the *Daily Nation* what Bishop Gomez said, that if we could have more christian people to run the affairs and do certain things in this country, we would have a better country. I seem to agree with him, not that I am saying we do not have people in churches that can do some bad things. There are some vagabonds in the churches, too. What I am trying to say is that the things that people would generally go out and do, I am sure that people who belong to certain churches would not do.

I would say that this Resolution is not even worth the paper that it is written on. A few nights ago I was watching a picture, and the Democratic Labour Party reminds me of this picture I was watching. There was a plane and every one in this plane was panicking because the lowering gear would not move, and every man was trying to do the wrong thing at the wrong time. I can see that happening now with the Democratic Labour Party, and I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic Labour Party will not have long, it is gliding about in the sky like a ship without a rudder, and by the year 1986 I am sure that the Democratic Labour Party will eventually come to its final crash.

I think that we can hold our heads high above the water for the work we are doing. I am very happy, and I would like to appeal to the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works not to give me up. Do not believe that because the Democratic Labour Party came down there and made their palaver that I am not with you. I want you to remember Mount Gay, Gilkes and Harmony where the father of my former M.P. takes up the rent. I would like you to go and see about Harmony for me. I would like him to go to Pickerings, I would like to see him take care of a place called Cluffs and Connell Town. All these are in letters that I have in there already. If anybody came next week and told you, Mr. Speaker, that they wrote letters for things in St. Lucy, they are lying to you and they are fooling themselves. From the year 1974 when I ran, I went and checked every district and I have already applied. I applied for roads, water and light in my constituency because I know these are the very important things which are essential to improve the living standards in this country.
4.15 p.m.

I have a letter which I should like to make a document of this House. I would like to read it so that you can hear me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, you have just half a minute to read it.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Thank you, Sir. I am going to be very fast:

We, the residents of Trents Tenantry, wish to express our deepest gratitude to the Government, especially the Minister of Transport and Works, the Honourable Victor L. Johnson, and our parliamentary representative, the Honourable Roy E. Brathwaite, for markedly improving our social life through the provision of a road to service our area.

Previously, the people of this district had to contend with obstacles of a gully and a rocky footpath. We, the residents, have nothing against the length of the road, since we feel that cul-de-sacs are not appropriate for this district. We are especially grateful that this road did not terminate in a cul-de-sac but provides easy access to our neighbouring district of Swampy Town. We know that building of tenantry roads terminating in cul-de-sacs is foolhardy, since they would present major problems to large vehicles, especially the large number of delivery vehicles using them. We therefore condemn the D.L.P. for the action they have taken. As a measure of our appreciation and support for the road, we sign this letter with a sense of pride and accomplishment, since this road has brought us in the mainstream of modern Barbados.

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: The names here — Do you want the names? I do not think he would bear with me to read this. There are seventy-six names on this letter, Sir, that you can see. All of these are residents of houses who live in this area.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will now make that a document of the House.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Sir. Surely.

Mr. SPEAKER: That also brings you to the end of the allotted time for your speech.

Applause.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: And that also brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for today.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I thought the Standing Orders were suspended.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I recall, Sir, that the Standing Orders were suspended today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And my understanding of the numbers that were called would have included the suspension of any time limit on Private Members' Business. It would seem to me that if Private Members Business is to be terminated, it would have to be done, at least, by Resolution.

I offer that for your consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. We would have had to suspend the Standing Orders in any case, because we begun at an hour which is not catered for in the Standing Orders, which was 10.00 o'clock. Then, he said that we would take Private Members' Business for two hours, beginning at 2.00 o'clock today.

I did not break the honourable Member for St. Lucy because at 4.00 o'clock, which would have been two hours, the honourable Member for St. Lucy was speaking. In any case, the honourable Member who started the debate started at 2.18 p.m. today. Therefore, if we had two hours allocated for Private Members' Business today, we have completed two hours.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, when the honourable Leader of the House indicated that we would have Private Members Business, I did not hear him say for two hours. I heard him say that we would have it at 2.00 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you check the Record.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not questioning Your Honour's hearing, Sir. I am only saying that I did not hear.

In any event, Sir, I still want to submit that even if the honourable Member had so said, the relevant Standing Order which puts us within a time frame for Private Members Business was suspended, and, therefore, if we are to curtail this particular motion, I submit that it would be in order for him to move that Private Members Business be now suspended and we will return to Government Business.

I am offering it to Your Honour as the way we should handle this, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see that, because the Standing Orders were suspended from the beginning of the day. If you said you are going to have Private Members Business for two hours, we are not operating within the Standing Orders at all. And if you said two hours, I take it that two hours are two hours. You do not need a Resolution at the end of the period. He said there would be two hours, 2.00 p.m. until 4.00 p.m. We started at 2.18 p.m. and we finish at 4.18 p.m.

COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

1 to 6 were called and passed.

L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Your Honour report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Hon. C. L. BOLDEN – 10.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES – 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Ten honourable Members voted 'Aye' and ten honourable Members voted 'No'. There is a tie. The Chairman votes with the Government. All the clauses have been passed and voted on and therefore the Chairman votes with the Government. Nothing has been changed.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me the passing of one Bill in Committee.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, further consideration of the Bill was postponed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 18th day of June, 1985 at 12 o'clock noon.

In so saying, I recognise the tactics of the Opposition today. I may add you are on the ball. Let me make it abundantly clear now. There will be no quarters given, none asked for as from today, no consultations from this side, as far as I am concerned. You have set out simply to interrupt business today with your stupid voting and your attitude in here today. You can rest assured that you are going to see the true steel in me as Leader of the House as from today. I say no more at this point in time, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not want to hear you. I washed my face and I have on clean clothes. Your face wants washing and your clothes are dirty. Let us see between the two of us. I am a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party. You deal with dirty face people. I am clean, full of deodorants, not like you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can I have a seconder?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, June 18, 1985 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Mr. J. G. ODLE – 10.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES – 10.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that ten honourable members voted 'Aye', ten honourable Members voted 'No', I declare it a tie. I cast my vote with the Ayes.

This House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 18, 1985 at 12 o'clock noon.
4.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, June 4, 1985. 2620

MESSAGES

Mr. SPEAKER 2620

Message re absence of Governor-General and
Sir Arnott Cato acting as Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2620

Resolution to grant the sum of \$200 000
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at
the disposal of the Government to supplement
the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current, as
shown in the Supplementary Estimates
1985-86, No. 1, which form the Schedule to
the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the compulsory ac-
quisition of land at Crab Hill, St. Lucy for the
purpose of providing recreational facilities.

Resolution to approve the compulsory ac-
quisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter,
for the purpose of providing a playing field
and an agricultural science plot for the
Speightstown Boys' School.

Resolution to approve the compulsory ac-
quisition of land at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael,
for the purpose of re-locating the Headquarters
of the Transport Board.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 177 164
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part II -
Capital, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1985-86, No. 2, which form the
Schedule to the Resolution.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 2621

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES
(EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1985

Mr. St. John, 2621, 2635; Mr. Forde, 2621
Dr. Haynes, 2625; Dr. Cheltenham, 2630
Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2631; Mr. Taitt, 2632.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION NO. 22 BY Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St.
MICHAEL NORTH) OF MINISTER OF
TRANSPORT AND WORKS (Hon. V. L.
JOHNSON) RE ROADS IN AREAS IN St.
MICHAEL NORTH. 2638

Mr. Johnson, 2638; Mr. Greaves, 2638; Mr.
Craig, 2638.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

CENSURE MOTION AGAINST Hon. V. L.
JOHNSON. 2639

Mr. Speaker, 2639, 2655, 2656, 2657; Mr.
Craig, 2639; Mr. King, 2639; Mr. Franklin,
2643; Mr. St. John, 2646; Mr. R. E.
Brathwaite, 2650; Mr. Taitt, 2655, 2657; Dr.
Haynes, 2656; Mr. Sandiford, 2656.

(d.p.)

SUSPENSION. 2638

ADJOURNMENT 2658

Mr. Craig, 2658.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRATHWAITE, His Honour R. E. (Deputy Speaker)
(St. Lucy)

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

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

FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)

FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)

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

HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)

JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)

KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)

St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)

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

SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)

TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): On a point of order, Sir: Our impression was, when the House adjourned last week, that the Leader of the House had indicated that the House was going to meet at 10.00 o'clock today — I just say this is our impression — to deal almost exclusively with the Resolution.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say, you said so. It is what you did not say.

Our impression was that we would meet at 10.00 o'clock to deal with this particular Resolution. When we came in here, other matters were dealt with, to which we did not object, and then it was indicated to us that Private Members Business would be taken at 2.00 p.m. I regret that I did not hear the Leader or yourself indicating, at that time, that it was only for a space of two hours. Therefore, I can only hope that some indication will be given as to when this Resolution can be resumed and the length of time that would be devoted to the debate on the Resolution, so that we would know how to order our business.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): It is my understanding that, under the inherited understandings of Parliaments such as ours,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What are the "inherited understandings?"

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what I am trying to get across to you now, Sir, if you give me a chance. Under those inherited understandings, with motions of no confidence or censure motions, as they are usually defined within the context of May's Parliamentary Procedure, time tends to be allocated for these motions to have priority over other parliamentary business so that they can be disposed of as soon as possible, and in the general interest of the parliamentary process, if a censure motion is brought either against the Government or a Minister of the Crown, then there is an accepted obligation on the part of the ruling Party to allocate such time to deal with and dispose of such motion in its entirety with expedition. This is my understanding from May's Parliamentary Procedure.

I mention this, Sir, in the event that you share my understanding of the procedures in relation to censure motions in Parliaments which share common tradition with Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as my knowledge of Parliament goes, the Government always affords time for the Opposition to bring a censure motion or charge again

against any Member of the Government. May's Parliamentary Procedure also goes on to say that Government Business takes precedence over any other business.

As far as I am concerned, when the Standing Orders were suspended this morning, the Leader of the House said that we would take Private Members' Business at 2.00 o'clock today, from 2.00 p.m. until 4.00 p.m., two hours. When we started back at 2.10 p.m. the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central started at 2.18 p.m. Therefore, with the honourable Member for St. Lucy, who concluded at 4.18 p.m., we would have had the two hours debating time.

I hear no Resolution to the extent of Private Members' Business and, therefore, I can only conclude that we have done the two hours.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' time be extended.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be done now. That would have had to be done before we reached the two hour period. We have already closed Private Members Business.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are operating under different hours altogether. Unless we have some kind of doublespeak, and I do not understand what is being said, my whole impression was, when we left the House on the last occasion, that the House would have started at 9.00 o'clock or 10.00 o'clock and that the whole day would be for the debate of this particular Resolution, and that every effort would be made to get the television cameras in here. Well, the television cameras apparently operated last night, not today.

From our point of view,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What has last night got to do with this?
4.25 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On this side of the House we are as anxious as the Government to get this matter out of the way, and, in the interest of the orderly development of parliamentary matters, we are asking that the time be extended so that the debate can continue. It is not in the interest either of the Government or the Opposition for the matter to drag on. We deferred from last Tuesday until today 10 o'clock, and the impression was given, and I certainly formed the impression, that the debate would have started at 10 o'clock, and when we have ordinary Government Business, you know we do not have as many people around to hear what is being said, so a lot of other people also thought that the debate was going to start from early this morning. Then we

heard that it would resume at 2.10 p.m. Like my colleague, the Member for St. Michael West, I did not hear that the debate would be limited to two hours. I did not hear that, and that certainly was not my understanding.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would like to put.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second the motion moved by my colleague.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no formal motion after the interruption of business. That is May's Parliamentary Procedure. I have already pronounced that we have come to the end of Private Members Business, and I am not going to stray from May's Parliamentary Procedure. Members who bring Resolutions to this Honourable House should acquaint themselves with the Rules and act within the Rules. I am fortified by May's Parliamentary Procedure, page 296, that, after an interruption of a business, there can be no formal motion. That closes the matter, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: May I, Sir, on the basis of May's Parliamentary Procedure draw to your Honour's attention, not to contest a ruling, that the Standing Order under which that particular ruling has been made, the Standing Orders having been suspended for the day, the rules which apply are the rules which the House decides, and even though your Honour has ruled, I think your Honour will agree that, without more, if it is the wish of the House to do something when the Standing Orders have been suspended, the House may so do under the same May's Parliamentary Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order which applies to that. It is a general principle of the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Precisely, Sir. And since we are not operating under the aegis of these at the moment, because they have been suspended, I am saying that this House regulates its own rules, and today, Sir, your Honour could entertain, without reference to these Standing Orders, a motion to extend the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have said from the beginning, Members who come to Parliament must come equipped knowing the Rules and how they want to operate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not think that the question that I have raised has anything to do with a motion coming to Parliament. It was a motion concerning procedure, and I do not believe that Members have to bring a Resolution to deal with matters dealing with procedure. I am raising the matter to put it before your Honour in the final analysis, how Your Honour rules, I have to agree with you. But I am putting it to you that Your Honour may not have in your contempla-

tion certain aspects of this particular business it to you for what it is worth, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I still say that we have^S (EX- the end of Private Members Business today. MEND- am concerned I did not have a motion before^{2621, 2657} come to the end, and I think we should co^{522;} other business for today. '9;

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I take it that we are into Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have come to the end of Private Members Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Government Business is now the instant Order of the day.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I second that.

The question that Government Business be resumed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. J. G. ODLE, and Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM — 10.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, and Mr. P. M. GREAVES — 10.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerk that ten honourable Members voted 'Aye' and ten honourable Members voted 'No'. It therefore leaves me to cast a vote, and I vote 'Aye', on the grounds that my vote will not cause a decision in anyway and leave the matter open to be determined by the Chamber. Further consideration is therefore postponed.

When the suspension was taken, we were in Government Business. To that we now revert.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES (EX-EMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) ACT 1985 RESUMED

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill; Mr. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.
4.35 p.m.