

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 – 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th December, 1971.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Leader of the House); The Rt. E. W. BARROW, BSc., LL.D. (Hon.). (Prime Minister); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Health, and Welfare); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Mr. A. MORRISON; and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting for Tuesday, 26th October, 1971, have been printed and circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have taken the opportunity to go through these Minutes and I find they are studded with numerous errors which are the fault of the printers, and I suggest that you let me pass my copy to the Clerk so that it would enable him to draw the matters to the printer's attention, and I urge that confirmation be further deferred.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this will be the first point of order that I will raise in this House for about seventeen years. I do not know if this is going to be done by a sort of exchange between the Clerk and the hon. member, because if there are some defects in the Minutes, one would have thought that before the Minutes are confirmed, the hon. member would get up and move the necessary amendments. I am just questioning the mechanics of how it is done. I do not know the defects of which the hon. member complains; but on a strict point of order I would just ask the Chair for guidance whether the deferring of the Minutes would be in order in order to allow one hon. member or perhaps the Debates Committee or the Clerk or somebody else to have another closer scrutiny of the contents of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that would be very helpful indeed. Would the hon. member for St. Peter care to point out the errors?

Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if you look at page 1 of the Minutes, the first wrong font appears at the paragraph which begins "Mr. Speaker informed." The letter "H" is in itself a wrong font.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would just give way, that is the precise reason why I think he should indicate the errors. He is going into the kind of elegance of the choice of script, or font or whatever they call it in the printing world, it is not going into the substance of the Minutes, because it is not whether you use times Roman or ten point this or sixteen point something, it is a question of whether the Minutes actually represent a summary of what took place in the House on the last occasion that the House met. Now perhaps that I have had this kind of indication from the hon. member about what his objections are, perhaps he would continue to

demonstrate to the House what amendments he would like to make and then we would see whether we agree or disagree with them. For instance it would have been much more elegant for us to have had the words "of an error" in line with "Mr. Speaker" on the first line, but you do not send back Minutes to a printer and put the Government to great expense for that kind of correction.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you find a similar error in printing recurring two lines below the one to which I referred just now. Similarly in the following line which begins "His Honour" you will find that the word "House" is in the lower case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member confine his objections to confirmation of the Minutes to points of substance? We are not looking into the mechanics of printing here, if not you could go on *ad infinitum*.

Mr. HINDS: That is why when you turn to page 4, at line 3 where you should have "Mr. Chairman", you will find "Mt." instead of "Mr.". That occurs again about ten lines from the bottom in the line "Mr. W. C. B. Hinds resumed."

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that has been corrected. There was originally a "t" but an "r" has been superimposed on the "t". Do not let us split hairs.

Mr. HINDS: If you go down to the line under "J. A. CONNELL" you will find "Acting Clerk Parliament". The word "of" should be inserted between "Clerk" and "Parliament".

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: If a comma is placed after "Clerk", would that help the hon. member? Are there any more objections? What would the hon. member wish, "Acting Clerk of Parliament" instead?

Mr. HINDS: If Your Honour's copy has a comma between "Clerk" and "Parliament", mine does not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was only being helpful and suggesting we could put a comma after the word "Clerk".

Mr. HINDS: I think the correct title is "Clerk of Parliament", and we should have the word "of" inserted. Similarly "Acting" should be in brackets. 12.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following, that the Minutes

be confirmed with the amendments proposed by the hon. member where "Mt." appears on page 4 for "Mr.", and that the final superscription should be the word "Acting" in brackets, "Clerk Parliament". I do not see the need for a comma there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the Minutes be confirmed, subject to those amendments, including the final one.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member who has just sat down is really serious about this. He agrees with having "Acting" set in brackets but he does not see the necessity for a comma to appear between "Clerk" and "Parliament" or that the word "of" should be inserted between "Clerk" and "Parliament".

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the Minutes be confirmed subject to the corrections "Mr." instead of "Mt.", and that at the end of the word "Acting" should be in brackets, followed by "Clerk Parliament", no comma. Let me make it clear that this is not a forum for delirium, we are here to get on with the people's business. I am going to put the motion that the Minutes be confirmed subject to those amendments moved.

The question that the Minutes be confirmed subject to the amendments moved was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay the following documents:

The Pensions (amendment) Regulations, 1971.

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1971.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1971.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November 1971.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay the following documents:

Statements showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the Payment of Money Orders for the period 1st March, 1971 to 31st July, 1971.

Statement of Money Order transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas

Governments and Administrations for the period March to July, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1971.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$221,293 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971 - 72, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON A MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I beg to give notice of a motion for the adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance. I have in accordance with the rule submitted to you the text of the motion which is that "WHEREAS the recent increase in the control prices....."

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it necessary to read it, I will only want you to give the notice. Having given that notice, I think I can give my decision at this stage. The hon. member for Bridgetown is asking leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of public importance under Standing Order 16.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to give my decision on the matter now. The notice is subject to Clause 2 of Standing Order 16 which states: "Before the commencement of the sitting the matter for discussion shall be reduced to writing and handed to the Speaker." I have received such notice. "The Speaker shall refuse to allow the claim unless he is satisfied that the matter is definite and urgent." I am not so satisfied that the matter is so urgent and therefore the motion will have to be moved at the relevant time to discuss this matter.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's

sitting, subject of course to the hours due, and any matters under Private Members' Business which the Opposition cares to do today will be dealt with at the appropriate time.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Prime Minister be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

12.35 p.m.

ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) ACT, 1971

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is the second amendment to the Estate and Succession Duties Act which we will be making this year. You will remember that, I think, it was in July earlier this year we passed an amendment — it was actually on the 8th June, Sir, and not in July that we passed an amendment to Section 40, and we made it clear that succession duty should not be paid in respect of any issue of debenture stock of the Government declared by an Order made under Section 10 to be exempted from estate duty. Then, in my Budget Speech earlier this year, I indicated that certain adjustments would be made to Schedule A to the Estate and Succession Duties Act, to wit, 1941, by amending the rates into a more regular kind of Schedule which would make it easier for computation in some respects with some kind of relief to the executors and beneficiaries of the deceased estate. In pursuance of that, Sir, it was itemised at the time of my Budget Speech.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 on the Order Paper be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3 is now the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is another of the measures consequential to the introduction of my Budget earlier this year in which we had a full disclosure to the House of the new amendments to the 1968 Income Tax legislation. I do not propose to go through them

again, because they have been discussed and a great amount of publicity has been given to the proposals. They inflict or impose no new incidence of taxation. As a matter of fact, there is a larger question of relief and I hope that those of us who may be entitled to some kind of restitution on the passing of this Bill will be the beneficiaries of the good temper of the House today.

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

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is read a second time, there are a few points which we, on this side of the House, would like to make on this Bill. The first point is that we welcome the passing of this Bill. After all, it is due to the support of a Resolution which was moved in the last Session of the last Parliament by the hon. member for the City in which we advocated various amendments to the Income tax factor in this Island.

We do not intend to repeat the statements made by the "Shadow Minister of Finance" at that time on certain aspects of the Budget, but there is information, perhaps, which the Hon. Minister could give us. At that time he had promised that he would try to negotiate arrangements with the United States in particular in relation to exempting social security benefits of our citizens who may go to reside abroad. Perhaps the Minister will tell us whether steps have been taken so far to enter into these negotiations, and if he will bear in mind also that there are a large number of our immigrants in the United Kingdom and that we would like to have some sort of reciprocal arrangements with the United Kingdom, and with the increase in the number of provident schemes and national insurance legislation, whether the Government does not consider that the time is ripe for negotiating similar reciprocal arrangements since, as the matter stands, we are giving a unilateral benefit to some persons who are citizens of Barbados as well, but have earned their living overseas and have contributed considerably to those countries. We are urging the Minister to treat this as a matter of urgency.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we note that the concessions being given relate only to National Pensions which arise by way of social security legislation, and we would urge the Minister to keep in mind the fact that there are many persons who are living on pensions — pensions paid also by our Government and Governments overseas and who deserve some consideration. On the next occasion that he is taking an opportunity to amend this Act, perhaps, he will keep those persons in mind.

Although under Section 5 we are supporting this legislation, there is a third point which arises. We are apt to say that half of a loaf is better than no loaf at all, and that the concession which is being given to married women who are habitually living with their husbands in those circumstances only relates to their earned income.

12.45 p.m.

Perhaps the Minister may also bear in mind the fact that there are a number of people who retire and both themselves and their retired husbands may well be living off the interest accruing from their gratuity which is invested and that these persons will be placed at some disadvantage. Perhaps the Minister may try in his department to find out how many such persons there are and what relief he can give to them, because "earned income" is defined in such a way that it does not extend to this set of circumstances.

There is another point of principle that we should like to make on this side of the House. We believe that the time is coming when firms in this country should be encouraged to give by way of benefits to their employees participation in the equity of workers' shares so that they will own more and more the means of production in this country and part of the wealth of this country, and we believe that the Income Tax Act should provide in such circumstances where there are genuine workers' shares and in this respect we are not including people who are directors of companies; we are talking about people who are down at the end of the scale for whom the hon. member for St. Michael-West may often be negotiating. We think that some scheme should be devised by which firms should be encouraged to make this sort of donation to the workers without the gift itself attracting tax at that stage.

There is another point that the Minister can bear in mind that we would like to draw to his attention. I think it is an error of drafting in this Act. Section 17 subsection (c) proposes to delete the word "period" appearing in the twelfth line of paragraph (p) of subsection (1) and to substitute the word "period". In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, it is merely a typographical correction that the Minister seeks to achieve, and the first "peiord" should be spelt "period". I think if one reads the substantive Act one would see that this is so; so perhaps before we pass it, we can actually make that deletion.

Mr. SPEAKER: What section is that?

Mr. FORDE: Section 17 of the Bill now before us, paragraph (c) says "by deleting 'period' ". There is a typographical error in the original Act. In actual fact the correct spelling is "period", but the Act as it stands at the moment spells it

"peiord", and this is what the Minister is seeking to correct. If one looks at the substantive Act, it is merely a consequential amendment which is necessary.

There is a final point. We would also like to encourage the Minister to move at some stage an amendment to the term "maintenance" as contained in Section 85 of the substantive Act.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just want to take up the hon. member on the last point. I think that the copy of the amending Bill is one which I have in my possession. I read the Income Tax Act and I am aware of its contents because I have to administer it in some form or other, and what I have in my copy is "peiord" which we have changed to "period"; so I do not know what point the hon. member is making.

Mr. FORDE: Up to this point the hon. member and myself are together, but in the amending Bill the first word is "period".

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What we sent to the printers from what I can see from my cyclostyled copy is "peiord", but they were trying to correct me. They should know they cannot correct me.

Mr. FORDE: I am glad to see that the hon. member and myself are *ad idem* on that point and that the printers are at error, but in actual fact the Bill before the House does contain the printer's devil and we should correct that, and that is what I am drawing to the House's attention.

The only other point of substance we should like to draw to the Government's attention is that in the defining section, "maintenance" is only defined by reference to a court order, and as a result there are persons who are separated from their wives and who are paying them maintenance by virtue of agreement although.....

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the hon. member ought to know that this is covered by a different section of the Act altogether just before, as far as I can remember, that section; not only maintenance orders but any agreement which a person is under an obligation to make, so that if a voluntary agreement is made, then it is covered, but to make assurance doubly sure, the thing to do is to get a consent order of the court if you are in any doubt and then it is automatically covered.

Mr. FORDE: As the hon. member is aware, in relation to words about voluntary agreements and settlements, this may be by virtue of covenant and the period must be a period of not less than three years or for life whichever is the longer, and in

relation to consent orders by the court, whereas it is possible to do this in relation to children under the Infants Act of Barbados, 1958, it is not possible to do this under the divorce legislation as it at present stands, because there is no action for wilful neglect to maintain and what we are finding is that you may find someone only willing to go to the magistrates court's level whereas he is earning much more money than that and the wives and children are suffering; so that it seems to me that at some stage the Government should give further consideration to this point and revert to the position as existed under the old legislation to have a wider definition of "maintenance". I think the Minister will realise that those of us who come in daily contact with this problem in the court have noticed it and this may be an apposite occasion to draw it to his attention. If the Minister so prefers, I will write a letter to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue or the Ministry itself so that he would have the points available to him; but it is a point of substance and we have taken this opportunity to draw it to his attention.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member who has just sat down. He started out on the wrong foot because he is saying that this piece of legislation is as a result of what the hon. member for Bridgetown introduced. I want to get the records straight because he is saying that three weeks before the budget was introduced by the Minister of Finance, the member for the City hears a whisper, runs in here and suddenly gets a Resolution passed dealing with the aspects which this Bill happens to deal with today. If he has any idea about Government financing, and the hon. member for the City would not have because he has never been a member of Government, he would know that the Minister of Finance prepares his budget months before, not three weeks, he has got to get the statistics from the various departments, he has got to assess the financial position, he has to make up his mind how much revenue he is going to get from whatever source and what concession he can give; so I just want the records to be made straight because this idea.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, if the hon. member for St. Michael South-Central wants to get the records straight, it was not a question of three weeks before; it was a question of some two months before, and the Resolution was never passed. The then junior member for St. Lucy manoeuvred the House in such a manner that it was not discussed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: In any case, the hon. member for Christ Church-West in his opening remarks indicated and will get publicity for the

fact that this Bill is a result of something said by the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, I never said it is as a result; I said it accords with.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, whatever words he used, the hon. member is endeavouring to make the public believe that this piece of legislation has some connection with something brought into this Honourable House by the hon. member for the City. The hon. member for the City has nothing to do with it for obvious reasons whether it was brought two months or three weeks before the Budget. I am a member of the Government and know how business runs.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is repeating himself; he has already made his point.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, so that the record will show that this piece of legislation is as a result of a decision taken by the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet and has nothing to do with anything hurriedly brought before this Chamber.

The Rt.Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that it is not my practice to discuss any tax measures, and that is the answer for the hon. member for Christ Church West. I may have my views on certain matters, and from time to time when I have been inclined to relieve the taxpaying public of certain incidents of tax I have in budget speeches indicated that I think that certain matters should be looked at, and in those three budget speeches prior to the entry of the hon. member for the City I indicated that the finances of the country could not have supported the separation of taxes of husbands and wives at that time, but that I would keep it under review.

When the hon. member for St. Michael South-Central says that the hon. member for the City or the hon. member for Christ Church West wants people to believe something, the results of the last elections have proved what people believe. It is true that my wife is not working at the time but I have to look at the general picture in the country. I am aware that there has been agitation and perhaps a good case, but I said that it involves the loss of well over half million dollars, so there is nothing to argue about because I do not intend to discuss it.

On the more administrative points as to whether steps have been taken to secure reciprocal bases, I should like to inform the hon. member for Christ Church West that we have been negotiating and it is only a question of getting the United States Government to arrive at a convenient date.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is now involved in the exercise of a Presidential election, and before that they were involved in a money crisis — they still are to a certain extent — and double taxation agreements with Canada and the United States are two of the agreements including reciprocity on matters of relief from tax and social security benefits. I should like to say also that up to yesterday I discussed with the Jamaican tax consultant the conclusion of a double taxation agreement with the Government of Jamaica, and after that, since they are more advanced than anyone else, we hope to conclude an agreement with each of the other Commonwealth Caribbean countries, but we are not really losing anything neither is there an investment in either of the two countries. It is very difficult for instance to get the Canadian Government to meet to finalise this matter because they have not fully implemented the proposals of Mr. Benson, the Minister of Finance, arising out of the Carter Report, and large sections of that report are still under consideration in the Canadian Houses of Parliament. They have told us in writing that they do not think they will be in a position to conclude any further double taxation agreements until they clear the air at home.

As far as the United Kingdom Government is concerned, we have already concluded double taxation agreements with them. The question of the reciprocity of the measure which I introduced I believe has already been taken care of. I cannot make any promises to extend the relief to pensions earned by people in other Commonwealth Caribbean countries as distinct from social security benefits, because we have a large section of the taxpaying community, and if an Officer in the Public Service elects to take a gratuity and a reduced pension, he only pays tax on the pension so already he has secured a benefit. If he invests that gratuity it means that he considers the investment more profitable to him than receiving a full pension that he would have secured, so again I cannot make any promise of relieving people in this way because it is difficult to distinguish and differentiate the money from investments on gratuities or some other savings or windfall that the particular taxpayer may have gathered or worked for. If at some later stage it appeals to me — I am not suggesting that because somebody on the other side made the suggestion it is not worthwhile, as a matter of fact they have made proposals that we should not pay tax at all — but if the economy grew to the extent that it makes it necessary I myself would be very glad to be one of the beneficiaries of such a dispensation made by Parliament.

The hon. member said that firms should be encouraged to give equity in companies to their

workers and the Income Tax Act should be amended where there are general workers' shares, and then that the donations made by the firms should be tax free. They are two different things altogether. I think it is in the Manifesto of our Party that there should be greater participation by labourers in the products of their labour, but there is one incidence of a firm here in Barbados which made a big hullabaloo shortly before the election when one of their Directors was supposed to be a candidate, but for all the 102 years they had been in existence they did not display any interest in workers participation which has always been part and parcel of the policy of the Party I represent.

1.05 p.m.

But you will notice that this munificence that they boasted about obviously to buttress up some of the claims of their candidates, who they then had on rent to one of the political parties, that you were entitled to purchase shares after ten years' service, and the earnings from the 50 shares would be \$3.36 per annum. The tax relief that I have given the social security pensions in any one month to 17,000 people exceeds the munificence of the largest conglomerate in Barbados who were talking about workers' participation. It is pure unadulterated hypocrisy, and up to today not one single employee of that firm has received a single share certificate in respect of 10, 25, or 50 years service with the firm. I hope that is not what the hon. member means. The thing dies off after the election just like all the other election talk.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of information, Sir. I am talking on a point of principle. If the Hon. Minister wants to use the occasion to make a launching, he is entitled so to do. He has asked what I mean and, to give him this information as a matter of principle, I am talking about the principle of encouraging workers' participation by suitable amendments to the Income Tax Act. I am not being personal, and I would not assume that he is being personal either.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised it; I did not raise it; I did not call his name. I said that a firm, the largest conglomerate in Barbados, of which a political contender was made a director...*(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not standing must, please, observe the relevant Standing Order.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that that is pure, unadulterated hypocrisy introduced only for election purposes. In the United Kingdom and other enlightened countries in this respect where we have industrial relationship...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the Prime Minister speaking of the same proposal which he praised at the time it was introduced?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order!

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the largest conglomerate in Barbados — if you want me to call the name I will do so. The hon. member for Christ Church West was a Director, but I am not being personal about him. I am being extremely personal about the firm, because I think it was a display of mass hypocrisy that after working ten years in a firm you are going to be allowed the great dispensation of being allowed to buy \$50 in shares deducted from your wages; so that they will be using your wages to finance their future expansion and to absolve them from the responsibility of getting loans to carry on their business.

I am making a responsible statement. I am saying that it is hypocrisy, and that up to today 4, 5 or 6 months later, despite the fact that they have purchased an I.C.D. computer and they have people trained to manage the computer and have been running programmes on the computer, they have not yet managed to deliver a single share certificate to any worker. I am saying that if that is the kind of participation and we must now add insult and an abuse of the workers to injury by giving them tax relief on proposals like that, then I am not going to have any of it at all.

In the United Kingdom and in many private firms where a person has worked alongside the proprietors and owners for a number of years he is given — not sold out of their salaries — shares — meaningful shares and meaningful participation in the products of his labour, and he becomes a shareholder and even a director in the firm by virtue of not being selected as somebody that you can rent for window-dressing purposes — (*Asides*) not rented for window-dressing purposes, but because you have been working for 20 or 50 years with the firm and have helped to build the firm you have been given shares. I am not being personal to any member here, but all of us around here would like to see that kind of workers' participation. But the hypocrisy of publishing during an election period that you are going to have these South African trained people coming in here to say that they are going to let the workers buy shares out of their earnings — (*Asides*) I am saying that is hypocrisy, and, so long as I am Minister of Finance, I am not giving any tax relief to any firm that goes in for that or any similar hypocrisy by pretending that it is interested in the workers. Give the workers shares, but do not sell

them shares. You can buy \$50 in shares and earn \$3.36 a year, if you are good enough to slave for me for 10 years. I am not having any of that. That is my answer to the hon. member's question. They can go and rent whatever black people they can find as window dressing, but...

Mr. FORDE rose —

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. FORDE: On a point of information, Sir. Is the Minister saying that South Africans were allowed to come into Barbados and work in Barbados?

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that a South African trained person is a director of that firm, and you know it, too, because you were a director of it.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not making any personal attacks on anybody in this House; I am not a director of any firm, and the hon. member knows that. The hon. member knows the position quite clearly. When we go into Committee, when I can speak a second time, I will reply to some of his points.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member continue, or is he finished?

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will continue at a later stage; I will write a whole book on this subject, Sir.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, at this point we would like to suggest to the Government that Clause 3 should also include an exempting section exempting amounts which have been advanced as genuine benefits by way of workers' shares, so that they are deductible in assessing the incomes of persons.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few points clear. With me this is a matter of principle, and the statements and fulminations of other persons on this matter will not divert me from stating that I consider it a matter of the highest principle in this country that the genuine shares given to workers — people who are truly workers — should be exempted in these circumstances from tax in order to encourage wider participation. It does not matter to me, Mr. Chairman, how often people will attack this and make a personal issue of it. It is a matter of a principle, and I will invite the Hon. Minister in due course to advert to the principle of the matter instead of making cheap, political statements on any matter of this nature, and try to deal with the matter in its true perspective.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the words "cheap, political statements," because, if I had made statements, he should have objected to the statements at the time. I have not yet finished dealing with him and his firm; I have only now served notice. You are going to hear a lot more about them.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I have no firm. If the Hon. Minister has a firm in the Cayman Islands or anywhere else he can say so, but I have no firm.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John has taken objection....(Asides) You will be silent. When the Chair speaks all other hon. members must be silent. The hon. member for St. John has taken objection to the words "cheap political statements". I am kindly asking the hon. member to withdraw those remarks according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. FORDE: If you so rule, Sir, as I said when I first came into this House, I will withdraw the statement, and will substitute therefor "statements whose only value is political and cannot be assessed on any proper weighing of the matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am a difficult person to cool things down. I would like to say on the point made by the hon. member for Christ Church West that I did not enter this debate earlier in the second reading because I did not think that his statement about workers' participation in the form he mentioned would appeal to me, because I do not go for this type of workers' participation. I go for direct workers' participation, and if he had asked the Minister, which I will do, that consideration be given at some future date to an amendment to the Trade Union Act in Barbados so that Workers can directly participate, I would have agreed. The Trade Union Act should be so amended that it would be treated like the Cooperative Act so that workers in their own cooperative form could be given the same privileges and rights as persons outside these organisations, so that persons can have a direct participation in the economy without anybody withdrawing their income, and where they will be directly doing it themselves. I do not see in principle that the Trade Union should not be able to do the same thing that a Cooperative can do because in principle they both would be the same; one is done by the Cooperative Act and one would be done by the Trade Union Act.

Mr. Chairman, the Trade Union Act in modern times should be amended to conform with trade union practices in more enlightened places in the world. I should just like the hon. member for Christ Church West to know that his amendment could not be carried out because it would be a charge and you cannot make a motion which prevents money from going into the Treasury by an indirect route. You cannot make a motion that the Income Tax be reduced. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is looking somewhat strange as if he does not know that is the law of the land.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, is the hon. member suggesting that I do not know the Rules of Order of the House, because the hon. member suggested to the Government to amend it. He never moved any motion. It is because the hon. member for Christ Church West is so familiar with the Rules that he spoke about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said it is no point of order and I have asked the hon. member to take his seat.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to say that if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been practising that style in the Chamber before, he will

not practise it on me. Now he cannot get up in the House on a point of order when he has not even spoken and try to make a speech. How can he get up and make a point of order by saying what another hon. member intended to say? What sort of burlesque game is this? The hon. member for Christ Church West is quite capable, and if I wanted to put it at its lowest, I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that the hon. member for Christ Church West is more than capable of explaining anything he has to say in the House of Assembly and would not require the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to say it for him. If he is incapable of doing that, he is incapable of holding his seat. I have greater respect for him than to feel that he would have to require the Leader of the Opposition to explain his points; but in his exuberance he said that he was going to make a motion. He might not seriously have meant it, and that is why I said there cannot be any motion to the effect that you can do anything here because this would be a charge on the Treasury even by a reduction.

The hon. member dealt with the principle in his speech in the House, so if he dealt with it in the second reading, he cannot be dealing with the principle again because he would have to be dealing with the substance he intends to amend. If he intends to amend this section, and his idea is to carry this a little further by amending the section, he could not now be speaking on the principle of the Bill; so the Leader of the Opposition must get his whole perspective right. The hon. member for Christ Church West could not be speaking on the principle of workers' participation because he has already spoken about that; so it is a question that in this Clause he would have to move a further exemption. What I want to make him understand is that he cannot move an exemption because a private member cannot move an exemption to a money Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the hon. member for Christ Church West say that he calls upon the Government to amend this section. I am continually being told that I have heard something in the House other than I have heard, and when the report comes out, it is always my recollection which the report supports. At the start of his speech he specifically said he called on the Government, and I noted it because I said to myself "I wonder why Henry does not move the amendment directly", and then I caught myself because I said if he moves the amendment it would be a reduction of the revenue, and I was actually a little surprised that in his couple of weeks in the House the hon. member for Christ Church West was already sufficiently alert to know that he would have to ask Government to move such an amendment and not himself move it. That went

through my mind and that is why when the hon. member for St. Michael West got up to tell those of us who have been in the House perhaps a few years more recently than he exactly what the Rules are, I must say we know the Rules. I have been in the House more recently than the hon. member. But, Sir, that is only by way of explanation.

It is the hon. member for St. Michael West whom I would ask, if he could, to explain what he considers is the difference between workers' direct participation in industry and the Trade Union or the workers' holding shares. I could not quite get what the difference was. I myself tend to believe that if you are in a capitalist society one of the ways of ameliorating the rough edges of capitalism is to allow worker participation in different forms in industry. To the best of my knowledge there is nothing to stop a trade union from owning shares in public companies. I can be corrected on that. I have never been an adviser to a Trade Union and I do not know, but my impression is that there is nothing stopping an individual worker or the Union as a Union from owning shares and direct participation, and I wonder if the hon. member for St. Michael West who obviously has a great interest and should have a knowledge of all this could assist me with it. What is the difference between direct participation and participation.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. member raised that. I will tell him what is the difference between direct participation and participation. Just as he said he was never an adviser to a Trade Union, he was never an adviser to a genuine Trade Union. (*Laughter*)

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of information, to any Trade Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: As I said, he has never been an adviser to a genuine Trade Union, but he has been the adviser to some of these nondescript and amorphous organisations that have sprung up around here and on the kind of advice he has given them, they have disappeared.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member really must not say that. The hon. member should know that I have never had any connection either with the management, advice or anything to do with any trade union; the only member of the Adams family who has had anything to do with a trade union was the one who started it.

Mr. WALCOTT: And the one who started it tried to destroy the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is going too far, I am not going to allow it any longer. Let us get back to clause 3.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am getting back to clause 3, but you have heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have given both sides a certain amount of latitude and I have decided that it must come to a stop and let us get back to clause 3.

Mr. WALCOTT: Clause 3, Workers' participation, which is the point that was raised. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he would like to know what is the difference between workers' participation and participation — and I am going to repeat, Mr. Chairman — that he was never an adviser to a trade union. In passing he said only one member of the Adams family had anything to do with a trade union and that was the one who started it. I think it is too soon after the passing of the hon. member's father to raise any question about history, because history is not always kind to all the points we would like to raise, but I want the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to go and look up the records. Not long ago he said he never advised a trade union, but in 1964 there was and there is still a trade union on the register of Barbados. It was not re-registered because the Minister who is responsible for trade unions would not re-register all the amorphous, nondescript organisations calling themselves trade unions that are registered here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. member for St. Michael West to let us get back to clause 3 of this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on the points which were raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will not speak, I have ruled.

Mr. WALCOTT: What nonsense am I hearing now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that anything relative to trade unions or else does not appear in clause 3, and I am asking that you confine yourself to clause 3. Discuss the matters in clause 3 and let us get along with the business.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you, I am going to speak on this clause in the manner that I consider is proper to deal with

it, and nothing is going to prevent me from so doing. That is a categorical statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Oh no, we are going to deal with clause 3.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to continue, Mr. Chairman, when you are finished and nothing is going to prevent me from speaking in the manner I think I should.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing now with clause 3.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the matter that is before this Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to sit down. I am going to bring forcibly to his notice Standing Order 35 that when the Chair rules it rules and you will confine yourself to clause 3 and let us get along with the business. I do not see anything in clause 3 about trade unions or anything to which the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, referred. I have given that amount of latitude to both sides, let us get along.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want any latitude, longitude or horizontal, I am going to speak on the matter that is before the Committee, and nothing is going to prevent me from so doing. The Leader of the Opposition made a speech and just before he sat down he asked that the member for St. Michael West explain his interpretation of workers' participation in order that the hon. member for Christ Church West would know what should or should not be exempted, and I am going to speak on that today. This is income tax we are talking about, and the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister spoke on this matter and explained his view to the Chamber, and the Leader of the Opposition spoke subsequently and drew me into the debate by asking me what I meant by workers' participation. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to know what I understand by workers' participation because I said at the beginning that as far as workers' participation is concerned I do not agree with the point which was made by the hon. member for Christ Church West when he made the statement about exemption, and I said that what I would like to see is that the Trade Union Act be so amended that the Trade Union will be able to operate like a co-operative, and the Leader of the Opposition said that the Trade Union can invest money and can buy shares.

The Leader of the Opposition knows, or should know, that the Trade Union is restricted in its investment under the Trade Union Act. It is restricted in the manner in which it can invest its funds, and he knows that, because our Trade Union Act is

modelled on the 1875 Trade Union Act of the United Kingdom, you can buy land and certain other things but you cannot open a business, you cannot trade as a Trade Union, you cannot take the Trade Union's funds and open a store in Broad Street because the law does not permit you to do that. A co-operative can. The same workers can form a co-operative and do that, but the Trade Union cannot do it, and the hon. member must know that because it is not anything new, it is similar in a way to the Act in Barbados dealing with Friendly Societies who are restricted in the way they can invest. They cannot trade in that sense. Where I said that workers' participation as distinct from the other point the hon. member for Christ Church West raised was not in respect of workers purchasing shares, because as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, the purchasing of shares does not mean that you have any controlling interest in the business, all it means is that it is a good thing where workers can invest, and the investment of your money in a business does not mean the kind of participation that the hon. member for Christ Church West was indicating, because that type of participation is done now. The workers have shares in Banks Breweries, but you would not regard it as workers' participation because they do not have any control or any decision making to do, what they have done is instead of getting 7½% on investment...

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to your attention Standing Order 26(2) and Standing Order 44(1). Order 26(2) states: "A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto." Order 44(1) states: "Any Committee to which a Bill is committed shall not discuss the principle of the Bill, but only its details." I would like to get a ruling on that.

Mr. WALCOTT: How can you do that? You cannot ask for a ruling on a point of order, what kind of nonsense am I hearing?

1.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. member is drawing the Chairman's attention to two Rules...

Mr. WALCOTT: He cannot, at this stage, draw anything to your attention and ask for a Ruling unless I am breaking a Rule while I am making a speech. He has to show on a point of order that I am breaking one of the Rules. He cannot get up and ask you for a Ruling, otherwise you will be doing that all day long. If he says that I am breaking Rule 32, he will have to quote it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if I am breaking a Rule an hon. member gets up on a point of order and states that I am breaking a Rule. He cannot merely get up on a point of order and ask you to make a Ruling. (*Asides*) He is asking a question and not making a point of order. Do not be silly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat. In my Ruling there was no point of order for the simple reason that, rising on a point of order, the hon. member should have brought forcibly to my attention the Rule which you had broken, and not merely to ask me for an opinion if the Rule was broken. You will proceed. (*Asides*)

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Committee has very little respect for the legal profession when the lawyers do not understand these simple things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I bring to your attention Order 26(2) and Order 44(1)? I am drawing to your attention Order 26(2) and Order 44(1) dealing with the relevance of this debate. I am submitting that the hon. member for St. Michael West is in breach of the Rules. Rule 26(2) states that a Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto. And Rule 44(1) states that any Committee to which a Bill is committed shall not discuss the principle of the Bill, but only its details. This would relate to the details of Section 3 of the Income Tax Act.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you need not worry with that, because it is a point of bad behaviour...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the last time I am going to speak. You will confine all of your remarks now to Clause 3. That is all I want you to deal with.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, by now you should realise that what we are talking about is Clause 3. In Clause 3 we are talking about...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The next time you do this, I will ask you to leave the Chamber. When I ask you to leave all you will have to do is to bring a substantive Motion to see that I move from the Chair. I am not going to accept this type of behaviour from either side. Let us get along with the Business of the House. On the Second Reading of the Bill I expected every hon. member would have got up to say what he had to say, and when we came to the Committee Stage we would have dealt with the Clauses. You

are now dealing with everything except the Clause.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I really want to contain myself in this debate; I am trying my best to deal with this matter; I do not want to say anything more because I am afraid that it would create certain problems for my own Party. Now, we are talking about exemptions. The hon. member for Christ Church West spoke on the exemptions in this Clause and asked the Government to consider certain exemptions. What he was asking the Government to exempt was the question of workers participating by buying shares in firms, and he wanted consideration to be given to that. I rose when he started to deal with the question and I said that they could not be exempted, and the Hon. Leader for the Opposition spoke subsequently. If it has not yet come home to the Chair that we are speaking about the exemptions of workers — workers could mean trade unions, co-operatives and so on and I could speak about anything as much as I like. I do not like this threat when you said that you would ask me to leave the Chamber. I regard this as an unnecessary threat on the freedom of my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want you to withdraw that. You must understand that I am not going to accept this type of behaviour.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition could rise and make the kind of speech that he has made on this Bill, but the first time we can hear the Chairman talking about asking somebody to leave the Chamber is when I am speaking in defence of this Government. Are you telling me that you are asking me to leave this Chamber? (Mr. MOTTLEY: Sit down!) Well, I am not going to sit down for that same reason.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, is it in order for an hon. member to tell another hon. member to take his seat?
1.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to sit down for that same reason.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: With all due respect to the hon. member, the hon. member was not speaking at the time. He was standing and a *sotto voce* remark went across the Chamber, and this is the thing I want to stamp out. There is only one way to keep order in this Chamber and this is something I have been trying to project from the moment I sat in this Chair. I do not see it is necessary to have all this rancour. I want hon. members to get on with the discussion and desist

from a lot of the things I have seen and heard in the last session. Let the hon. member proceed.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I want to get the records straight. The hon. member for Christ Church West, to my understanding, was moving an amendment when he was taken up on it quite properly by the hon. member for St. Michael West, to the effect that firms which give shares to their workers should be exempt from tax.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order...

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not begun to say what I want to say and the hon. member wants to rise on a point of order. They want strangling at birth; keep the after birth and throw them away. They are no use to this community.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the debate.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: People like them are only an incubus on a community like this.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I will ask you to ask the hon. member to withdraw that people like them are only an incubus on the community.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is anything to be withdrawn because when the hon. member says "people like them", whom does he really mean?

Mr. FORDE: People like them who do not know how to behave themselves, and trying to rush at people.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: People like them who do not know how to behave themselves are an incubus on this community. Now may I continue? I understood the hon. member for Christ Church West not only on his second reading, because I have written it down, to say that he is standing on this principle and suggesting an amendment that firms which give shares to their workers should be exempt from tax. I want the hon. member to explain if he is moving such an amendment or merely suggesting it to the Government. If he is moving an amendment, it is out of order; but if he is suggesting it to the Government, I will reply. I have asked the hon. member to straighten the records. I will repeat that I got the impression that the hon. member was saying that he was moving an amendment to the effect that firms that gave their workers shares should be exempt

from the payment of tax. If he wants to explain, let him explain, and I will accept *pro tem* whatever he says or whether he is asking the Government to move such an amendment. I am not going into whether he is right to ask the Government, I am going to ask if he actually asked the Government or whether he said he himself was moving the amendment. I see that the hon. member is being advised that he is not to answer. Government Ministers always reply, I cannot reply, but I have written down that the hon. member has said that he is proposing an amendment to Section 3 that the Government should exempt firms from Income Tax if they give workers shares in an industry. If he does not answer, that is what I have written down and therefore I do not expect that he will challenge the accuracy of that if he does not elect to say whether that is accurate or not.

Mr. FORDE: I rest on the accuracy of Hansard. If the hon. Minister's brain cannot comprehend and understand and listen at the same time, I am sorry for him. If he would stop attacking me personally all the time, which he wants to do, he would understand what I am talking about.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have not attacked the hon. member. I said I do not want any mistakes. I have written down what I heard. I heard the hon. member's solicitor, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition interpreting what he should have said if he had any political sense, but as Leader of a party he has to protect his novitiates and those who are not well versed in parliamentary matters, and therefore he is trying to protect his party and the hon. member. I got up and asked the hon. member to get the records straight. He then attacks me and says I cannot understand. Well this country would be in a very bad state if the leaders of the Government of the country cannot understand simple English. I am not going by what the Leader of the Opposition has interpreted the hon. member as having said, but if he is moving an amendment, Your Honour has already decided that the amendment would be out of order, but if he says he is asking the Government, I will reply to that, and I have asked him to say whether he is moving such an amendment for asking the Government to do it as the hon. member for St. Thomas has said. I do not think there is anything more parliamentary, more correct and more proper than to invite the hon. member to get the records straight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is...

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am Minister of Finance of this

country, and The Income Tax Bill is one of the most serious matters in Barbados. Here is an hon. member not having the courage to get up in order for a Government Minister to reply to him to give an answer that he requested to tell the Chairman exactly what he wants done or what he proposes should be done. Since I wrote down at the time what he said, I must reserve my right, having invited him four times to say what he said, to say what I think he has said because I wrote it down contemporaneously on this sheet of paper at 19 minutes after 1 o'clock. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to bring forcibly to the Chamber that there is no motion before the House and I cannot make the hon. member for Christ Church West get up and reply.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, Sir, I am going to reply. The hon. member for Christ Church West said on the second reading that firms should be encouraged to make donations without tax becoming attached as an incident of those donations, and during my second reading speech I alluded to that and I told the hon. member what I felt about it and he did not object. Then in the Committee stage of the Bill the hon. member rose and moved an amendment and I invited him on several occasions to say whether he was making the amendment or whether he is now going to be subject to the emendation made on his behalf by the hon. member for St. Thomas acting as his solicitor and political adviser, that he was merely inviting the Government to make the amendment that firms should be relieved of tax on shares that they gave to workers.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, I have no solicitor in this House.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: A solicitor means a person who solicits on your behalf rather than an hon. member of the legal profession. The hon. member for St. Thomas is a member of a higher branch of the legal profession, so I could not accuse him of being a solicitor in that sense but I mean soliciting as an act of grace, soliciting support for something. The hon. member for Christ Church West got up and moved an amendment which I can treat with contempt because the hon. member for St. Michael West has demonstrated to your satisfaction, I hope, even although you may not have agreed on other points, that such an amendment would be monstrously inept and out of order. This legal luminary they talked about moved an amendment to impose a charge on the Treasury, so I will not deal with that, but if he is suggesting that a

Socialist Government should relieve all the bogus, hypocritical employers like Barbados Shipping and Trading or any other firm in Barbados, a conglomeration or otherwise, from taxation on any shares that they give workers to encourage them to give or sell those shares to workers, I am saying that as long as I am Minister of Finance you will never see an amendment to the Income Tax Act to that effect, and he should have had the courage to put it in his Manifesto at the time when that firm was pretending to be interested in the workers and not merely renting black people out, but as far as I am concerned as Minister of Finance the matter is closed because I have no intention of allowing that firm to deprive the Treasury of revenue on the pretext that they are interested in workers. If they want to give the workers shares let them give them because of the blood, sweat and tears that those workers put into the firm and not because they have been induced by a socialist Minister of Finance to do so. That is my answer.

Mr. FORDE: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, there are two points I should make in relation to this Clause. I am not interested as I said before in bogus employers, Shipping and Trading or any other company, my view is that this Parliament always has the power and if the Government is truly serious it will pass legislation nationalising any firm that is against the workers of this country without fulminating on each occasion in the House and trying to make it look as if they are the only people who can represent workers or look after people's interest in this country. They had ten years to pass the necessary legislation, but what I have suggested in this honourable House — and I think the member for St. Michael West was correct in one respect when he said that any form of participation is by giving co-operative powers and taxation relief by way of amending the Trade Union Act, but I will say there are precedents for this happening in socialist countries like Scandinavia, and if the Hon. Minister is not familiar with it he should read a book called Government Enterprise by Friedman who is one of the authorities on the social aspect of Government.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would ask the hon. member to be relevant. I have made the final speech. (*Asides*) I am on a point of order, the hon. member is not dealing with the points of whether he wanted the Government to exempt firms from taxation if they transfer shares to the workers. I am not talking about nationalisation, I will nationalise what we have to nationalise in Barbados when it is necessary, I do not want a person like him, a rented person, to come and suggest that to a born socialist.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, from my first day in this House the Hon. Minister of Finance has tried to attack me. I do not want to disrespect this Chair, but I would let him know he cannot run me anywhere and he is no more socialist than anybody else in this country. The position is that we are asking the Government at the appropriate time — and that is what I said before — to consider the principle of getting the form of workers' participation going in this country by helping companies, including the new industries coming into the Island and exploiting the workers, that workers' participation from the beginning, exempting the shares which they give and in due course from taxation.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member never said anything about exempting the shares, he said exempting the firms from taxation.

Mr. FORDE: With respect, Sir, both on the principle on the second reading of this Bill and in Committee I dealt with exemption of shares. The hon. member has practised at the Bar long enough to know...

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member to bring an illustration because he is bound to be wrong. How can you pay any tax on those shares if you are getting \$3.36 a year? He must mean the firm because he said firms.

Mr. FORDE: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, but I will not deal with it like that. The hon. member should know enough about income tax to realise that if you make a donation of shares, that those shares will attract tax because it is a benefit under section 2 of the substantive legislation. If the hon. member does not know that he should make himself familiar with the income tax provision, and what I am saying to the hon. member was that in due course Government should consider the necessary legislation to exempt the shares because otherwise they become benefits, and in calculating the income of a person for the income year they attract tax on the person concerned. No matter of fulminations or talking about Shipping and Trading can deflect me in this House from telling the hon. member what I understand, and he must get it clear that when he gets on his feet and tries to be personal I can be equally personal with him. If he wants me to be civil I can be a gentleman.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to say this, Sir, it is impossible for me to be personal to the hon. member who has just sat

down. The hon. member as far as I am concerned, and I have very definite views, is a non-person so I cannot be personal to him. He is irrelevant to this society, he does not exist as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his remarks because if I am irrelevant to this society, as far as I am concerned the hon. member does not exist and is quite capable always of being insulting to people in the foulest language he can think of.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot ask him to withdraw since you have replied to him. I have had enough on this now and I will put the question.

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

2.05 p.m.

Clauses 4 to 16 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 17 was called.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 17 there has been a typographical error which was not in the original draft. In Clause 17(2), line 2, substitute the word "of" for the word "period".

I beg to move that Clause 17, as amended, stand part.

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

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

Clause 18 was called and passed.

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

On resumption:-

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4, standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, be the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I wonder whether the Leader of the House can inform me whether, when we have finished this Bill and presuming the Prime Minister's Bills and Resolutions will have been completed, we can do a little Private Members' Business, as was mentioned earlier. It will take no less than an hour. (*Asides*) If Mr. Greaves would like to deal with his...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has just referred to another hon. member by name and that is slightly unusual.

Mr. ADAMS: I should have said the hon. member for St. Lucy; I am sorry about that, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, that undertaking was given and still holds good. We will revert to Private Members' Business from 4.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.

The question that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PUBLIC LOAN (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Loan Act, 1961.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill with which we are now about to deal is one in respect of the Public Loan Act. Under the provisions of the Public Loan Act, 1961, the Government is authorised to raise up to a limit of \$30 million by loan under Section 2. Since that time we have been to the London market and successfully raised two loans: one of approximately \$12 million — I say approximately because there are various charges attached to these loans that have to be deducted and there will be a plus or minus of \$1,000 one way or the other — and another one for \$6 million. All the other loans that we have raised so far are local loans. Of course, at the back of the Estimates hon. members will see all the various borrowings by the Government and all the advances dealing with the raising of loans.

Under the authority of the Act in 1961 the ceiling was raised to \$30 million, and then legislation was enacted on the 27th September, 1967, by the Public Loan (Amendment) Act, 1967 No. 60 of that year. Under the provisions of the Loan Act the amounts were authorised to be raised either locally or abroad, and the amount actually raised to finance projects including the Development Programme of 1960-65 and the Development Programme of 1968-72 amount to about \$29.6 million.

We are now coming to the end of our Development Programme 1968-72, and we are about to introduce a new Development Programme for 1972-75 inclusive and the Capital Expenditure which we have incurred from 1966-67 will be of the magnitude of \$58 million. I will give the amounts, and then hon. members can do the arithmetic.

3.20 p.m.

The Capital Expenditure in 1966-67 was \$11 million. These are the actual expenditures. In 1967-68, \$8.5 million; in 1968-69, \$8.8 million; in 1969-70, \$11 million, and in 1970-71, \$15.7 million. If some hon. members would add those figures together he would arrive at a capital expenditure from the beginning of the financial

year 1966-67 of something to the magnitude of \$58 million. I can add them up but there are so many people idling in here that I do not see any reason why I should speak and do arithmetic as well. Anyhow it is round about \$55 million, but we are only authorised to raise \$30 million by way of loan. Hon. members will immediately ask how it is we spent over \$55 million and we are only authorised to raise \$30 million. The answer is a very simple one. The other contributions to capital expenditure came from Development and Welfare grants and also surplus on current account which in some years were very generous. One year we had as much as \$7½ million; so the discrepancy between \$29.6 million which we actually raised by way of loan and the approximate \$55 million or \$56 million that we actually spent during that period on capital expenditure was met from grants from one foreign source or another, to a very limited extent of course, and the rest of it was met from surpluses on current account. Surplus on current account up to the end of September, that is, for the first six months of the financial year 1971-72 was \$5.6 million, but we have spent something like \$11 million on capital expenditure up to the end of the last month alone; so you can see in a situation like that, although we had \$5.6 million we had spent an extra \$5.4 million over and above our surplus on current account on capital expenditure for this year alone. We have reached the critical stage where in order to finance our development programmes we will perforce have to get authorisation to raise the ceiling from \$30 million to \$50 million in order to carry us through until at least the end of the financial year when the whole situation will be reviewed. After 1972, large repayments have got to be undertaken and we have some sinking funds which will be available for either the conversion or the paying off of those loans. We are asking for authority in this simple Act which is a very short one, in Section 2 to substitute the words "fifty million dollars" for the words "thirty million dollars" which appeared before.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, for many years it is safe to say that there has been broad agreement between the two political parties which alternatively have formed the Government of this country from colonial times until the present day, that some increases in the public debt of Barbados is necessary for the purpose of long term financing of capital projects. This I think was agreed up until 1961 when our party

formed the Government, and it was agreed, broadly speaking, until comparatively recently when the Democratic Labour Party formed the Government, as at the last count, as set out in the Estimates for I have not been entirely able to follow the Prime Minister's arithmetic today. The public debt of this Island including public loans and special loans — the only outstanding special loan apparently being that of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation — amounted to \$62 million. The fact that there has been broad agreement between parties that the public debt must increase in order to carry out development in Barbados does not mean that the public debt can be increased forever. I know there are persons who argue that the public debt, the debt that a Government owes, is not really a debt at all. I think Andrew Carnegie or some other likely American source, one who might be thought to oppose big Government spending, was the author of some much quoted phrase to the effect that the money that a Government owes its citizens is not a debt of any sort. Nonetheless, we in Barbados cannot altogether accept this.

We have had no opportunity, Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Estimates to comment on the public debt and very often in debates you have no opportunity because the charges are all fixed by law. You merely vote the money on the debate of the Estimates. As far as I know no money has to be appropriated to cover sinking funds or public loans, because they are all covered by a Sinking Fund Act and by the Public Loans Act, and therefore this House gets very few opportunities of debate upon the public debt. During the Budget Speech more attention is often paid to details of taxation than to the general details which may be given in the Economic Survey and treated cursorily in the Budget Speech itself, and perhaps also at an earlier stage in the second reading of the Appropriation Bill; but we tend to lose sight of the fact that charges of debt in Barbados are running at between \$7 million and \$8 million a year, and only \$2½ million of this is in fact going to repayment, the rest has to go to interest charges.

Now I am certainly one that believes in genuine deficit financing and not the sort which you introduce in a Budget Speech every year, but you underspend and over collect so that you have a situation at the end of the year, a turn-out or whatever the magic words are, where there has not been any deficit financing at all. But I think we have to take serious look at some stage to the way money raised under the Public Loans Act is being spent. I have heard it said from time to time, it is apparently the quick reply to our

party's promotion of the Deep Water Harbour, that the Barbados Labour Party built the Deep Water Harbour but the Democratic Labour Party has to pay for it. In fact the largest single expenditure for which a loan was ever raised remains the Deep Water Harbour. Two loans were raised totalling \$18½ million and these loans are due to be repaid, I am sure the Prime Minister has the figures if I have them wrong, within the next two years I believe. I think that December 1973 is the final date of repayment for the Deep Water Harbour itself; but I think the lesson we should learn from that is that the Deep Water Harbour alone among projects in Barbados financed entirely from the proceeds of the public debt was able to pay for itself and interest constantly, and to pay an amount which now runs at nearly \$400,000 a year into the Sinking Fund to sink not only itself, Mr. Speaker, if you will forgive the metaphor, but indeed to sink the rest of the public debt of Barbados, because the whole amount of the Sinking Fund is just over \$2½ million, and of this the Deep Water Harbour at last count contributed \$370,000 for the current year.

I would like to think that when the Government raises the loan limits under this Act to \$50 million, and we on this side will not be opposing such a raise, that it will pay some attention to putting money into projects which can develop Barbados at the same time that they pay for themselves. The Hilton Hotel with proper management could have been such a project. I am not going to stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and attack the conception of an International Hotel such as the Hilton, one belonging to an international chain that has its own overseas contacts that can bring tourists into Barbados because the hotel is there, but I must attack the execution of a scheme which should have been as valid and as useful a money-maker as a harbour... 3.30 p.m.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I know that others of his colleagues said they would burn down the Hilton Hotel and chase away the people, but fortunately those people are not in here now. The point I am making is that the hon. member may not know that every single year from the end of the first six months we have had money paid into the Hilton Hotel account, and I authorised the transfer on Friday of \$1.1 million from the Hilton Account into the General Revenue and they still owe us a half year's rent on the accounts up to the end of December, 1971. I am sure the hon. member who now supports the hotel will be pleased to hear that we have \$1.1 million on credit.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I never heard of any hon. member either presently or formerly in this Chamber who said they would like to burn down the Hilton Hotel, what I would say is that if you have a hotel that does not make money you could give it to the hon. member for Christ Church North Central and he would know what to do with it. That is what I heard said in here, and I was told this by a person whose conduct I respect, and if I were to call his name hon. members would be impressed.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I was not quoting the hon. member just now, I said I was quoting a colleague, but what another hon. member said was that he would turn it into a maternity hospital. We now have \$1.1 million from what was called a maternity hospital; that is our form of birth control.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not opposed to the concept of bringing an international hotel to Barbados, that there was waste at the Hilton Hotel and inefficiency in its execution can be attested by members of the IDC from the Chairman back down, but in private I believe the Chairman and other members are probably perfectly willing to concede the points that have been made on political platforms and in this House and at other times that the Hilton Hotel was overspent in its building and ran at an unnecessary loss for too long a time. If money is now being transferred from the Hilton account...
(Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you ignore those remarks which are made by members who are not speaking? Please remember this is a Bill to increase the limit under the Public Loan Act and not one which gives you the opportunity of discussing the pros and cons of expenditure when the Hilton Hotel was being built.

Mr. ADAMS: I believe that there is a rule, Sir, that says when you are discussing the raising of money you can discuss the projects to which it applies, but I am not going to extend it, all I would say is that I hope that if the Hilton is now making money that in next year's Estimates we will see a projected sum next to the notes to the Item of redemption of loans, Hilton Hotel — payments to sinking fund. If it is making so much money let it do like the Deep Water Harbour.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, there has been a lot of misunderstanding about the finances of the Hilton. We have had disputes with all the contractors on change orders and that kind of

thing, they said we had to pay more for this and less for that, and I think now we have settled all the disputes, and the hon. member for Christ Church West will be pleased to hear, including the legal fees, which some may or may not think too high. I am sure the hon. member and I will have the same view on the legal fees, the hon. member for Christ Church West may have a different view, but even that we have managed to settle.

There is no sinking fund for the Hilton Hotel because it was never necessary to raise a loan for the hotel. We own the land, and the average cost of constructing the hotel was something like \$336,000 a month, let us call it \$350,000 a month, and over the period of construction this was the average amount of money that I authorised to be paid over to the Hilton Development Committee for payment of bills which were coming in all the time. At no time have we raised any kind of loan for the Hilton Hotel, either directly or indirectly, I want to make that abundantly clear. All the payments which come in to the Government now are net rental payments paid directly into the Consolidated Fund and in the process of time we will have recovered all the money that we paid out of the Consolidated Fund for the construction of the hotel, and then after that it will be what the Trinidadians call "lanyah". I look on these as repayments of money advanced back into the Consolidated Fund, and after that it will be everything off the top. We never at any time raised any loan for the Hilton Hotel. I want to get that clear, because I have heard talks on platforms about the rent that was not paid and interest charges. If you want to ascribe local interest charges to \$9.8 million you can purely as an academic exercise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member resumes, I think this is a convenient time for me to read Standing Order 28. "No member shall interrupt another member except (a) by rising to a point of order, when the member speaking shall resume his seat and the member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision; or (b) to elucidate some matter raised by that member in the course of his speech, provided that the member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair." Accordingly, all that the last hon. member has said falls under part (b) and is nothing but elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS: I am obliged to the Prime Minister for the point of elucidation because it

brings me nearer to the point which we are now debating, the extension of the loan limit. Since I am one that feels that if the Hilton Hotel had not been financed in the relatively haphazard way that the Prime Minister has just described, if it had been properly cost accounted, if it was known that there had to be a redemption, that the Hilton Hotel had to be built for a certain cost and provisions were made for a sinking fund redemption and for regular interest payments so that we in this House could see the amount that the Hilton has cost and see its true financial picture, if all that had been done at the time and money for such a project had been raised under an Act such as this, we would not have had many of the debates we have had in here, we would not have had a lot of the acrimony, and the Government might have been on a sounder commercial undertaking.

I welcomed the Special Loans Act when it came into operation, and I am glad to see that CBC was not financed in payments out of the Consolidated Fund *ad hoc* from time to time but under the authority of a proper Act which allows members to see, read and understand all that was involved in the payments there. I do not want to anticipate the Resolution, Sir.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member will give way, on a point of elucidation, year after year in the Estimates — the Hon. Minister for Tourism will verify this — that in their Estimates, the Hilton Development Committee which is a sub-committee of IDC put in Estimates and we came in here and debated the Estimates and proper cost accounting was done. There was no point increasing the public debt when we had enough surplus funds on current account, in my opinion, as it turned out to be in fact, to finance the roughly \$3 million per annum that the Development Committee called for, and this appears in their allocation and proper accounting was done at all stages. I would like to make that clear, and accounts have been submitted from time to time, year in year out, month in month out, which are available and have always been available on the Hilton account.

Mr. ADAMS: With respect, I have never seen an account for all the money that was spent on the Hilton Hotel in here reduced to proper form, but the point that I am making is, I do not agree that where you are financing a commercial undertaking that you rule out the public debt as a means of financing it. If you are going to borrow money to put into something to make money, that, it seems, is an adequate and proper purpose for the application of a loan raised under the Public Loans Act.

3.40 p.m.

The Deep Water Harbour is a commercial undertaking; the Hilton is a commercial undertaking, but building a school is not; so I prefer to see these current surpluses, where possible, applied to school buildings in Barbados — the Secondary Schools for which we have been waiting. There are 10 Secondary Modern Schools, 8 of which were built by our Government. (*Asides*) The Minister of Education will correct me if I am wrong. All Grammar Schools and 8 of the Comprehensive Schools were inherited by this Government. I would prefer to see the current surpluses to which the Prime Minister refers applied to capital projects that in their nature cannot make money, and allow capital projects such as the Hilton to be financed out of an Act such as this.

Nobody in here can state, apart from the Prime Minister and he has called in aid the Hon. Minister for Tourism, how much the Hilton Hotel costs. Nobody in here can actually say that. Mr. Speaker, if it has been financed under an Act such as this, we would have been in a better position to deal with it. Has the Prime Minister, perhaps, forgotten that in those days when he refused to raise a loan to build the Hilton that the Capital Works Programme voted in the Estimates for 1963 and 1964 fell far, far below...

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is probably more convenient — because I was not rising at this stage — for me to interrupt the hon. member on a point of explanation. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Will hon. members not speaking observe a little silence!

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just made a point, and it is neither irrelevant nor untrue. Because we had the Hilton Hotel, the Treasury Building and other large absorptive projects going on at the same time, the Public Works Department, both on account of personnel and their ability to manage projects, could not undertake the other Capital Works that we had provided for in the Estimates. This means another explanation why we did not have to go and raise loans specifically, because we had enough surpluses on current accounts to finance projects like the Hilton Hotel.

I should just like in conclusion — I will not interrupt any more — to tell the hon. member that he should not make a parallel between, say, the Deep Water Harbour and the Hilton Hotel. When I had to raise the \$18 million for the Deep Water Harbour Messrs. Yearwood and Boyce, Solicitors, had a writ to file against the Government for the same \$12 million loan for

that amount of money and that never left London. Here was a situation which I inherited in which we owed the contractors — I cannot remember the precise amount, but the hon. member can check it with Mr. Brookes who is always willing to help the Opposition Party in all respects, both with information and otherwise. I give Mr. Bruce Brookes the authority to give him that information. They proposed to sue us all, because the taxpayers would have been involved, for something like \$11 million; so I had to rush up to the Treasury in London to raise the \$12 million which never left up there because we were on the verge of being sued. The other \$6 million is also money that I had to go and get. These are the only two loans that I have raised in London to pay for the Deep Water Harbour.

With regard to the Hilton, it was just like the question of pay as you earn — not build now and pay later; we had to pay as we build, and that is what I have done. I do not see anything in that about which he should quarrel. I have not left myself or anybody else with any incubus on the necks of the taxpayers in Barbados, except that we have not yet paid. Let us stop boasting about the Deep Water Harbour. I paid for it — I do not mean out of my own pocket — and we all paid. In 1953 I was telling the Government to build the Deep Water Harbour when the current Five-Year Plan was introduced, and it would have cost us one-third of the amount. No more interruptions, Sir.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was of the firm impression that the Prime Minister is on record as saying that the merchants and not the Government should have built the Deep Water Harbour, but that is a matter more for a platform than in here. I have heard the Government say that they had to pay for the Deep Water Harbour, but this is the first time I have heard that it was the Prime Minister who raised the loan for its building. But, nonetheless, we have to let these things pass. It was raised under the Public Loan Act of 1957. Never mind that the Prime Minister was not in the House when the loan was passed. We have to accept what he has said.

Nonetheless, in any consideration of this Bill, I must draw the hon. member's attention to these things. The Public Debt must go up because the Island needs development, and we should not have to pay for it ourselves. Our children and grandchildren have to pay for some of the roads that they will be driving on, the Airport on which the planes are landing, and the schools in which they get educated. That is the fundamental reason for having a Public Debt.

In countries such as Bermuda that have managed very well without either Income Tax, or a

Public Debt of any sort — only this year in Bermuda it has been found that a Public Debt is desired by its citizens. (*Asides*) The cost of living in Bermuda has never been as high as that of the Bahamas. Nonetheless, it has been found that the citizens of Bermuda actually want the outlet of Government Bonds in which to invest their money. The Bermudians want that and they have found that the building of a bridge at the entrance of Hamilton Harbour, which will be a very substantial project, can best be financed from a large loan which they believe will be readily forthcoming.

Other countries that have gone along arguing that the National Debt is always a burden are finding that it can be an advantage, but it must be properly administered, and the Government must keep a careful eye on it. When I hear that the Hilton has not burdened us with interest, what the Hilton has burdened us with is the consumption of money which, if there was a surplus, could have been applied to a Sinking Fund. In Barbados the total amount of Sinking Fund is only \$8 million, facing a Public Debt of \$62 million. It is only \$8 million available to repay the \$18 million for the Deep Water Harbour. It is obvious that fresh loans will have to be raised to pay off these old loans as they fall due, and these old loans at 5% or 6% will now have to be repaid at 7% or 8%.

With regard to the money overspent at the Hilton, it does not make sense to say that they did not have to use the Public Loan Act because the Public Works Department could not have carried out all of the projects, anyhow! That surplus could have been used to avoid future borrowing, or assisting the Sinking Fund to pay off current debts as they fell due. We on this side of the House do not think that a consolidation of anticipated expenditure in the amount of \$50 million is excessive. The Public Loan Act of 1957 authorised \$22½ million — this is now 1971, 14 years later when the value of money may well have halved — and if our Government was prepared to authorise a Public Loan totalling \$22½ million, I am not going to quarrel if 14 years later another Government asked for authority to borrow \$50 million under a single Act as it is doing in these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking that where the Government has a **fundamentally** commercial undertaking to finance, then it should finance it on a loan basis and not on what I repeat is a comparatively haphazardous basis of the early and inexperienced years of the Democratic Labour Party's regime, for none of the Ministers concerned: the Minister of Tourism, the Prime Minister and none of them was a person experienced in public financing at the time the Hilton Hotel was conceived and commenced.

3.50 p.m.

I do not believe it would be similarly executed today because I believe both the hon. members have perhaps got a little more experience of Government enterprise and of the administration of public finance and would therefore perhaps use principles more in keeping with the ultimate interest of the taxpayers. Subject to those remarks, we on this side will not be opposing this increase.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I remember reading that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said to the Hon. Prime Minister in the last Budget Speech that he was delivering his last Budget Speech then, because he would not get the opportunity to do anymore and he was quite content then to deal with it. Now today I am not aware if he is the Minister now or the Shadow Minister of Finance, but what I would like to say is that it seems the member for St. Thomas is really shadow boxing because each time the Prime Minister attempted to explain a point, he tacked like a boat and looked into a different wind for sail. At the beginning I thought the hon. member was making the point that our public debt was too high and from what the Prime Minister said he drifted in that the public debt did not seem to be high enough over the last ten years. I told the Prime Minister to allow him to speak and run out and then reply.

Dr. Dalton was one of Britain's experts on public financing. He was an excellent Chancellor of the Exchequer, but Dr. Dalton had his methods of financing things in the United Kingdom that another Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, would not have employed. Similarly there is no royal road or blue print about how a Minister of Finance will undertake a public project. I am glad to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition today agreeing in principle to the building of the Hilton Hotel which has been a burning question with the Opposition. What we would like him to say is that he has come around to the point that the Hilton Hotel as a project was a worthwhile project and not the nonsense that his party had been mouthing all along that it was not a worthwhile project. Today he says that the only fault with the Hilton Hotel is the management. If it is management, you can accuse the Government of that. The hon. member talked too about cost. All Governments cannot manage all the projects that they have. At one stage the hon. member for Christ Church West was a member of the Barbados Marketing Corporation under this Government, and I do not think he would have accepted the position to serve on a Board if he felt in principle that it was a worthless projection. He must have felt it was worthwhile;

but management is something you have to give to people.

With respect to the Deep Water Harbour, the hon. member might have been too young. It seems that the hon. member's history begins very late, but he should remember that since 1898 — and that should be a date to remember — they were talking about building a Deep Water Harbour in Barbados; but the Deep Water Harbour was not built until Sir Alfred Savage came to Barbados and pressed for it. You will remember that the Deep Water Harbour was not built in an independent Government regime. I will not say more. I know why the Deep Water Harbour was built. The Deep Water Harbour was built because the Colonial Office felt it was time they should build a Deep Water Harbour, and they sent a Governor here who was a Financial Secretary and he worked incessantly that the Deep Water Harbour had to be built. We know the difficulties about it. One of the problems of not building the Deep Water Harbour many years ago was the narrow political problem of what was going to happen to the people with lighters and what was going to happen to lightermen and so on. So let us be quite clear of our facts.

I was the Chairman of the Deep Water Harbour Committee; so I would know more about this than the hon. member. The hon. member mentioned the schools and said that you have to create public debt. Everybody agrees with that, but the Prime Minister's answer was that on every public financing you do not have to create a public debt; you do not have to borrow money. The hon. member will know that it just depends on what surpluses there are. There was a time when this Island was building up what was known as a Revenue Equalisation Fund and the Prime Minister opposed that as a matter of principle. (Mr. ADAMS: Did you support it?) Yes, I supported it. I am not one of those people that if I support something and somebody else opposes it I am going to say that he opposed it and I supported it. The Prime Minister opposed the idea of the Revenue Equalisation Fund. I supported it because at that time I felt that in a country with about \$10 million you could not afford not to have some money in reserve against these things, because we did not have the capital accretions we should have. The Hon. Prime Minister's attitude was that you should utilise, as the hon. member is saying in a different way, some of this Revenue Equalisation money for capital projections, and instead of creating a fund like this you should estimate on the basis of creating greater public debt. I would say that there is no absolute rightness about your method of financing. This has to be a question of

judgment of what I would do at the time; so there can be no question of saying that because the Government did not borrow money to build the Hilton Hotel that the projection was wrong. If the market situation is such that you have enough money in reserve that to borrow money and to pay interest charges you would find yourself with unnecessary public debt, then it is a question of what is the most expeditious way of financing the scheme.

Now I was amused when I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speak about Bermuda. I do not believe any hon. member of this Chamber or any Barbadian who is a member of a so-called socialist party could ever dream of citing Bermuda as an example in the context in which the hon. member cited Bermuda.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, the point I was making about Bermuda is that even conservative Bermuda where they do not believe in Income Tax and did not believe in public debt, have found last year that it is desirable to have a public debt. Even Bermuda perhaps in the context within which I was speaking. I was not holding Bermuda out as an example. They are finding now that even if they do not have Income Tax at least they could have a public debt to finance public projects.

Mr. WALCOTT: The reason why I said so is that Bermuda is the one country in this area where more of the charges, not public debt charges, would fall on the total population because it is a country without any Income Tax, it is a country that allows investors from all over the world to plant their money there, and the hon. member knows that if this Government became the receptacle or holding station for people's money from all over the world and we became another little Switzerland or another little Bermuda, he would hear that it would be said of the Government that they are the greatest imperialists in the world, that they have become the haven for foreign people to come and dump their money here for us sit back and get the benefit. It is a fictitious economy when you begin to talk about the Bermuda economy.
4.00 p.m.

If something happens tomorrow, and notwithstanding all that, the Bermudians are still a Colony, they do not have the right of experiencing democracy in the way the hon. member has seen democracy experienced in Barbados, so I would not use Bermuda too much in this context.

The other point the hon. member made was very amusing; he said that we are alternative

Governments, but I would like to be more precise. The Democratic Labour Party has taken over from the Barbados Labour Party, you have not taken over from us yet, the alternative has not yet taken place. When the hon. member is saying that we inherited the Deep Water Harbour and all these schools, etc., do you expect a Government when it takes over a country to bring in new things with it? If you had taken over at the last election would you have brought in the schools in your hip pocket? Would you have brought in your own Police Force? You must take over these things, you do not tell the people from whom you have taken over to keep these things, you have to take over the good and the bad, the liabilities and the assets. The hon. member spoke as if the harbour was built at such a fine cost, and when I see the other hon. member sitting down there, I remember how much his father criticised the last Government when they built the Deep Water Harbour, he knew how the money was spent, how many people got bungalows and so on, because this was one of his pet subjects. It was built for \$24 million, £5 million, but you always heard of the many people who built houses out of the Deep Water Harbour, but all that was part of the contingencies and it is known that in a contract for \$24 million where every load of stone and sand came from Bagatelle that people were going to be able to build houses out of that.

The Hilton Hotel project was no different from the Deep Water Harbour, I agree that posterity should be called upon to pay for some of the things you do, and that is why I was surprised when the hon. member started because I was not sure where he stood in this matter. I thought he was projecting the idea that this Government has increased the public debt to some extent, but now we have his words "to be careful" about the public debt you are going to incur. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the public debt in a country like ours with the present situation as it is, is in a good position. You cannot produce an economist or an expert who can tell you that in 1971 with the current position as it is what the public debt is likely to be because it never stops, but some people will ask you what percentage of your total income it is. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows what a peculiar monetary situation the world finds itself in today, the dollar is likely to be devalued and I feel that any Finance Minister ought to take this into consideration. When it comes to the public debt it is not a question of political sides it is the particular question of what you think your country can afford, and if you think your country can afford to borrow money at this time because it

is the best time to do it, by all means go ahead and do it. I am very pleased, and I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will have it made known, that he said in the House of Assembly on 14th December, 1971 that the Hilton project is a good project and that it has meant something to this country but the only thing he has against it is its management. You will have that against the Government, the Democratic Labour Party is managing the country and not yourself, but that is the fundamental difference. We do not agree that you should manage it, so that is the difference.

I think that in process of time we can talk about a one-party state, not a police state, but I am sure that in process of time when more parliamentary light has shone upon the hon. member for Christ Church West he will see whether it is an appropriate place for him to give parliamentary representation. He is a young man and although he does not have to be assured of these things, after all, Saul made a change therefore anybody else can.

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

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

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
4.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* C.B.C., GOVERNMENT AND THE BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be the next Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the release of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from liability to meet any interest or Capital Instalments due to Government on the loan borrowed by Government from the Bank of Nova Scotia for the said Corporation.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 6 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution concerns the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation which was first established in December, 1963, for providing a radio service. Its task was to inform, to educate and to entertain the people of Barbados and the neighbouring Islands. Now, in 1964 it was decided to go further and to establish a television station as well. Since that time there have been a considerable number of developments with regard to both radio and television. For example, of course, we have now educational television, and quite recently we have been the third Caribbean country in the Commonwealth of Nations to have colour television. I am sure that those hon. members who have seen the colour television presentations will agree that they are as good as you can see in most parts of the world, if not better.

In addition to this, the F.M. Radio Service has just started its operation, and I am told that as from the beginning of next year it will be operating on a 24-hour basis. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation presently employs 86 people, 85 of whom are Barbadians. Now, I hesitate to mention the other one, because I recall last week that there was something of a monologue concerning the Hospital Engineer and the Resident Engineer and that went on for some time. I have to confess now that the one person at C.B.C. who is not a

Barbadian is the Chief Engineer. I recognise by saying that it is like a red rag to a bull to the hon. member for St. Peter, but it was he himself who said that the hon. Lady member for St. Michael North East has the bull by the tail. There is one who is not a Barbadian and his contract comes to an end in February, I am told. Advertisements are now out, both at home and abroad, to try and find a Barbadian who is qualified, so that this may become a wholly Barbadian operation.

Now, I feel sure that some hon. members may have reservations about "Dark Shadows" or some of the programmes, but in general it will be agreed by hon. members and the public at large that C.B.C. has given a very good service to the people of this country both in Radio and Television Service. I think that C.B.C. should be complimented on the service it has given. However, there is one aspect of it, of course, which is not so easy as the operational aspect, and it is for this reason that we are bringing this Resolution this afternoon.

As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, I believe, at one time this afternoon, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was financed from the beginning with Bank loans. In December 1963 a Resolution was passed by the House of Assembly in the month of November 1963 permitting the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to obtain a loan of \$300,000 from the Bank of Nova Scotia to purchase and install equipment to carry out structural alterations to the building at the Lazaretto, the appointment of staff, etc. Now, after the Radio Station was established, a decision was taken to establish a Television Service one year later - approximately 7 years ago right now, and it was opened in December, 1964.

Now, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation then sought Government's approval to raise a loan to defray the cost of the establishment of the Television Service and also for the further development of the Radio Service. The Parliament gave its approval to all of this in June 1964 for the Government to guarantee the payment of principal and interest on authorised borrowing by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of an amount not exceeding \$650,000. Parliamentary approval was also given in a Resolution of February of that year for the Government to guarantee payment by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of an amount not exceeding \$510,000 to enable the Corporation to purchase televisions, transmitters and studio equipment. This then is how the Corporation was financed from the beginning, and anyone who has been in business will appreciate that from the very beginning it would appear that it has somewhat of a millstone around its neck.

The Corporation is expected, it seems, not only to make a profit from the outset, but also to repay the capital which was on loan as well as the interest on those loans.

4.20 p.m.

This has proved impossible over the years and it is hardly surprising. It would have been a great shock, I think, if indeed this had been possible, because they had no money in the kitty from the beginning and worked with loans from the very beginning. I do not think anyone would disagree that that is an exceedingly difficult way to start any business private or public.

Now the Corporation then came back to the Government bringing its problems in train in 1968, and pointed out these problems which I have mentioned. They brought to the Government's notice that they had not been able to repay the loans and in fact other debts were also then becoming due. Subsequently therefore in March, 1968, Parliamentary approval was sought for Government guarantee of a loan of \$2.1 million to C.B.C. and this was agreed. This sum was used to repay the loan at the Bank of Nova Scotia, money which had been borrowed from the Harbour Fund and the Hire Purchase accounts and other creditors. The time has now come, it would seem, to put C.B.C. on a much more business-like basis and in very much the same way the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was talking about a little while ago, and that is to capitalise some of its money and give them a chance to stand on their own feet. They have managed to give an outstanding service and they have an expectation to continue to make an operating profit. This leads one to believe that not only will they be financially successful in the future, but in addition to that they would also be able to pay for expansion of the services which of course has to go on all the time.

The present position of the Corporation at the end of December, 1970, to which the Addendum refers in there to be seen. The loan which I referred to of \$2.1 million is there, trade debts amounting to \$171,000 and unpaid loan interest of \$452,000, less the fixed assets and the current assets which leaves a figure related here as an amount of investment loss of debt of \$1,158,882. This works out over the eight year period at approximately \$150,000 per annum, and I suppose one would have to say that it is in the form of a subsidy for the very good service which the country has enjoyed in the field of radio and television over these past eight years from the point of view of informing people, educating people and entertaining the people.

As set out in the Addendum, it is proposed that the Government would write off the losses to the extent of \$1,150,000 and would convert part of the consolidated loan into equity to the extent of \$600,000. The Government would convert the remainder of the loan into a soft loan repayable in seven years at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and Government would now undertake the responsibility, and this is what this Resolution is all about, to meet any interest or capital instalments due on loan of \$2.1 million. At the present time all interest due to the Government will be capitalised as additional equity, and the Corporation will keep for further expansion such money as has been set aside for the interest payments on the total loan at this particular time. That then is the position, Mr. Speaker, and the Resolution seeks to, as I have said, put C.B.C. in a position where it can stand on its own feet, and continue to give good service to the people of this country and others.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, before the Hon. Minister finishes, I wonder if he could make available to the House the Report and Accounts of C.B.C. for the year 1970 so that we can have a picture of what is really going on.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order really; not even a point of elucidation.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: However the hon. member will have ample opportunity to request that because I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I believe that the Hon. Minister for broadcasting is really under some difficulties today. I know he is not very well, and I am sorry for him that he has had to inherit so drastic a liability, to quote the words of the hon. member for St. Michael West, within a couple of months of assuming office, because unlike most of the hon. members present in the House, we have been through all this before. It was in the debate to grant C.B.C. a loan of \$2.1 million in 1968 that some of the most explosive situations that had ever arisen in this House arose. It was, I think, in that debate that the former hon. senior member for St. Joseph accused the Prime Minister of telling more lies on him than they have jackasses in Egypt, and it was in that debate that I, perhaps against the Rules, permitted myself to say of the former hon. junior member for St. Thomas that if he had been born in Chatsworth Castle and grown up to be the Duke of Devonshire he would still be an uncouth lout.

So you will understand, Mr. Speaker, from those few references which I have drawn that this has been a subject which hon. members who have been in the House in 1968 remember with some vividness.

I think the best comment which I can make on the previous debate in which I believe I made the principal speech on behalf of the Opposition is to refer hon. members to something I said on that occasion, it being an earlier session, and, I submit, still extremely relevant. I would just like to remind hon. members that I am quoting from the debates of the 26th March, 1968. Perhaps the history will help hon. members. The point raised by the hon. member for St. James was raised then also in respect of any of the accounts of C.B.C., because we did not have any in 1968 and the same point was raised on the 19th March, and the then Leader of the House adjourned the debate for a week so that the accounts could be submitted to hon. members, and when the accounts came we found that there had been certain variations made in the methods of drawing up the balance sheet, we alleged, to conceal certain things from 1966 to 1967, and I think the hon. member for St. James perhaps is only asking for accounts so that such a situation can be avoided. Anyhow, that no doubt is being pursued.

Our comment on it is roughly the same as we said in 1968. The Minister, Senator Tudor, he was then the Minister introducing the Resolution, had told us how the whole of C.B.C. had to be restructured and if it had started off on a basis of share capital that it would not be in the position it was in then. I do not quite know how if you start off with a share capital of \$1 million and lose it you are in any different position from if you start off with a share capital of \$100 and borrow \$1,000,000 and lose it. I do not quite see what the difference is, but apparently the Government of those days found some difference.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the hon. member to remind hon. members that it was agreed that Private Members' Business be taken between 4.30 p.m. and 5.30 p.m. unless the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would want to continue this debate and then begin Private Members' Business at some convenient time for one hour.

Mr. ADAMS: I would prefer to stop now. I am glad you have drawn my attention to the time.
4.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for one hour.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the first Order under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO REDUCE THE AGE OF LEGAL MAJORITY FROM 21 YEARS TO 18 YEARS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the passing of a Resolution which stands in my name, whose purpose is to seek to reduce the age of legal majority in Barbados from 21 years to 18 years. Nobody knows from what strange avenue of civil or common law the age of 21 years was fixed as the age of majority, the age at which a child would become a man or woman as the case may be; sufficient to say that Barbados has inherited this as most countries have inherited it, and it has become part of our law unchangeable except by legislation. For some time persons all over the world have argued that in these days as educational facilities are increased, as international communications and intranational communications are expanded so that the experience available to a youth or a girl of 15 or 16 years may be greater than the experience available to a woman of 60 or 100, now that everybody has the capacity today in countries such as ours to learn something of the world and to know that there are countries outside Barbados, and to know that it is important to understand the purpose of getting on in life. All this being so, many people in Barbados and other countries have argued that 21 years is too advanced an age still to be suffering from legal disabilities, and there are very real legal disabilities attached to what is called an infant. If money is left to you in a will you cannot get it

until you are 21, unless the Solicitors are very generous you cannot get married before you are 21 without the consent of your parents, and there is very little doubt by some lawyers in Barbados whether an illegitimate child, so called, can be married under the age of 21 without the consent of the Chief Justice. There are all these difficulties.

In Barbados you may vote at the age of 18, if a Barbadian goes abroad and becomes a resident of Great Britain or the United States, there are even circumstances in which they might become liable for military service. You are old enough to vote, you are old enough to work and to fight but no provision is made for you to become an adult, and if you have the wisdom — I respectfully suggest to hon. members — to exercise your franchise to put members into the House of Assembly at 18, you can have the wisdom to own property, to get married and to carry out the other functions of an adult. I do not want to be long over this Resolution because I sincerely hope that there are no hon. members who are so insensitive to the aspirations of youth that they will not give their support in this regard. The history of this particular measure is that two years ago at an annual conference of the Barbados Labour Party a Resolution was passed calling for the reduction of the age of majority from 21 to 18; in the last session of the House I asked a question whether the Government would not so reduce it and I believe the only upshot of that question was that a branch of the Democratic Labour Party took it up and made it a part of their policy — a branch now represented in the House of Assembly by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, the hon. member for St. Michael West — and as one of the Labour members of this Assembly I would be glad to see that he still represents a constituency that thinks young and I look forward to his support, notwithstanding that he should have cast some doubt a few moments earlier when speaking on the Deep Water Harbour of my ability as an adult, since I was all of 26 years old when it was started, but I am sure the hon. member will support his Party in supporting this Resolution. I commend it most earnestly to hon. members.

I urge upon hon. members of the Government at the earliest stage to introduce this legislation where you will be bringing Barbados into line with what after all is usually called a conservative country, the United Kingdom, where the age of majority is 18, and in line with the United States where there was recently a constitutional amendment to reduce the age to 18. It is an age of educational development which

suits the aspirations of our people and it is not as small a point as may be thought at first, and I hope hon. members will support this Resolution and that the Government will very soon in the new year bring down the appropriate legislation. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

Mr. FORDE: In seconding this motion, Mr. Speaker, I do so deeply conscious of the fact that I still belong to the band of those people who are under 40, and I think it is very significant that this Resolution should come at this time particularly when in this House we do have quite a number of people, including yourself, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, who belong to the band of the young. I am not sure that if many of us are here on the next occasion that you will be able to claim the honour of still belonging to the band of under 40's. The only tragedy about legislation such as this is that sometimes it takes a long time before a country moves as the United Kingdom has moved in amending various aspects of our legislation. I think you yourself in your other capacity as a legal luminary — although apparently in this House that is a thing which is to be scoffed at occasionally — will know that the United Kingdom has passed legislation in this respect some two years ago, and one of the consequential effects of passing this legislation if other hon. members agree to it will be amendments to many aspects of our legislation, the Wills Act, the Infants Act, the Infants Relief Act and also various other disabilities which affect the people under the age of 21. We will hope to relieve them of some of these disabilities; it must be a rather difficult thing at any age to gauge the exact or the correct age at which people attain the age of wisdom. I do not believe that any person has the right to say this for all time because we are deeply conscious at times that people who are older than ourselves may not have as much wisdom, and also they are some younger than some of the older members of this House who may not on occasion display that wisdom.

4.40 p.m.

But I think if both sides of the House are agreed on one thing it is that the young people of this country have an increasing role to play in formulating the policy of this country, the road on which we go economically, the road on which we go socially, the road on which we go politically, and it is in that light, therefore, that I think this Resolution ought to be commended. I am happy to hear from the Mover of this Resolution that the Resolution was not only introduced two years ago at a Party Conference of our Party, but that also the hon. member for St. Michael West Constituency Branch is doing its

own thing in being young. I know that the hon. member for St. Michael West likes to look young even if he is not young, but I think he very frequently speaks with the voice and authority of a young person with an old head on his shoulders. I hope that it is in this way that he will support this Resolution. I think it is an important Resolution. I am sorry that it did not come at the same time as the Government had seen fit, for instance, to reduce the voting age some years ago. I think it had done that very soon after it assumed office after the 1961 Election.

I hope that the Government, despite the fact that this is a Resolution coming from the Opposition side of the House, will not treat it lightly, or will not treat it as an occasion for political party vendetta or political party banter as so often happens in matters of this sort. I hope the Government will treat it as a National issue, and will support the Resolution in all of its wording and form.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I said earlier today that the hon. member for Christ Church West, I am sure, would see light as he goes on in Parliament, and I know that before the end of this Session he might see light and realise where he should be. The hon. member knows that it was a bit of a disappointment when the under 40's were led astray with a motley crowd of people who do things their own way. He is wise as the hon. mover of this Resolution is wise, but they are wise 10 years late. If they would look into the history of this House, they would see that I moved a Resolution, as a Private Member, asking that the voting age be reduced to 18 years.

Now, I do not believe in making yourself a legend in your lifetime and crowning yourself with these things. That was done because I believe in it. I do not believe that there is any magic about 21 years of age. I do not know if I felt any different when I was 18 and when I was 21 years of age, although sometimes some people feel that 21 is an age you have never passed or that you were born at the age you are at the moment. The age the young people are supposed to be, I think I have passed that way also. I see no magic between the ages of 18 and 21.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition can say that he was not in the House, but the hon. member will remember that his Party was afraid of this type of legislation. The reason that 18 years of age is not the majority is that when we said that people should be able to vote at the age of 18, his Party voted solidly against it. If you are voting against people having the right to vote

at the age of 18, then you will have to say what is the position.

The hon. member says that my Constituency Branch agrees with it. You must remember that if I have anything to do with a Branch, then I must express these views. The hon. member will bear in mind that, apart from being in this Chamber, I am the General-Secretary of an organisation of predominantly young people and, therefore, in order to maintain my position I must reflect the thinking of this large number of people if not I would be no use to them.

There is absolutely nothing in this Resolution. If the Opposition is catching up with what we have said earlier, then it shows that we may have a one-party Government without losing democracy. If one organisation feels that people can agree on these things, you will find that there is not much room for argument. It is true that we will not be able to accommodate everybody.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think this is more or less in keeping with Government's policy. As the hon. member who has just sat down has stated, it was this Government that reduced the voting age from 21 to 18 years many years ago. This seems to be a sort of corollary, but it may entail many amendments to many Acts. I think this would have the blessing of the Government, and this type of legislation would be welcomed on both sides.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to this Resolution for various reasons. In the first place, when I realised that the Government in power had reduced the age of voting to 18, I objected on one basic ground, because I said it was not fair to reduce the voting age to 18 and at the same time keep the age of majority at 21, because I have always been a believer in the fact that if any person at the age of 18 is competent enough to go to the ballot-box and elect a Government, then he should be competent enough to be involved in the Government and be elected to take part in the Government.

I also felt that until the Government could make one stroke of the pen thereby declaring that all persons who have reached the age of 18 to have reached the majority age, then I think it was unfair to the young people, because you were using them for one purpose and at the same time you have no use for them at the other side. I, therefore, support this Resolution, and I hope that when it is passed the Government will also amend the Representation of the People's Act so that the moment anyone reaches the age of 18 he or she will also be eligible to be elected to the House of

Assembly, to the Senate, or to any relevant place where Government is administered.

Another point I want to speak on is something that is now catching up with our Barbadian society. You will find that people have advanced in their knowledge of trade. You will also find, as a lawyer, that a person cannot enter into.....(Asides.)

4.50 p.m.

Sir, we find that hire purchase is now the order of the day in Barbados. Everybody is practically living on hire purchase, and therefore it is still unlawful for a person of eighteen years of age to go into a store and become involved in hire purchase because technically he cannot be sued in Court, but it means that at least 20% of the hire purchase documents in Bridgetown in some way tend to be fraudulent or illegal. If you take all the young people walking about the streets with their transistor radios, they have got them by hire purchase from DaCosta's, Courts, Kirpalani or somebody else. Apart from that, you will find that young people are brought into Court and the first defence they have is that they are not yet twenty-one. These are the reasons why I feel that if you are sufficiently developed or living in a developing community, you should be made liable at eighteen.

Another point. On the question of our marriage laws, in our society it is all well and good for an eighteen year old boy or girl to live together in a house as man and wife. The mother cannot stop her because the law says that at sixteen they can be thrown out of the house; but you cannot go before a priest and get married because you have to go back to the same mother and father for him to sign for them to enter into a contract of marriage. You can only do this on your own if you have past twenty-one. These are situations which I believe are absolutely necessary, and very soon to change the age to eighteen, because I do not see how you can expect them to exercise that sense of responsibility to be a voter at eighteen, and on the other hand you say they are not capable enough to transact the ordinary business of life until they are twenty-one.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this reduction of the age, but I just want to say it is interesting to see that there is a change of heart on this question of the age of majority, because when the framers of the Constitution went to England, obviously at that time it either did not occur to anyone or they felt that twenty-one had some magic, because under Section 37 of the Constitution it says: "Subject to the provisions of section 38, any person who at the date of his

appointment (a) is a Commonwealth citizen of the age of twenty-one years or upwards; and (b) has been ordinarily resident in Barbados for the immediately preceding twelve months, shall be qualified to be appointed as a Senator." So that is the qualifications to be a Senator even although you could vote at eighteen which had happened before the Constitutional conference in England, twenty-one is still inserted as a magical number. Similarly when it comes to qualifications for membership of the House under the Constitution, section 43 says: "Subject to the provisions of Section 44, any person who (a) is a Commonwealth citizen of the age of twenty-one years or upwards; and (b) has such connection with Barbados by residence therein as may be prescribed by Parliament, shall be qualified to be elected as a member of the House of Assembly.

The point raised by the hon. member for St. Joseph would only necessitate an amendment to the Constitution. I just draw this to the attention of hon. members that while the Government is in favour of the reduction, yet the Constitutional framers did put in twenty-one as having some magic. But as I say, to tamper with the Constitution can always lead to difficulties, but I have thrown this out because when the Government does consider amending the age of majority to eighteen, it would also require an amendment to the Constitution since the Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will reply very briefly. I would like to thank all hon. members, even the hon. member for St. Michael West, for their contributions to the debate. I was not in the House and therefore I can only go by what I am instructed. I am instructed and informed that the Barbados Labour Party did not oppose the reduction of the voting age to eighteen when it appeared here in the form of a Bill. It may have opposed a Resolution of hon. members, I do not know. It may have opposed it when the hon. member for St. Michael West was in Opposition, but when it appeared in the form of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, I am instructed that the vote was unanimous. So just let the records be set straight, and there is no question of why we did not know this ten years ago. This is the first time barring my question in the last session that this matter has been before the House. There is no question of anybody being a legend in his life-time because he raised it ten years ago. The only person who has raised this is the hon. member for St. Thomas. Let us get that correct. I welcome what the Hon. Minister of Communications has said. I thought he was perhaps going to chide us for not seeing the point in London, but in fact the qualifications for Senators were extensively

discussed in London because we had sought to make alterations, and I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael West should remember, but it was said that these qualifications only repeated what was in the legislation and London was not the appropriate place to make them, and we were told how the former Parliamentary Leader of our party had agreed with everything, so we should not say anything then. It just shows the dangers into which you can fall when you have divisions of authority within a political party. Subject to these remarks, I very much welcome what the Government members speaking as private members have privately said, and I am glad as I anticipate the House can go on to the approval of this Resolution.

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

RESOLUTION TO RAISE THE AGE OF MARRIAGE TO SIXTEEN

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the passing of a Resolution to raise the age of marriage in Barbados to the age of 16 years. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which I think calls for attention even more than the previous Resolution, although it is not one that appears so vividly before members of the public. My mind upon this subject was made up when I became acquainted with circumstances in which a young girl of twelve became pregnant. The man who was aged thirty-one or thirty-two went to her father and by some inducement, I imagine, I cannot speculate as to the circumstances, but the fact is that he answered the more serious Police charge against him by marrying the young lady. He received parental permission and I remember when the matter came up before the magistrate the magistrate commented "my man, you may find that you have exchanged a sentence of seven years for a life sentence". It was that that drew to my attention that we have still retained the common law rule shared now by very few countries under the Common Law jurisdiction. A few of the more backward states of the American South such as Mississippi and Georgia retain this common law rule, although I think Georgia may have recently changed because they reduced the age of majority to eighteen and I think at the

same time raised the age of marriage, but this was retained by a few of the backward States of the American States and by hardly anywhere else that I know of in the Christian and civilised world, because I do not think our religious customs suggest to us that twelve is the proper age for a married woman. After all if you are going to have compulsory education, this will mean that a girl is married at twelve or thirteen, she is going to school and there may be a teacher who knows less or on the face of it knows less about the facts of life trying to teach something to this twelve or thirteen year old married woman.

5.00 p.m.

It does not often occur but it should not occur at all, there is not anything to be found, as far as I know, within the Marriage Act to deal with this, and if this commends itself to hon. members I would ask the Government to look at the entire Marriage Act. The Prime Minister drew to the attention of this House that marriages by proxy of young girls are still permitted in Barbados. I think the particular example he drew was a girl at Queen's College, and I think he mentioned the age of 14, who was married by proxy to someone in Bombay who then sought permission into Barbados upon the basis of being married to a Barbadian citizen. It is not my view that proxy marriages should satisfy us in this day and age any more than marriages of children. I would ask the Government, if hon. members are in agreement with the Resolution, to look at the entire framework of the Marriage Act at the time it seeks to put this Resolution into effect. If the Government agrees with this, I will point out that there are international conventions relating to this exact subject which place the age of 16 as the minimum age at which a boy or girl should be married, and I am suggesting to hon. members that 16 being the age of sexual consent in Barbados is a suitable age for the age of marriage.

It seems to me that it is meaningless to say that you cannot have sexual intercourse with a girl under the age of 16 and then say you can marry a child of 12. The two statements are so contrary to each other as not to have any moral meaning in them whatsoever, and I would urge this Resolution on hon. members. An hon. member has asked in an Aside if it then becomes an offence to have sexual intercourse with your wife if she is 12 years old; in fact there is a proviso where the age of consent is placed above the age of marriage. That is only an Aside, I would not want to say anything which misleads such Barbadians as happen to marry girls under the age of 16. I would suggest this is something that should have been done when the age of

consent was raised to the age of 16 in the year 1963; perhaps it was overlooked because you do not find it in a Statute, you have to know the law to know that a girl can marry at the age of 12. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the Resolution on other grounds. First of all, it brings to mind the current situation which exists in Barbados particularly in respect of illegitimate persons who require to be married and have got to appear before the Court in order to get the necessary consent before they can do so. I remember hearing that one of the tenets of the platforms on which the Prime Minister came to power was that he would reduce the cost of legal matters in this country, and I think this would be a good subject if the Government can accept that this Resolution be put into effect quite speedily, because it would reduce the cost of these persons who require to be married having to appear before a Judge in Chambers asking his permission because they are illegitimate.

The next point is that not only does the entire Marriage Act, in my humble opinion, needs to be looked at, but in the last session I asked a question dealing with the whole family laws of this country. Our divorce laws are antiquated, out of date, out of reality and there have been simple laws which have been introduced in the United Kingdom which it is said is one of the most conservative countries, and from all reports I have read even the Archbishop agreed with the simple rules of divorce laws. New Zealand and Ghana have adopted them and I do not see why in Barbados in this day and age we who have been ahead of Trinidad are now behind Trinidad on the question of our family laws. This is something to which I think the Government should pay immediate attention and rectify the situation, because in removing the legal age of marriage and putting it at 16 you are going to find the same problems in respect of your divorce laws, because God knows what is likely to happen to the person who gets married at 16. As the hon. member for St. Thomas said, a man who is 31 and marries a girl of 12, as long as he is married and he abandons her, after that what is her status before the divorce court? These are things which should be looked into and I think it is time that our whole family law should be looked into. I would humbly suggest at this stage that we accept *in toto* the family law of Ghana, because it puts the relationship of man, woman and child in a complete picture. The question of illegitimacy would disappear, the question of who is liable for a child would no longer be a test in the courts, the question of marriage and divorce, all these are things which I think should be looked into quite promptly.

I say again I second the Resolution hoping that the Government will get down to business quickly and bring the necessary legislation before Parliament which I am sure having had unanimous approval in the House would not evoke any lengthy debate except perhaps in the wording. We in 1971 are still operating on the basis of a divorce on three grounds, matrimonial offence and adultery, desertion or cruelty and there is a fourth which technically if you look at the Act is not even there. Mr. Speaker, you know very well that cruelty is such a difficult thing to prove unless doctors are prepared to go in court and give evidence. It is quite simple to bring in the new divorce laws, and the question of divorce after separation of three years with consent, the question of divorce after separation of seven years without asking a question would be settled. It would reduce, in my opinion, the present cost of litigations in family life, it would also remove the contention which we exist under today, and I am urging the Government to accept this Resolution. I would be happy to lend them the Bill that operates in Ghana, because whenever you go into court you always hear the 1937 Act is the one which a young barrister cannot find. I believe that this could be incorporated in a modern-day Act.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long, but certainly no one can quarrel with laying down a minimum age below which the marriage vows cannot be undertaken lightly, whimsically or otherwise. Government is not opposed to this, as a matter of fact, in my experience I have not known of any case of a Barbadian girl who was married under the age of 16, but the cases must be very rare. If of course the law protects a young girl up to the age of 16, and since many men do not buy a pig in a poke, certainly it is but fair to expect that the minimum age at least at which marriage should be permitted should be 16. While I was Attorney General there was drafted a new divorce law, and I think the Hon. Minister of Labour can support this, and it was hoped to get this modern piece of legislation before Parliament at an early stage. It is not because the Government is hesitating to bring these bits of legislation, but I think the hon. member for St. Joseph and the hon. member for Christ Church West would know that the drafting of legislation is handicapped because of a shortage of draftsmen, and therefore we have to deal with more important legislation, even although it is accepted that the divorce law certainly needs up-dating, because the Marriage Act which is in existence is for 1904, and certainly the approaches to modern day society cannot be governed by an Act drafted in 1904.

5.10 p.m.

What I can assure the hon. member is that this Resolution calls for no opposition, and that every

attempt will be made by the Government to see that a modern Marriage Act is brought before Parliament, time permitting. Draftsmen being available, at the earliest possible date.

Mr. FORDE: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, having heard the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works giving this assurance, I do not think that we need prolong the debate on this Resolution, particularly when there are other members waiting to introduce other Resolutions. But as one of the people who is very keen on law reform, I should like to invite the Government, in this instance, to ask the members of the Law Society and the Bar Association particularly to give them assistance on this type of legislation which has no political content and political difference as it is. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I recall a Solicitor and myself drafting Divorce Rules and passing them on to the Attorney-General's Chamber. It was not as up to date as the legislation which we need now, but I should really like to stress that if the Government is going to give effect to this Resolution it is vitally necessary that the rights of women be protected and the rights of children be strongly protected in any legislation which will amend the Act.

If marriage is going to be made easier and based on more realistic ground, I think also that men should become deeply aware of their obligation to their children in this community, and in particular I should like to see some legislation, as recommended by the hon. member for St. Joseph, on a pattern of the New Zealand divorce laws where the court must be satisfied that adequate arrangements have been made for the children before it will permit a divorce by consent to take place. I think this is necessary particularly if we are going to have the marriage age at 16. Our marriages do break down for some reasons that are sometimes not even contemplated by the parties, and although this may be tragic, yet, the children should be protected.

I should like to emphasise that, speaking on this Resolution, members of the Government have adverted to this. Although I am only a Council member of the Bar Association, I know that both the Bar Association and the Solicitors will give their time, as we have done before, to the Government gratis to help draft the legislation, if necessary, and pass it on to the Government. This is not a matter of day-to-day political bread and butter. The hon. member for St. Michael West and myself will agree on this wholeheartedly, regardless of whether I am on that side or this side, or regardless of whether he is on the correct side where he always belongs.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the lawyers have spoken on this matter, but there is one thing that has been left out. Personally, I do not share the lawyers' view about the rightness of any specific age. I do not believe that there is any magic in 16, 14, 15 and so on. This is only an arbitrary arrangement. A girl or boy reaching the age of 16 — there is no magic about the knowledge of life or anything. If you arrive at that age, I should like to say that I do not agree with the Resolution because it is a specific one asking the Government to introduce legislation to raise the age of marriage to 16 years. From all that I have heard, what I would prefer to see is that the Government — I would like to see this Resolution so structured that you would be asking the Government to go into the age of marriage, and let people from a cross-section of the community go into the question.

It is a non-controversial question in so far as the age of 16 or 15 is concerned, but what has to be studied now is something that the lawyers cannot do alone. This is a sociological problem and not only a legal problem. People who are involved in sociology; people who have been dealing with these problems and who understand some of the habits of the community should be brought together and asked to give their views on this matter in order to determine this question. The problems raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West are real problems not only in getting married, but in the question of family life. They deal with the whole idea of how Barbados is moving and the ambit of family life.

I do not believe that laws of this nature should be merely copybook laws, but should be made in relation to the indigenous population having due regard to what goes on in the community. I am of the opinion that, with a community like ours, a study should be made of this matter before arriving at a specific age. I am not one of those people who will agree to say 16 because the question has been raised. The most important thing in marriage is not the partners themselves. The partners go their own way after they disagree, but the children cannot always go their own way. That is the problem with which we are faced.

The problems sometimes come from immature parents, and sometimes the children are left to the wind. I hope that the lawyers and the sociologists will make it incumbent on both parties, or on the fathers, to look after the children, because in Barbados children have been left too much to the wind. Sometimes their education has been stunted and their lives have

been stunted through the problems of their parents.

5.20 p.m.

I do not feel it is fair that children should be left in this position. This question of family life is something that should be studied if there is going to be legal protection. I am one of those people who believe very strongly that children in any contract of marriage should be well protected. I feel that the two parties to the contract could fight their way out, but the children should not be left to the wind; so amending the Marriage Act and making it easier for people to be married but not making it easier for the children to be protected will not be doing the community any good; so we would only be making it easier for people to legalise what they are now doing illegally and the children would be left in the same position.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the hon. member for St. Michael West I believe is thinking that when we discussed on this side the question of making marriage easier, we were leaving the children in a vacuum, but I think this is wrong. Just to explain something which the hon. member might not be aware of, at the moment a young girl at sixteen and not married who gives birth to a child is bound to apply for maintenance for that child in the Magistrate's Court where the figure fixed by law is a maximum of \$5, and the man may be earning like a Legislator \$500 or \$600 a month or a Minister \$1,800 a month; but if she is married she does not go in the Magistrate's Court on a Bastardy Order at all; she goes in the Supreme Court by virtue of the Marriage Act and there is no limit to the Order. So the children would be better protected. We know we must face realities that with some of these people, as soon as they become pregnant at sixteen the mother is in the background with the shot-gun over the man's head and he goes and gets married; so all we are doing is providing an escape for the children through a better maintenance order. In Barbados where illegitimacy is still a sort of stigma, it gives a name to the child and therefore proper maintenance.

Mr. SPEAKER: All of that is a point of elucidation.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not think we were at cross purposes. All I was saying was that whatever you do in marriage or whatever you do in the whole gamut of family change, the children must be protected. I agree with the hon. member for St. Joseph. I do not believe in the restriction in Ghana as he said; I do not believe

in the restrictive basis of what we have in Barbados through what we have copied from the English Act, because I am not one of those sanctimonious, purist people with this Church concept that the marriage in itself is only a contract that has been legalised in the form, and that is why I say that the whole concept of our family life and family laws must be amended. We can make laws and have them adjusted to suit our condition, not adjusting ourselves to the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached the stage now in our life that the laws of Barbados must be changed. I do not believe that any man's children whether he is married or unmarried should be left to chance. I do not subscribe to this idea of the Bastardy Order. I do not feel it is right that children should be unprotected because the children are not responsible for themselves, and I would not like to see that perpetuated. I know our Party has agreed to amend it, and that is why I say that the whole idea of this Common Law English concept has to be wiped out and we must reconstruct. If the Barbadian lawyers operating in Barbados for all these years cannot get down with the sociologists in our community and pass laws that would relate to the culture and background of our people, then we will be failing in our duty, and that is why the whole thing should be changed in order that inside or outside of marriage you must decide what you are going to do for the children and the whole family life. That is why I say too that you should restrict even the element of sixteen. I would like to see it widened so that you give us a better community because one of the things that is debilitating to any developing community is when there is nothing that closes the family life, but the families are split up all over the place. I feel it is essential that the future generations should be protected and anything we do at law should go towards protecting the future generations.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad for all the sentiments expressed by hon. members. The only one perhaps that needs a comment since it goes to the structure of the Resolution is the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael West. Mr. Speaker, what I would draw to the hon. member's attention is that this Resolution calls on the Government to introduce legislation to raise the age of marriage to sixteen years. If the Government feels that sixteen years, although an age very generally accepted in civilised community, is not an age suitable for Barbados or that dispensation should be made for religious purposes such as the passing of a Hindu Marriage or Moslem Marriage Act, all these are possibilities, I have no doubt that the Government will introduce its legislation in due course meeting the arguments of

the hon. member for St. Michael West and the sentiments of hon. members generally, and any religious sentiments which may need to be taken into consideration, and I would urge the Resolution in its present form, because this is a mere request of the Government, on hon. members for their favourable consideration.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I had spoken to the hon. member for St. Lucy to ask whether he would wish to do his Resolution since the hon. member for St. Peter has indicated that he is not quite ready with Item No. 3. There are three minutes left and I do not know if the hon. member wishes to start. If he wishes to start in that time, I would be happy to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order.

I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION reSEVERANCE PAY

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which stands in my name relates to the payment of Severance Pay for displaced workers at certain sugar factories in this Island. Now I think for the benefit of hon. members I should indicate that in 1965 this Government saw fit to introduce and pass Legislation entitled The Sugar Factory Workers Severance Payment Act. This gave an opportunity for those people who were displaced from working at sugar factories to get some measure of reward for the work which they put in at these various places of employment for a particular period of time. Now this indeed was an act on the part of Government which indicated its socialist tendencies, that is, looking after the needs of people whose only means of income and support for families was removed through being severed from a particular job. There was obviously need for this legislation, and I am talking now particularly about severance payment legislation in general, and this is what the Government subsequently did.

This particular piece of legislation relates to factory workers. Now over the past year or so a number of sugar factories have been closed down. My information is that there are about four sugar

factories which have been closed: Warrens in St. Michael; Spring Hall in St. Lucy; Three Houses in St. Philip and Kendal in St. John. There were approximately 312 people who were employed at these factories and who up to this day have not yet received any payment as a result of the closing down of these factories.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to point out that Private Members' Business is now at an end, the time now being 5.30 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in the circumstances that Private Members' Business be extended for a period of 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

NOES: Hon'bles. C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, P. M. GREAVES, L. E. SANDIFORD, F. G. SMITH, P. G. MORGAN and G. G. FERGUSON; Messrs. R. StC. WEEKES, A. MORRISON, E. E. GREAVES and W. R. LOWE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND — 12.

AYES: Mr. ADAMS. (*seated and covered*).

Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the vote cast by the Leader of the House I have not heard any hon. member vote; the only other hon. member whom I have heard call on for a vote is the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, can you assure me that everybody has voted? I vote Aye.

Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY, L. S. CRAIG, H. deB. FORDE and W. C. B. HINDS — 5.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: At the point of interruption we were discussing Item No. 6 and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer hon. members to the debate of 26th March, 1968, they will find that when this \$2.1 million was

introduced in the reckoning by Senator Tudor, he told us how for one and all time there would be restructuring of CBC's accounts. I quote from him: "The 1967 accounts are not yet to hand, but it is projected that the loss would be \$336,000 in 1967, \$184,000 in 1968, \$81,000 in 1969, a profit in 1970 of \$162,000 and in 1971 a profit of \$286,000, and that in seven years the \$2.1 million will be paid off." One can only regret that the former hon. junior member for St. Lucy could not be around to hear his chickens coming home to roost in this House, but perhaps he will get to hear what is said today by some other means.

This is what I said on that occasion to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy's projections. "We are getting a series of projections by the Minister as to the hope CBC has of repaying this loan in 10 years. CBC is obviously going to have to make an enormous amount of money between 1971 when it starts to make a profit and 1978 when it hopes to pay off this loan, if it is going to pay off this \$2 million when this projected profit is in the region of \$200,000 over seven years. I think it is seriously misleading the House also to speak of paying off this loan. This is a straightforward appropriation of capital to sink the debts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, there will be no compulsion on the Corporation to pay off, there will only be a simple, straightforward contractual liability. What the Government is really asking us to do is to attach to last year's Estimates a sum of more than 20% of the total capital spent last year, more than was spent on schools, more than was spent on roads and twice as much as was spent on Seawell Airport. It was more than was spent on the Prime Minister's Office, and more than was spent on Home Affairs that we are being asked to give to CBC on a speculation that in 10 years they will be able to pay it off. It cannot be done and it is wicked of the Government to suggest that it can be done."

That is what I said in this House three years ago on this subject, and I repeat it was wicked of the Government in 1968 to come in here and mislead the House with a lot of false projections which within three years they have had to eat by asking that the \$2.1 million be written off just as the initial million had to be written off. CBC has been proved under whatever Minister to be a total financial disaster to the people of this country. I am not dealing with the programmes, I have attacked and dealt with the programmes at length on many other occasions, I am not dealing with the personnel in any way, it is the whole concept of running CBC that is at fault, and since so many people up there are the political darlings of the Government.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, as I understand this Resolution it is not asking the House to write off any \$2.1 million, it states: "RESOLVED that this House approve the release of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from liability to meet any interest or capital instalments due to Government on the said loan of \$2,100,000." It is to relieve them from the liability of paying so much interest from time to time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there have been moments when I have listened to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and thought that his knowledge of the law was very shaky, but never at any stage have I had any belief in his knowledge of finance, therefore he cannot disappoint me by the foolishness he has just said, he has merely upon this particular occasion exposed to all hon. members of the House that he cannot even read the Addendum to the Resolution. I see here that Government will write off the losses to the extent of \$1,150,000, so how can the hon. member say it is only a Resolution to release them from the liability of paying interest? How can the hon. member say that standing up interrupting me with that and calling it a point of order? What sort of point will you call that?

5.40 p.m.

Nonetheless, Sir, I would not worry with him. Nobody thinks the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is an authority in finance. We have to wait until we have the hon. member for St. Michael West back here in order to get a real authority, but, having spoken on every subject in the House so far today, I have no doubt he will speak with authority about the subject of broadcasting and the financing of Radio Stations.

Sir, I am not dealing now with the programmes. I am just dealing with, how it is that C.B.C., an institution that is supposed to be a money-making institution — an institution about which you had such high words of recommendation two years ago from Senator Tudor, the then Leader of the House — is still losing money? Upon an earlier occasion I was corrected in here by the Prime Minister when I said that Mr. Cecil King had said that if you gave him a Television Station you were giving him a licence to print money. The Prime Minister said that it was not Mr. Cecil King but Lord Thomson, and the Prime Minister was right. It was not a correction he should have made at all, because he was telling me that Lord Thomson, the man into whose hands he had initially placed the broadcasting future of Barbados, regarded broadcasting as a licence to print money. But

print money for whom? For himself, and for his own organisation, because it remains true to this day that the only people who have got anything out of C.B.C. are the staff who draw their salaries no matter what foolishness goes on in the Accounting Office or what they say on the screen, and Lord Thomson, who drew the money until the Government conveniently lost the contract and avoided, I believe, paying what he thought he was entitled to for a longer period than he, in fact, enjoyed it.

I am not getting into any quarrel between friends. If the Government and Lord Thomson have come to blows, I believe that the whistle has been blown on that fight some time ago. It is true that we are now having to pick up some of the pieces, because the amount of investment lost today, \$1.1 million, is ours — the people of Barbados. I support a Radio Station; I believe it is a good idea to have television; it is educational even without schools television. The colour television is not up to the standard that the Minister would have us believe, but all of these things are interesting. They believe that, but I could never believe that a Radio Station, which is run with advertising and which is run commercially, is being properly run if every two or three years it is losing \$1 million with a population the size of Barbados and the number of television sets that are in existence.

In the United States many cities smaller than Barbados have two or three Television Stations; Little Rock, Arkansas, is smaller than Barbados and it has three Stations; Atlanta, Georgia, is twice the size of Barbados with five Stations, and they make money. How is it that in Barbados C.B.C. is constantly throwing away the taxpayers' money? At certain times if a private man was running a business and the people who were running it for him were so inefficient, the 63 Barbadians and one foreigner or whatever the figures are would have the axe on them. The chopper would go through the studios, but it cannot go through the studios of C.B.C., because there are too many people who have made themselves politically useful to the Government for ruthlessness which it is necessary to bring to bear on a commercial undertaking of any standard anywhere in the world except Barbados must make money but yet loses money here.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: How is it that C.B.C. running a Commercial Television Station, an institution in which some of the greatest fortunes in modern business have been made in North America and Britain, can lose money? C.B.C. does not have the expense of giant, musical extravaganza; there is no paying of £25,000 to

Harry Belafonte to come to do two programmes years ago when I was at the B B C. We have none of that here. You go to appear on a programme at C B C, and you are not even offered a cup of tea, far less offer you a fee. There is no question of a fee.

Now if a politician in New York or London is invited, not to promote himself in a campaign, but to give his views in a discussion programme, do you believe you could give a politician in London less than 200 guineas to appear in such circumstances? In Barbados C B C. cannot even afford to pay politicians. If you do not pay politicians, it must be known that you do not have any money at all, Sir. C B C has no production expenses. It has to pay for a few second-hand films that it is showing now – films that were shown when C B C was first on the air in 1966 and 1967. That is what appears on C B C. You are getting old films that were made in Hollywood and have made their profits years ago. The films are so old that the most ardent cinema-goer cannot remember when they were shown at the Olympic theatre in the old days.

Now, I am not criticising the programming because it is, obviously, all that can be afforded, but there is nothing on the T.V. screen that makes us feel this Station has inordinate and exceptional expenses. Advertising is not cheap by the standard of the costs up there. What is wanted is a proper Cost Accountant to go through C B C and see where the money is being spent. When you buy new colour television machinery then, obviously, that is a capital expenditure. One expects that, subject to depreciation, it is going to be shown on the expenditure side, but the colour T.V. machinery is going to be shown on the assets side as well.

When in 1968 we were asked to put \$3 million into C B C., the total assets of C B C. then consisted of \$1 million: plant, building and everything. Today we have the Fixed Assets and the Current Assets as \$1.5 million, but we do not have before us any proper analysis of what is comprised in these assets which were put before us as of December 1970. This is December 1971, so God knows what the position is in the last 12 months. We do not even have that before us. All we have is that the amount of investment lost to date is \$1.58882 million.

I see here that Government will write off the losses. Government will convert part of the consolidated loan into equity to the extent of \$600,000. Sir, I am not an accountant. I remember asking all the members of my party last night, when we were discussing this matter,

what is meant by this. Senator St. John looked at it and we could not understand it. I should like some information from the Hon. Minister of Tourism about this. I believe, based upon the speech that I have heard him make, that he is as much at sea with the finances of C B C. as I am. In fact, more at sea, because he could not have been so closely involved in the first debate. What is meant by the Statement: "Government would convert part of the consolidated loan into equity."? Is C B C going to issue shares? As far as I know it is a Statutory Corporation without a loan capital, and I have always thought equity refers to share capital. We are not in the Government, Sir, and a lot of these things we do not understand. When you apply the ordinary language of laymen, lawyers, or businessmen to the transactions of the Government, you may find yourself in very deep waters indeed. What is this conversion of \$600,000 into equity? If you are converting that, I see that poor C B C. is going to be made to repay \$350,000.

Now, at least, this is a measure of difference between the present Minister and the former administration. The former administration promised to pay back \$2.1 million, but the present administration is promising to pay back \$350,000.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When I got up and said that the Government was not being asked to write off \$2.1 million, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has now come to the point where C B C. will have to pay back \$350,000. He got up with a smile on his face and glossed over it when he knew I was telling the truth!

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of elucidation rather than a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member, having been dusted off, Sir, is trying to re-attract some of the dust back on to his shoulders. If the hon. member reads my speech, he will see that the writing off of the \$2.1 million is a matter a little separate from what he raised initially. 5.50 p.m.

What he got up and said was that the Government was not asked to write off anything. If he had listened to what I said, he would perhaps have got a better understanding of what was going on. If his feathers have been ruffled, Sir, I am sorry. Politics is about that and when you get up and say something based upon not understanding what is in front of you, you are going to get all that. You must learn that. I do not believe that hon. members on that side are

going to spare me. They misquote and misrepresent what I say, and that is what I object to, but I do not object to honest blows. Do not misrepresent me and I will sit down and smile when you all make your jokes and laugh. Do not misrepresent me, and I particularly address that to the hon. members for St. Michael West and South Central.

Now, Sir, many hon. members have not yet made any speeches in the House that are sufficiently weighty to have caught our attention over here, but maybe they misquote me too, Sir, but I have not heard them speak sufficiently to be able to estimate it.

C B C and its trouble and its tribulation. What I am suggesting is this: you should never have asked the present Minister of Broadcasting to come in here today to introduce this Resolution, because members on all sides of the House have in their minds questions they would like to know about C B C. How can they lose this money? How can they go on losing money? How can they go on losing money year after year? The Hon. Minister, the member for St. Michael South got out of it at an early stage, and I congratulate him. I think the best thing of all he has done during his tenure as the Minister of Education is to abandon responsibility for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, because his mistakes, whatever they are, have not saddled the taxpayers with the type of burden which the day to day administration of C B C has put upon our backs. From the brave words of 1968 the Government now feels that C B C can pay back \$350,000. I would suggest not to even worry with that, and you will save a Resolution next year. Do not even worry with the \$350,000 because next year or year after you will be bringing a Resolution to write off more money for C B C.

Sir, the Prime Minister has never shown his wisdom better than when he introduced the Special Loans Act to cover situations exactly such as this, a Special Loans Act to bale out all the Government concerns like the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the C B C that lose money, and his wisdom was shown in the amount that he put. \$20 million is there in the Special Loans Act for baling out these Corporations of Government when they prove month after month and year after year that the Government's running them is hopeless that all they can do is absorb the taxpayers' money.

The Minister of Education will know that a secondary school could have been built out of C B C's losses. The Minister of Communications and Works will know what could have been done

at Seawell Airport to facilitate its use when 400 passengers start arriving at a time, and they have not got anywhere proper to service them. Hon. Ministers opposite will well know what could have been done with that money if it was spent by a Government Department under their direct control. They would have built the Post Office by now, and I suggest to hon. members that the Government is totally bankrupt of credit on this C B C problem. I am wearing a black tie for personal reasons; hon. members opposite should put on collars and ties for once just so that they can wear mourning for the Government's broadcasting policy as evinced in this repeated application to the House of Assembly for more and more money to bale out the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's attitude to C B C does not surprise me, because during the last election his party went around the country saying they were going to fire from the manager back down, and they had it planned whom they were going to fire from C B C, but the fact that the people did not give them the opportunity to fire people as they said they would naturally must cause him a certain degree of annoyance.

Mr. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way, it is not really a point of order. Just get it quite clear...

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order, is it?

Mr. ADAMS: It is a point of elucidation. I have never said I would fire any manager from C B C or anything of the sort. Do not involve me and say I am disappointed. I have no disappointment whatsoever in respect of not having the opportunity to fire anybody. Leave that out as far as I am concerned. (Mr. CRAIG: I would fire them.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member restrain himself?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I said that the party, and even if the Leader of the Opposition did not say so himself, I think I just heard *sotto voce* from the hon. member for St. James that he would fire them. (Mr. CRAIG: I would burn them.) You have heard it now louder, Mr. Speaker, than I could have said it.

Secondly the television of C B C was the cause of their downfall to a large extent, because when the public saw their broadcast which they were permitted by C B C and saw the poor

showing and the exhibition they gave on television, it was quite clear that it was another nail in their coffin, and that accounted for the catastrophic defeat of the Opposition. I am not surprised at his attitude as one of entire non-co-operation. It is perfectly understandable. You always find the Opposition against any progressive ideas in this country, they have always been, but this Government feels that the broadcasting station is doing a service to the entire community. I feel so proud when I see Miss Jane in an humble part of this country with her little children around her watching Cheyenne, watching Dark Shadows, even the Flint Stones, that I personally feel as a Socialist that it does not matter to me whether it pays or not. This Government is bringing to the people of this country a modern means of communication, a modern means of education and a modern means of coming into contact in their limited way with the world outside, and this is an education in itself. When the children can sit down and watch Sesame Street and learn the letter "O" and learn to spell, even if that is losing this Government money, I feel as a socialist that we are serving the community which is enough to benefit from such schemes.

As the Hon. Minister for Tourism has pointed out, from the very beginning this C B C was not capitalised in a way that would make it pay. All the talk you hear from the Leader of the Opposition about making it pay, television in Barbados will take years and years before it can become an economical, viable proposition. For one thing, a lot of people who shout glibly do not pay the licence fee which is very cheap; some of the people who shout and criticise C B C and who do not like Dark Shadows and some other programmes as set out would not walk across Independence Square and pay the \$10 to the Government which would help it to become a bit more economically viable.

Secondly, with a population of 250,000 and probably 18,000 sets, even if everybody pays, plus Barbados is not big enough to have a number of non-imported programmes that you can have otherwise, it could not pay. When you buy programmes from abroad you have got to pay for them and most of the programmes do come from abroad; there is copyright and there is a lot of money that C B C has got to pay for the programmes. In the field of advertisements, you are competing with a Radio Station, you are competing with the *Advocate-News*; well the *Truth* and the *Beacon* do not publish anymore; they were never any threat anyhow and have gone through the eddoes; but in the meantime you will find that a thing like C B C in Barbados

must be considered not from the point of view of the profit making aspect, but from the point of view of providing a service to a community that has emerged quite recently from colonialism, and you have therefore got to expose them and broaden their outlook as to what is happening in an independent and cruel world. This Government has approached it not – not that we have even thrown money down the drain – from a socialist point of view by enabling people in this community to benefit from experiences which their brothers in the more developed countries have had; and so with these problems, Mr. Speaker, the number of sets, the cost of importing machinery, the unavailability of being able to get your own programmes, C B C could not be expected to pay.

Mr. Speaker, when we put on the Government programmes here you hear it is propaganda; when we appoint the Government building a school, you hear we are pushing the Government and using it for the Democratic Labour Party; and even that alone cannot keep a television station going. Let them sit down and go through the whole gambit of an evening's programmes. When it starts with Sesame Street for the children, through the Flint Stones, through the Lone Ranger, through the other programmes, all have got to be imported, because in most cases you cannot get enough Barbadian programmes. There is a limited amount of drama and comedy and you cannot show them every night.

6.00 p.m.

And even that cannot keep a television station going. Let them sit down and go through the whole gambit of an evening's programme when it starts with Sesame Street for the children, The Flintstones, the Lone Ranger, all those have got to be imported because in most cases you cannot get enough Barbadians, there is no drama. (*Asides*) There is drama but not to the extent that you could find enough to use from time to time. I have seen a good one on television with Mr. Collymore and Mr. Pragnell, but this is not something you can run a television station on seven nights a week. I feel that once the money is not stolen, once the money is spent to the best ability of the administration of CBC, I am satisfied. I am a socialist and I have passed through in the last election and have seen the little houses, the little 18ft x 9ft, with people sitting around with their families watching television, keeping the father in from going to look for another woman, keeping the children from roaming the streets, keeping a unit together, and even if it does not pay I feel as a socialist that I would pay to make that type of

person happy and make them feel a part of a civilised community.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that under the guise of socialism one of these days we may hear murder defended, because it seems that one of the cardinal principles of the Government any time that any of their measures have been attacked, and where the measure is not a proper measure, is to hide behind the guise of being a socialist. Mr. Speaker, let us face facts about this Corporation. I think, although he was not aware that he was speaking the truth in this respect, that the only worthwhile point made by the Hon. Minister for Communications is that this Corporation was badly financed and capitalised from the beginning, and I would like to draw to the attention of the Government that the capitalisation of this project took place not under the Barbados Labour Party but under their Party, and that therefore if they are really being fair, get up and say this is our mistake and despite the fact that we boast that we have this wizard for the Minister of Finance he too is fallible — although sometimes in this House he does not make people believe he is. It is not only CBC that is badly financed and capitalised, there are other Statutory Boards, like the Marketing Corporation, and that is why I have some sympathy for the Minister for Tourism and Information, that he must come into this House and justify the position to the House and to the country where you are writing off \$1.150 million in capital because of the losses which have accrued over a period of eight years; why is this? I believe, like the Government — although they do not seem to genuinely accept that the Opposition is as interested as they are in seeing that the people get the benefit of cultural entertainment in this country — we must get this clearly understood that there is not one of us in this country who sits on the Opposition who would disagree with programmes that are worthwhile and that are up to date and that reflect the culture of this country, and that are making a contribution to the educational development of all the people, the man in the street and the others in their castles, so there can be no argument about this. What we say is that if you bring down a project to the country and you have made an error do not continually come in here and hide behind the guise of a socialist philosophy for their bad management, this is the position.

Governments have participated in the economy by various means. The only nationalised project in this country that has ever paid money has been the nationalisation of the Natural Gas Corporation which was nationalised by our Party,

but when we come to CBC, what did the Government seek to do? To borrow \$300,000 to buy equipment, then to borrow \$400,000 to buy equipment, then to borrow a further sum in order to buy equipment, and there was no equity capital put in from the beginning, hence you were asking the Corporation from the beginning to be saddled with loans which it had to repay without forecasting properly the revenue you were going to generate. This is a mistake. They took the advice of Mr. Thomson — and I should like to draw again to the Minister's attention that Mr. Thomson is the very imperialist that he is always saying that we are saddled with — and he gave them the wrong advice. They did not properly look at the restructuring of this Corporation, and hence the position today. What I would like the Minister to help the House on is vital information. Can he tell us of any year that CBC has made a profit? Can he give us some figures that if we agree to this Resolution and allow them to write off \$1.150 million to convert \$600,000 into equity which is instead of saying you are writing off you are saying that the Government has a further \$600,000 in equipment for the concern and then to ask them to repay a soft loan of \$350,000 of loan capital to be repaid to the Treasury, is he going to tell us what his forecast is for the next five years on the new restructuring of the Corporation? What is his forecast profit wise? Are we going to be asked within the life of this House to come back again for further financing? Those are the problems I think the country would like to hear.

I know that from both sides of the House there are political advantages to be gained by kicking this football about a little longer, but in my view we are saddled with it anyhow as of now, and I want to know the view of the Corporation, because it seems that they are certain urgent measures that this Corporation should take. One is that the Government must make up its mind whether it is going to run the Corporation as a commercial exercise or not. It is not enough to say that the Government is a socialist Government and it does not matter whether they make or lose money. After all, CBC is also in competition with Rediffusion, Rediffusion is making money, and the people of this country can be considered shareholders in CBC and are entitled to know how their money is being spent and whether it is being properly spent. Give us some idea of your losses, your projected earnings in the future, whether you think you will need further capital for capital projects, if you are going to extend the Corporation. We want to know about buildings, for instance, what more money you will need for this purpose, do not make too many bites at this.

Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, one of the mistakes made by the Government in relation to the formal method of going about this measure is the piecemeal method by which they have come into this House on many occasions with this project without holding the bull by its horns — if I may quote the hon. lady member — of dealing with it properly, and they should have dealt with it in 1968, they should not have been bothered in 1968 to face up to the country and say we are in a very difficult position and the Corporation has lost money. Having said that, the Minister in introducing this Resolution talked about some of the operational aspects. I am not one of those who believe that you should take staff and tell them their jobs are in jeopardy. There must be a chain of command somewhere, even in Statutory Corporations, and if there is a loss that has occurred, as I understand the correct procedure is that in the first place the then Minister is the person whose head should be axed if the Prime Minister had the courage.

6.10 p.m.

It is bad management. I am not talking about the then Minister of Education. I think it was the Prime Minister himself who managed it, and he should have resigned if he could not manage it properly. If he feels that it was due to bad financing, he should say so to the House gracefully. After all, we all make mistakes, Sir, and I think that was said in this House not long ago. But, for Heaven's sake, let us in future in looking at the participation of Government's economy where it goes into commercial enterprises — let us get this straight, when it is going into things that have a commercial content, the country expects it to show a better standard of management than we are getting from some business firms in this country. If we want to hold forth our people as capable of management, then we cannot show ourselves in the light where we are always having to say that we financed this badly, we did not operate it properly and, therefore we are coming back to ask you to subsidise the position. I believe that if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would look at the matter in this light, he would not feel that we are merely quarrelling about this Resolution simply because of the fact, as he puts it, that the television programme may have caused us not to have won the Government. I believe that is for the newspapers as a political aside.

Mr. Speaker, the true reason is that I am concerned as a taxpayer, and I am sure the hon. member should be concerned, that it has been badly financed; it is not being run as economically as it could be; it is being

outstripped in competition so far as the radio side of it is concerned and so on. I believe that it has a vital contribution to make in this country and, in this context, I hope that the Minister of Information will liaise very carefully with the Minister of Education to see that the programme start reflecting something that is of better educational content than "Cheyenne", "Dark Shadows", or that the type of programme that is introduced by saying: "This is your music man; the lover of fast cars and fast women." I do not believe that this is the type of standard that we should be asked to subsidise. I hope that the Minister of Education will bear this in mind. The Minister of Education and the Minister of Information are new members; they are not saddled with the past history like my Leader and the other members who have been in here and may have had their political wrangles before. They bring a new guise and a new view of looking at these problems, and if this Resolution goes through it should urge them to insist on strong standards of management at the Corporation.

In this respect, one of the things that I ask the Government to look at is to choose members for the Corporation who can, at least, exercise independent judgment in the running of the Corporation and who do not feel that they are wedded to a particular person or Party for their jobs. This is always a mistake, and you do not always get the best Government. I hope that with these words and these comments our opposition on this point should be put in its true perspective. We are not challenging anybody's job; we know that the taxpayers have to pay the money; we recognise that even if we voted against the Resolution it will be passed, but at least we want the Government to assure us that it will insist, in future, that the money is properly spent and that we will not be biting off more than we can chew by running into colour television, for instance, before you may be adequately financed in order to take on the cost of something like this.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one of those which found the Mover, on this occasion, falling quite similarly into the position of a former introducer of a similar Resolution. I think we were asked to vote money or to do a certain thing, and if it were done it would help CBC to restructure its finance; it would help it to liquidate its loans and make it, amongst other things, a more viable entity. It is quite a number of times since I have been a member of this House that these words or very similar words have been mentioned in here whenever money was sought or the assent of this House was

sought in approving a Resolution to assist CBC or a similar organisation.

We are well aware of the fact, and it is not because CBC was not started with equity, that is, having available capital for doing this or that, that we are going to criticise it. We now appreciate what Senator Tudor had to say at one time. I remember in 1968 he said that you could not always wait until you raised the amount of capital that was necessary before you embarked on any particular project. He also said that after you have embarked upon your project, it may be nothing to do with internal management or operational efficiency, because you can devise the best kind of financial structure and you can have every advantage thrown away if the operational efficiency is not 100% or is not nearly 100%. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that he was fully aware of what he was saying at that particular time. If he had the opportunity to read it since then, he would realise the significance of what he was saying at that particular moment.

Now, when we look at this Resolution before this Honourable House, what comes before us is that CBC, according to the figures before us, has been making money, but not from its inception. It is a money-making concern as a whole, and I am telling this Honourable House that CBC is making money. If CBC is making money, then why is it that we are asked time and time again to take measures such as we are asked to take today to save CBC from financial embarrassment and so on? There is only one answer to all of this. CBC is making money, but the money is being wasted. That is what the Minister has to investigate without any further delay.

Now, the Minister, perhaps, should know this. CBC projects a profit for 1971 of \$200,000. If the Minister does not know this, I am telling him now.

6.20 p.m.

Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation estimates that it would be making a profit of \$200,000 when they close their books at 31st December, 1971, and their plans are that they are budgeting for \$1½ million for 1972. These things seem to be bringing hon. members from the other side into life. If C B C is concerning itself with not being able to pay its way at present, how can they have these projections for the future? I do not want to go into the Thomson issue which in itself makes history, because they had more than \$½ million for doing absolutely nothing over the years, and as for the law suits between Thomson and the Government, these are not before us now

and we need not worry ourselves about these. The Introducer of the Resolution told us that C.B.C. has been rendering this very good service in Barbados. I do not know which Barbados he is referring to because complaints have been numerous. I am not prepared to say that all these complaints are justified. I appreciate the point that whatever one does he cannot be expected to please everybody, but if we were to look at it we would see that the value of advertising in Barbados runs into something like \$3.6 million. Now for 1970 and 1971 C B C had over \$1.4 million out of that in each year.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to look back at the figures which have been presented to us here, there is cause for a considerable examination of all that has been set down before us, because it is in the face of all this that we are being asked to take certain action here today to relieve C.B.C. from a certain amount of strain, if I put it that way. We want to say that in doing so, if this Resolution is passed, the Government would write off the losses. Our first concern, Mr. Speaker, must be whether we are to understand that all the money C B C has lost from its first year of operation up to the present moment is \$1,150,000, or whether this is one year's losses. We have very good reason for asking this. As for Government converting part of its consolidated loan into equity to the extent of \$600,000, I have heard what the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say on that point, and I heartily agree that it is something that needs a detailed explanation from Government benches, because before all this is done we have still got to look at the fact that in addition to what C B C has been able to take in from its advertising, there is still a very considerable sum that C B C receives from licence fees. What has become of all of this? Where is it going? We know that C B C found itself in a position of buying equipment. It was equipment that was more suitable to amateurs than to professionals, and as a result replacements had to be found sooner than would normally to amateurs than to professionals, and as a result replacements had to be found sooner than would normally have been expected, and I must say Mr. Speaker, that in any undertaking involving the installation of machinery, and a certain amount of expertise is not brought to bear whether by Government or by private enterprise, one can very easily run into such a situation. So you will find that as in the case of their video tape machines, CBC — and this undoubtedly ought to be in the possession of the Minister and I would hope that the Minister would get to his feet and tell us if these things are not true, have had to spend over \$370,000 replacing them, and the truth about it is that if

they had not been badly advised in the beginning, an expenditure of that magnitude could hardly have been expected to be embarked upon during the short life of a T.V. station such as C B C.

Now, you will find, Sir, that these same Video tape machines really cost more by way of replacements than the building that houses C B C. costs; so that is a situation with which we are faced in a matter such as this. If we were to look back, therefore, we would find that in 1970 on paper - and this is what we want to challenge from this side - \$1,260,000 were made from advertisements.

6.30 p.m.

We have no reflection to cast upon their auditors or anybody else, but it is high time we hear something about this Corporation and its finances; after all, advertising does not sell itself, somebody has to sell advertising and you must know the cost of your advertising before you can offer it to your customers, so as a consequence one must be able to determine at the end of each month or at the end of each quarter, half yearly or however one may approach the matter, it must be known, after all, it is a Corporation that must keep books and a true indication must be given or should be given as to the actual amount of money that is made from advertising. A television station lives by selling advertising; that is what it does, that is its main source of revenue and if in its annual report or whatever report it might be that is put before this Hon. House, or that is put before its Governing Body, if it does not reflect the true state of affairs, then I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is time some very serious consideration should be given to that aspect of the Corporation's operation.

C B C. is now faced with an entirely different situation again, because advertising agencies which now get I think something like 15% are trying to get a bigger slice, and Mr. Speaker, this in itself must bring us into accepting that something is wrong with the financial affairs of C B C or the reports of C B C, because it is advertising agencies that give C B C the business. In other words, C B C has got to pay the advertising agencies at the end of a month or at the end of a year so much money. When I say that C B C pays the advertising agencies I mean by way of commission, that is, they get commission back for all the business that they give C B C so there might be the case where some agencies buy time outright and then resell that time to their customers, which to my mind should be reconsidered by C B C because it opens to the advertising agency an opportunity to

buy cheaply from C.B.C and make a profit over which C B C. will have no control, and we never know, there might be the agency that squats here for a short time with the intention of taking whatever it can from amongst the customers it can get from time to time and move on, but nevertheless that customer might be scared away from C B C.

Another point which arises is this, what we are saying is that it is on account of the volume of business that the agencies know is placed with C.B.C that is giving rise to their quest, their demand, their search for an increased slice to be added to their commission which they receive. Are the advertising agencies being told that C B C. in other words is a buying concern? Do they know that we have before us a Resolution for \$2,100,000 to prop up C B C? That is what it means too, and if that is the case, if they know this, could they be expected to receive more? What we are saying is that they are satisfied beyond the shadow of doubt that the picture is much rosier than we in this House have been told and as a consequence they want to get their pound of flesh and some of the blood from C B C. as well. There can be no denying the fact that one of the problems confronting C B C. is that it has attempted time and time again to undertake more than it can really manage adequately. For instance, they had T.V. men covering the games in Columbia and that kind of thing which is very expensive indeed. We like our sport and all of this, but how much is too much to pay at times when the burden is so great upon the backs of the taxpayers of this country? You find that we have heard praises have come for our colour television from all parts of the world, we are doing such a wonderful job, but how surprising it is that since we have gone into colour television there are only about 400 colour television sets that have been sold in Barbados.

6.40 p.m.

I would like to say not 401 unless one was sold today. Where is all of this praise? You will find, Sir, that here is a case where we are allowing dollars to go abroad to import colour TV sets, and there is no comparable export to bring these dollars back which we need so much. All of these things ought to be taken into consideration.

Now, C B C has a tremendous amount of staff. You must remember that there are people at C B C who are drawing sums of money that if hon. members were to hear of the amounts I believe some of them would run up there and want to hold the Manager and the paymaster by their necks and prevent them from writing

cheques for next pay day. You will find that at CBC the tail is wagging the dog. There are people who go to CBC, report for duty at one hour and 10 minutes later they cannot be found on the premises or anywhere else doing anything for CBC. That is not an isolated case, Sir. That is a day-to-day pattern. You will also find that, quite recently when the strike was on in Bridgetown, quite a number of the staff walked off their jobs for no just reason whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for bringing these things to the attention of this Honourable House is that I am trying to show where Heads of Departments at CBC are people who did that sort of thing. I am trying to point out where management either lacks the confidence of these people, or these people do not have the confidence of management. They seem to be heading for a break down in the administration at CBC. In these circumstances, as Senator Tudor, when he was the Leader of this House, said: "No matter how you can devise the best kind of financial structure, you need much more than all of this."

Now, I was making the point just now about... (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of hon. members that the air conditioner be turned off? At least you can turn them down but not off. I hope the hon. member for St. Peter does not think that this is a way of making hon. members uncomfortable. Please continue.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I will revert to these sets for just a moment. In places like Australia and New Zealand there was a 100% decrease after those stations went on colour, but it happens in Barbados that after we had gone on colour for three months the position is as I have put it before the Committee not so long ago.

Now, CBC spent, I think, something like \$5,000 on research, that is, trying to determine its listening potential. The time has come when a survey is absolutely necessary at this point. If we are to vote money time and time again to assist in the restructuring of CBC, then you can expect us to find, at the end of the year, that we are back in the same position as we were formerly. Now, CBC has agents in the United Kingdom. I would like to hear from the Minister if he knows of any difficulty that CBC has been having with the United Kingdom agents.

6.50 p.m.

You will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is a fantastic sum that has got to be paid by CBC to

their U.K representative, that is, I think I am right in saying that 50% out of the 85% of the profits of CBC goes to our U.K. agent, and this is something I think the Minister will have to put his all in and try to have put right as soon as possible.

Now in ordering equipment, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that CBC still finds itself under a severe handicap, that is, it is still linked through some partial agreement where equipment for CBC has got to be ordered through this Thomson Consortium. I would like the Minister to be as careful as ever in examining all related matters to find out if CBC cannot be given a free hand to place the order for equipment through other sources. I believe, Sir, that it would be of some knowledge to us if we knew that on a particular day when CBC was in full swing, or let us say, on the day of the strike when they did not operate, it would have lost \$9,000. In other words, money that it could have earned on that one day would have amounted to that figure. This gives one to understand and appreciate what is involved. You will find that at CBC everybody is doing what he likes, and when I say so I mean even in the use of equipment. I do not mean, as I said earlier, going in and clocking in and scampering off; but that there is not sufficient control that is exercised over the use of CBC's equipment. This is one of the things that must be a cause of concern and we are to ask that these things be looked into before it is too late.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are one or two points which I must draw to the attention of this Honourable House and to the attention of the Minister because he sees them at times; slides are put downside up, and the wrong voice or the wrong announcement to an advertisement is given. What might be of interest to us is that the Minister ought to have this at his fingertips. There was, and I think I have to call the name of the person so as to enable the Minister to be able to reply, a Mr. Perry Jones who has been down here knocking around CBC and got a lot of money out of CBC, and the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us how much money CBC paid this Perry Jones and for what. Now the Minister should know as well that of this \$26,000 copyright that CBC entered into we get 60%, and all these are things that we ought to know. After all we ought to know, as I said earlier, that advertising is one of the main sources from which CBC gets its revenue. If CBC can go into contracts with producers or with anybody else and get a royalty or whatever one may call it, we would like to hear from the Minister how much CBC gets by way of royalty

from a particular source as against that. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: But you know!)

7.00 p.m.

I believe that barristers would be more familiar with a matter such as this than I might be, that is, where you find a Corporation like CBC paying for what they call performing rights. My information is – and I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would be in a position to tell us something about this – that neither Kenya nor Ghana pay for performing rights, yet here in Barbados CBC has to pay for these performing rights. We get quite a bit of overseas advertising, but we think that if the Minister could meet all these local advertising agencies he might be able to get a better deal with them, because I remember how some of them operate.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that he is repeating himself?

Mr. HINDS: I am not repeating myself, Sir. After you have heard me and I have repeated myself I am sure you will rule me out of order. Some of these advertising agencies, I remember, after CBC has performed its end of the contract, hold on to the money for three months or sometimes longer, but can a Corporation like CBC afford to have such a situation obtaining? That is why I said it might be in the interest of the Corporation if the Minister or some member of his staff could meet these persons and see if something better cannot be had out of all this expense.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see that CBC continues to function under perhaps more competent and careful management. You will find that appointments to the CBC Board are things that matter in some respect because you often find an appointment to the Board...

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see how the appointments to the Board have anything to do with this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if you so rule I will have to abide by your ruling, but when you are dealing with CBC and a money Resolution, I am sure that it has always been held with a money Resolution that every aspect, from the last Porter at CBC, the man who sweeps at CBC comes under our focus, back up to the Chairman of CBC, even the Minister. Remember, the Chairman and the members of the Board are paid from the money we vote for CBC and I think that the Chairman and each and every individual member of his Board should be discussed. I am

sure Your Honour will bear me out on this point, but I am not going to pursue it any further.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I propose to talk on this Resolution but I think that the time has come when it is only fair that members of this House should have a break, and at this stage, if the Leader of the House is around, I would like to find out what time he will break for dinner. I think it is also fair to the staff who have been writing for more than four hours, and I would like to make a motion that the House be suspended for an hour.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for one hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think I will accept that motion that the sitting be suspended for one hour, and we will resume Government Business on resumption and with your leave proceed with the supplementaries because we must get these supplementaries passed. I beg to second the motion.

The question that the sitting be suspended for one hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

7.10 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, when this sitting was suspended I had intimated that we have quite a few Supplementary Estimates to be dealt with. It may well be proper to deal with some of them now provided it meets with the approval of the Opposition. I would suggest that we now proceed with the Supplementary Resolutions.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is no objection to that, Mr. Speaker. I reserve my right to speak on the matter when the Resolution comes before the House again.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 17

A Resolution for \$12,848 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9 – Ministry of Finance – stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14 – Inland Revenue – stand part.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 18

A Resolution for \$1,664 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out the sum of \$1,664 is required to cover the cost of weeding and cleaning of Fire Services premises by employment of part-time workers as circumstances dictate.

I beg to move that Head 28 – Fire Service – stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out from the Leader of the House whether this is a new situation that has cropped up at these Fire Stations and what has been the situation in the past. I do not remember being called upon to vote money for this before.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there were complaints from the Fire Service about this matter and one of our Ministers gave the assurance that he would look into the matter. The men complained that they were required to weed and clean the premises at the various Fire Stations, and they were given the assurance that the Government would undertake the necessary weeding and cleaning. The Ministry of Communications and Works, who were requested to perform this service, told us that they could not undertake it.

The Chief Fire Officer has submitted information which indicated that about 80 man-hours of work per week would be required at the four Stations. The Chief Establishment Officers looked into this matter, and it was felt that there was not sufficient work to warrant the recruitment of a whole-time worker at the Stations and suggested that a sum to cover the cost of the work should be included under Incidentals – Fire Services – to pay part-time people at the rate of 70¢ per hour and this sum of \$1,664 is required to pay part-time workers for cleaning which has to be done on a part-time basis.

Mr. HINDS: Does this include Seawell Fire Station as well?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All Fire Stations.

Mr. HINDS: What of the complaints about the keeping of pigs at Seawell Fire Station? Do the 80 man-hours also take into consideration the cleaning of pig pens? The Minister mentioned the keeping of pigs and the complaints of Firemen at Seawell Fire Station. That is something that I brought to the attention of Government time and time again in this House. I am trying to find out whether this is a way in which the Government is trying to satisfy those people.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this matter arose when I was Acting Minister of Home Affairs, and it had nothing to do with pig pens. The Government does not make Firemen keep pigs. The Firemen keep pigs because they can get pork from them. They can do what they like. I investigated all of the complaints; there was a referendum or a voting on the keeping of pigs, and the majority of them decided to keep pigs.

This money is not to hire people to clean pig pens. If the Firemen do not want to keep pigs, then they can get rid of the pigs. The keeping of pigs is done on a co-operative basis, and it is in their interest to keep pigs in order to get cheaper liquor for their canteen. Government has nothing to do with this. It is not part of their terms and conditions of service. This is merely to stop them from having to clean Government Offices, to clean windows and to weed around the Fire Stations. (*Asides*) They can keep Black Belly sheep if they want to, but the Government has nothing to do with that. This money is not asked for to pay somebody to clean pig pens for Firemen. They could get rid of the pigs and the Government could not care less. The Government left it to the Firemen to decide to keep pigs, fowls, and so on.
7.20 p.m.

This is to help them with the weeding they used to do and the cleaning and sweeping of the place and nothing to do with animals at all. That is a cooperative effort which they as grown men must decide if they are going to keep in their own interest or not.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the debate, but I know it is entirely different from what the Minister who has just sat down has tried to outline. It is a cooperative effort no doubt in certain respects, but a fear lingers over certain members of the Fire Service. If they say they are not interested, they are not recommended for promotion. This is the gravamen of their complaints. It is a very good cooperative effort, but, Sir, there are some members who are not in for this kind of fun or the benefits that would accrue, and even some of the ones who would want to take part in the cleaning and rearing of the animals and birds would like to get some of the benefits, but we know that it is exactly as I have stated. Some members feel that when the time comes for promotion they have been left out because they are being punished by the N.C.O's, they are given unnecessary and harsher duties than others because they did not undertake certain duties in connection with this pig rearing, and the Minister knows it is really true. I am not saying he can do something about it, but it is really true.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 19

Head 9 -- Ministry of Finance -- was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, there is a certain amount

of financial loss suffered by three officers owing to the take-over of Local Government functions, and this is to compensate them for the financial loss sustained. The note explains it.

I beg to move that Head 9 -- Ministry of Finance -- stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under Rates and Taxes I believe the Minister is going to have a ready answer because any matter that concerns personnel is not a matter which the Minister can deal with readily. However it is our duty to draw it to the attention of the Minister that in this Department there are officers who have served Local Government faithfully and well over the period of years. They have been taken over by Central Government, they have been put from time to time and in some cases for more than eighteen months to act in a particular post, but when an appointment is to be made the officers who have given satisfaction are overlooked. They have been put to act in positions and they perform so well that they have been put to act in higher positions as well, but have never been confirmed; and you will find that when an appointment is to be made even to the lower post in which these officers have acted, although they have given satisfaction, they are overlooked when you are going to make appointments to the substantive posts. It is not fair. One cannot expect any officer whoever he might be to continue to function and give of his best in those circumstances, and I would certainly like the Minister to make a note of what I am referring to now and have the matter investigated, and if there are any officers in the Rates and Taxes division who have been functioning as I have indicated, to have their grievances, if they are genuine, redressed if it is humanly possible.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think a little conversation between the hon. member for Christ Church West would tell the hon. member for St. Peter that even if what he says is correct, the Government has nothing whatsoever to do with appointments to the Civil Service of this country. Sometimes I wish we had, but we just do not, and even if the hon. member is correct, the complaints must go to the Public Service Commission. The Officers who are passed over must complain to the Public Service Commission. The Government cannot interfere with the appointments, discipline or anything of the Civil Service and this is the position. I think the hon. member for Christ Church West can say that he has never heard of one Minister writing any letter to the Commission or taking any steps to influence the appointments

when he was a member of the Commission. So do not tell the Government if they are passed over. If they are passed over it is to the Public Service Commission they are to complain. I am giving you the constitutional position. This Government gets accused of doing all sorts of things and the constitutional document under which we operate clearly shows that all appointments to the Government Service in Barbados rest with the Public Service Commission, the Police Service Commission, the Judicial and Legal Service Commission and not the Government; so when I hear that the Government did this and the Government passed over anybody, it is not constitutionally possible.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member who has just sat down a lawyer? When I got up to speak I said that the Minister is going to have a ready reply because he is going to state that if it is a personnel matter it is not a matter with which the Minister can deal. So all that the hon. member has done was to repeat in similar language what I prefaced my remarks with. I really do not want to reply to what he has said.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has been Attorney General of this country for some time, and I think while he was Attorney General I remember the Comptroller of Customs and the same Public Service Commission that he is talking about; how many years were too long? Are they now saying that the Comptroller of Customs is not good? let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what I was about to ask.

Mr. HINDS: The next thing some hon. member would want to hear from me about is the Labour Commissioner. I do not want to go into these things. I agree that the Public Service Commission is responsible for making the appointments, but hon. members have a perfect right and are justified in bringing the grievances of members of the Public Service to the floor of this House, and it is for members on that side to take a note of what is said and by whatever means draw it to the attention of the appropriate commission or carry out the necessary investigation to find where the grievances exist and have them remedied.

8.30 p.m.

We are not telling the Government to go and appoint someone and dismiss somebody else, that is nonsense.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you put the question, it is precisely that we are attempting to do here tonight. The Ministry of Finance

recommended that this amount be brought down by way of compensation to pay three officers who suffered as a result of the takeover, but that is what we are doing. There are three officers involved, two are still employed but one has retired, so this amount is to give personal allowances to those who are still employed and compensation to the one who has already retired. The Ministry of Finance does recognise what the hon. member is saying, that financial loss has been sustained and that is the reason for this amount being brought before Parliament.

The question that Head 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 24 – Ministry of External Affairs – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: In seconding the motion, Mr. Chairman, even although this matter falls under the Ministry of External Affairs as the source from which the contribution should come, yet in truth and in fact the Minister of Communications and Works is responsible for the Regional Shipping Council and the Minister is a member of that Council. The Addendum clearly sets out the position, I have not had the privilege of attending my first Regional Shipping Council meeting, but it is anticipated that there will be a meeting in Guyana in January at which many pressing matters will have to be discussed at ministerial level.

When one looks at the amount of money this Government is asked to contribute, 10.65% of the total cost, one can see that the total amount of the subsidy which the Governments are forced to pay for the running of the two Federal boats and in the leasing of other boats is certainly, to say the least, hard, and the Governments of the region will have to seriously have a reassessment of the situation to see to what extent this subsidy can be brought within reasonable limits. There is no doubt that for some time to come there will have to be a subsidy, because the Federal boats which were a gift of the Canadian Government to the Federation that had existed is serving a useful purpose in the context of CARIFTA and in the context of West Indian closer association, and therefore the Governments have accepted that in respect of that they will have to subsidise these boats from time to time, and we are taking steps in the context of having to subsidise to keep the subsidy within reasonable limits. As a matter of fact, we have just got a round robin approval for the increase of freight rates, an increase of 43.5% as a temporary measure, because

we found that if we tried to keep the subsidy even at \$1 million we would have to increase other rates by 75% which would be a great amount at one time.

We have a very big agenda for the conference in Guyana, some very hard things will have to be said and these are obligations which we have got to meet. I am sure as Minister responsible that I am a bit worried both about the cost to the Government of Barbados and the general running of this service, but it is unescapable and we have to meet our obligations in the context of West Indian integration. As you will see, the Addendum clearly set out the position, and you will see that part of this sum which this Hon. Chamber is being asked to provide is as a result of revised estimates for 1970 and 1971 in view of the fact that the deficits for both 1970 and 1971 are deficits which are greater than was originally forecast and estimated, and therefore it naturally means that the Barbados contribution based on the percentage which we are forced to contribute is so much greater.

What does worry me again, only a week or so ago the Federal Palm which we have had to bring back on the run was arrested in St. Vincent for debt, therefore we are trying here in this last Resolution to pay our contribution even in advance in order to assist the Corporation in meeting the most active commitments. As Minister in charge of the Regional Shipping Council I am not entirely happy having to come to Parliament for this amount of money. As you know, the ships are registered in Trinidad, Trinidad is the headquarters, and I promise this Hon. Chamber that this whole matter of the Regional Shipping Council, its composition and its financing will receive from me the most serious consideration and scrutiny, but I can assure hon. members that for some time to come we will have a deficit and Barbados will have to contribute to it unless you are prepared to raise the freight rates and passenger rates to a standard which will compete with the standard of the other shipping lines, and if you do that it will affect the cost of living in the territories and it will negative the whole purpose of West Indian integration and to some extent injure the cause to which we are all in some way dedicated.

I do not think that any hon. member in this Chamber can seriously quarrel with this Resolution, he cannot quarrel with the Government, the Government is not the captains, the Government was committed from the break up of the Federation to run the two boats which the Canadians gave us to assist in bringing people together and to get goods from one territory to the other. Mr. Chairman, I second this Resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, we on this side do not want to oppose the passing of the necessary sum which is obviously necessary to keep this service existing between the several islands in this region, because we feel that with this service there may develop an even closer link which we so earnestly look forward to in the near future, but most of us here will remember that some time last year the Hon. Minister of Health who was then Minister of Communications and Works was absent from the House for some considerable period and we were told that they were then investigating the sale of one of the existing boats and the purchase of a replacement. We would very much like to know what has happened to the report dealing with these boats. We would also like to know what price has been negotiated for the sale of the boat and the price of the boat which they are expecting to acquire.

It is all good and well to say that we must finance this service, but the Hon. Minister who has just sat down earlier tonight spoke about a socialist Government which cannot think of making profits. That may be so, but at the same time I believe it is only fair not only to members of this House but to the taxpayers of Barbados that we be given some sort of report so that we can feel justified that the money which is being voted in this Assembly is really being put to use. There are rumours all around the place that the boats are inadequate for the service which they are expected to provide; it is known boats load up cargo for various islands, they go to the destination of that cargo and then the cargo cannot be discharged. There is also the general complaint about passengers facilities on these boats.

8.40 p.m.

We hear it daily, and we would like to get official information about it. It is not much good in having a Minister attending a Conference, and yet we are asked to vote money without knowing what is happening. I believe that it is time for the Government to issue a White Paper to clear the situation and to set out its future intentions. I believe it is right that the past Minister should, at least, give some sort of Interim Report about what has happened. For a Minister to travel from Barbados to Germany, Switzerland, etc., to look at ships and then return here without telling us something about the matter is not good enough. We are told that there will be a new regional meeting in January, 1972.

The hon. member for St. Michael West said earlier tonight that you do not come into power with a Deep Water Harbour in your hip pocket. Obviously, the same statement can be made in relation to the Minister, because he took over the portfolio. He has to take over a file somewhere;

he does not come in with all the papers in his pocket, and at least he should know what is going on in the shipping service; what is the likelihood of cutting down the cost of things; what are the avenues for keeping down expenditure and so on. All of these things should be in a file somewhere. We are willing to vote the money to continue the service, but at the same time, at least, we should be given some idea of how the money is being spent.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Sir, the Minister of Communications and Works has just mentioned, with regard to the Federal ship, that even if freight rates and passenger rates were increased to the ordinary rates we would then require a subsidy. I would say that even if the rates were normal rates we would still require a subsidy, as long as it is a service. One of the important things that people cannot understand about the Federal ships is that they cannot be loaded to capacity, because they have to go to too many ports. I still maintain that a ship which is loaded in Trinidad with cargo to be taken to St. Vincent, Barbados, St. Lucia, Dominica, Montserrat, Antigua, St. Kitts and Jamaica will find difficulty in unloading and loading cargo in the various ports, because you may not have easy access to the cargo for certain ports. Regardless of what anybody tells you, no one ship laden with cargo for all of those ports will be able to load cargo to its full capacity. Unless this type of voyage is broken down where you can have smaller ships going as far as St. Kitts, or two ships loading for different ports at the same time, you will always have this problem.

Now, if cargo was loaded on a ship in Trinidad and some of that cargo was for St. Vincent, then when the ship arrived in Barbados to unload and load cargo for the other ports there would be some difficulty in getting access to certain cargo. This is one of the problems that we are having with the Federal ships. We will always have these problems, unless you had a ship 10 times the capacity of the Federal ships when you will only be part-loading the ship in order to have access to certain cargo whenever you so desired. Of course, that would cost a great deal of money. It would be better to have smaller ships travelling between the ports, and one ship going up to Jamaica.

Another thing that creates a lot of expenses is when a ship is carrying passengers and cargo and it is delayed in port while taking the cargo, because it will be necessary to feed and maintain the passengers at a high cost. Passenger ships cannot afford to remain in port more than a specified time. The hon. member for St. Joseph

said that this House should be given certain information in a Report. Now, I was appointed to go abroad to look at certain ships. I had no direct instructions with regard to the purchasing of ships. It was merely a question of checking on ships in the area as they had agreed to sell the "Federal Palm" which should have been turned over to some company in the United States. Up to now I still maintain that no one ship travelling from Trinidad, calling at all of these ports and then going on to Jamaica will ever suffice this service. The second point is that no ship running both services, that is, a passenger and cargo service could ever be able to do it in an economical manner.

Sir, very often the cost of taking cargo to a place like Montserrat cannot even pay for the fuel used on that type of voyage, but it is a service and we will have to contribute to it. Until these things are cleared up, we will always be in this position. Barbados is in no position to say that it is not contributing to it. I think the biggest contributors to this service are Trinidad, Jamaica and then Barbados. The other Islands such as Montserrat will pay 45% of the total. I think Trinidad pays about 32% to 40%. Barbados pays about 10½% to 11%, and that is the position of the subsidy.

Mr. BOLDEN: Sir, that is the very reason I said that there should be some Report from this body to let the people or the members of this House know what is the future thinking in relation to these boats. It is quite clear that there is need for an in-depth investigation as to the type of ship which would be more suitable for our conditions. There must be an investigation into the routes which are being run, and the method in which the routes are being plied. There must also be an investigation into the routes in relation to passengers and cargo. It is quite clear that if you are taking cargo to a place like St. Kitts where the cargo itself cannot pay for the service, then it is an uneconomical situation to continue to run a boat from Trinidad to St. Kitts and so on when you are not making any money. You will have to find out whether there is a need for smaller boats; whether you need to run the boat from Trinidad to Barbados and then to Antigua and the other Islands. It is a situation which calls for some sort of proper investigation.

8.50 p.m.

You come here year after year and vote money and say you must subsidise them, but we, particularly the Leader of the Opposition who enjoys the position of investigating public accounts, can never know what is going on. I

would suggest that it is time that Government issues some sort of White Paper, have a general debate on the situation and certainly out of the debate ideas can arise which the Government can put to the Shipping Council and say this is how we feel in Barbados. We do not want to withdraw the service, but we have to look after what money we are putting into it and see how best the money can be utilised.

The hon. member who has just sat down said there is an agreement to sell the boat. We have not heard what the sale is like, what the proposed replacement is going to be; so I can only say in my personal capacity that even at this stage they do not know what they are doing in the Shipping Council, because if you are going to say that there is an agreement to sell a boat and there is nothing concrete in what you are going to replace it by, certainly we are still in the dark. The Shipping Council is not functioning sufficiently well that this House or any House can pass money to pay into it because if you know they are losing money, and if you know the ship is not suitable for what is being done, something has to be done quickly, and I think it is time that the Government issue some report or White Paper, have it debated and say at the next Shipping Council meeting that this is the position which Barbados wants to see. Something must be done.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, there is no magic about this matter and the Government is not trying to hide anything. There was a meeting of the Regional Shipping Council in Trinidad on the 27th July, 1971. At that time I was not the Minister; I was still Attorney General, and the Shipping Council even then, the Hon. Minister of Health was there, passed a Resolution that the Commonwealth Caribbean Regional Secretariat, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the West Indies Shipping Corporation should conduct immediately a study of the flow of cargo and passengers to determine the projected level of service which would be required taking into account the proposed replacement of the Federal Maple.

Now these reports have been done and I will read the Agenda which was to have been discussed at the meeting of the Shipping Council in October. Jamaica and Trinidad could not make it, so it was abortive. I am not making a statement at this point. I have the reports which though not confidential have not been discussed with the other members of the Regional Shipping Council; so I cannot tell you what is the result. I will be able to tell you this on the Budget in March, because the Shipping Council meeting

would have taken place. At this point we are worried about the Federal Palm which is costing so much to repair; we are worried about having to hire the Nina to help take the cargo. We know there are problems. The agenda which we were to deal with at the meeting which never came off is a very long one, and it is going to deal with all these reports. Let me read it to show you what I will be able to tell you about when I have discussed it with my Ministerial colleagues who belong to the Regional Shipping Council: Report on the Special Meeting of the Regional Shipping Council held in Trinidad; Report on the sale of the M.V. Federal Palm; Tripartite Report on the study of a suitable replacement for the Federal Maple; The West Indies Shipping Corporation efficiency study and cost analysis; West Indies Shipping Council's statement of disbursements and collections at various ports of call; Report on the condition of the West Indies Shipping Corporation's ships. I have reports, but I cannot come to the House when I have not gone to the meeting to discuss the details as the hon. member for St. Joseph would expect. Then we go on: Report on the possibility of introducing a Guyana-Associated States Shipping Service; Revision of West Indies Shipping Corporation's freight tariff; West Indies Corporation's Annual Report and Accounts for 1970; West Indies Shipping Corporation's revised estimates of revenue and expenditure for 1971; Estimates of revenue for 1972. Agreement establishing Regional Shipping Council; Establishment of a Regional trans-ocean shipping line; Regulation of shipping in the region; a draft Merchant Shipping Bill; the Consultative Committee and the West Indies Association. All these are matters on the agenda to be discussed in January. I cannot come to this Honourable Chamber now and tell you what my decision is. I will have to discuss it. I am not hiding anything from you, but you can rest assured that when we come with the Estimates just as there is a figure under this particular Item under External Affairs, I will be prepared to answer any questions, because I am as worried as you are.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Hon. Minister to go home sweating tonight because he could have opened his statement by saying that we are worried, but we have reports which we will be able to discuss later. Had it not been for the probing from this side we would never know there are reports over there and this is what we have been asking for. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for St. Michael West was in here he would say that I do not understand Government; but what I do not understand is that if you are expected to vote money for this Shipping Council, I could never find out why

certain things are so secretive and then you get them three years later, because if the reports are there, I would have thought that once you are elected to Parliament, it is part of your duty to know where the taxpayers' money is going. As the Minister said, he will tell us in March next year after the sum of \$1,974,240 has been passed. It will be March 1972 and probably the report will be published in March 1973, and then we will know what happened. I believed when you come into the House you take an oath, and there are certain matters which the Government can mark as confidential from which members will know what is going on with the public's money. I do not believe anybody on this side wants to know what is Government's confidential business on the expenditure of \$1.9 million in relation to the two boats which every man on the wharf knows that from the time you see them coming up over the horizon every stevedore runs and hides. The Hon. Minister for Health knows this fully well, because he knows the most arduous job down there is to offload these two boats. I went down there one day to get cargo off one and it went back to Antigua to come back down again. Certainly we would like to know what is happening with our money, and if there are reports, let us know what is going on.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, it is not just the money that is spent. There is more in this than the contribution, because there are three main ports where the bulk of the cargo is loaded. The north bound cargo for most of the Islands would be cargo landed at Trinidad and Barbados as trans-shipment cargo. It must be remembered that the amount of cargo landed at Barbados provides work for the Harbour and for stevedores, and this is one of the things that we have got to pay attention to. I honestly feel that it is worth our while to make a contribution like this if you pay regard to the amount of revenue that is derived from these boats.

On the south bound trip most of the cargo would be loaded at Jamaica which would mainly be cement and manufactured stuff for Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica and St. Kitts, and it is cheaper for a lot of these ships coming from European ports to land cargo at Barbados and Trinidad and trans-ship from these ports to the other Islands, as well as with the south bound trip from Jamaica. The other ship which was chartered would have been employed more on the long run from Guyana to Jamaica. My argument is that too few of these trips would require a ship as large as those ships with the capacity carried from St. Kitts to Jamaica where the entire voyage is far more than two voyages from Trinidad to

St. Kitts, and this is where a lot of fuel consumption and so on is lost.
9.00 p.m.

Just as the Hon. Minister has mentioned, an investigation has got to be gone into thoroughly with the amount of cargo and the movements of these ships which is what we would call a five-lighted lamp, something that actually does not exist, to perform the services that these two ships presently perform.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think we on this side are very much indebted to the present Minister of Health for his explanation, and we are very conscious of his tremendous experience and knowledge in things connected with shipping, and I was thinking while he was speaking on this Resolution, that so far as the principle of supporting the Federal ships is concerned there is no distinction between the two sides of the House on this matter. I think hon. members know that we on this side of the House are very much devoted to the principle of West Indian unity and we would support anything which goes to promoting trade between these islands. We consider also that Barbados must be a trading nation because of its size, because of its heavy content of people per square mile, because of its high educational standard, we must export people, we must export goods and we must export capital, but having said all of that, I think a lot of this rancour and what appears to be disagreement could be got over if Ministers when they have attended these important conferences would make a statement to the House which may not be debated at times, but at least it keeps hon. members in the know.

This is an issue on which there is very little political fire, but if we are given a statement when Ministers return from these conferences so that we will have the basic information - and I am sure that the Minister when he goes to Guyana will take the concern of the whole of Barbados, not merely what the Government of Barbados thinks but what the Opposition thinks as well on the position which is now confronting the West Indies Shipping Council, and I am sure that his hands are strengthened when he gets up to speak by being able to tell his fellow Ministers that the Government and the Opposition are concerned about a service that is losing money, and although we recognise we must support it to some extent, we must have some sort of proper commercial principle. We are not really trying to get under the Minister's skin, we are really looking at the Resolution, discussing it among ourselves, recognising that the Addendum does not give us the necessary information, we see

statements being made by people that they have bought these ships, surely the House would be entitled to know something about it, and it is that type of information we are asking for. I believe, Mr. Chairman, your task would be made easier if there is a greater flow of information — I do not know what happened in the past Houses — but certainly with a depleted Opposition we must probably speak more often than a larger Opposition would speak, but we want to have the information. Some of it we will accept, some of it we may query, and I will ask the Hon. Minister when he goes to Guyana to come back even before the Estimates and let us have a statement laid on the table of this House.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971 -72 No. 20

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, Item 3 — District Hospitals under Head 103 needs to be supplemented by the amount of \$40,000, and is to provide additional accommodation and to improve the existing facilities at the District Hospitals. At the time of the takeover of these institutions in 1969 the condition of these buildings was so deteriorated that this Ministry drew up a list of priorities for providing essential facilities where none existed and upgrading the present four facilities. Because of the concentration of the programme on the upgrading of existing facilities such as kitchens, toilet blocks, dining areas, change rooms, etc., most of which never conformed to the requirements of the Health Service Regulations, the provision of essential non-existent facilities had to be overlooked.

Mr. Chairman, the amount required under Item 3 for District Hospitals is to implement Government's plans for these facilities, and I would like to state what our intention is in the Ministry. There are five District Hospitals at present in the Island, and our intention is to remove all the children from these District Hospitals and put them in Children's Homes. Some of the children that are ill provision will be made to look after them, but we would like to make one of these institutions definitely a hospital for the sick rather than having sick people and welfare cases together. What we would like to do in the Ministry is to concentrate on one hospital, so the St. Michael District Hospital will be the main District Hospital where everybody there will be sick people, and in the four other District Hospitals only welfare cases

will be there. The same thing goes for the children. (*Asides*) What I have said is that there are five District Hospitals, St. Michael, St. Philip, Christ Church, St. Lucy and St. Thomas. You have in each of these Hospitals a certain number of patients who are ill, some with chronic cases, the others are people who are very poor and are welfare cases, and what we intend to do is to make one hospital as a hospital for the sick people where they will get better medical aid than at present.

In the St. Michael District Hospital we have at present only visiting doctors, but if we make that strictly a hospital for the sick we will be able to concentrate on having greater benefits for the sick and the others will be for the welfare cases. In the case of children one of the children's homes will be strictly for ill children and the others for well children. I do not think it is the best thing to have the sick and the well mixing together, it does not mean that because people are poor they should be placed with the sick people, we feel they could still be in homes and enjoy their health rather than to be put among sick people, so I cannot see why the hon. member for St. Peter is saying that he thinks this is something wrong.

9.10 p.m.

I will give you a breakdown of the present situation. In St. Michael there are 485 adults and 54 children.

Mr. HINDS: To what date will your figures go? That is very important.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: These figures have been checked up to the 13th December. I was saying that in St. Michael there are 485 adults, 54 children, that is, 207 males and 278 females, and of these 319 are sick patients and 166 welfare patients. (*Asides*) There are 42 chronic cases. There are 54 children: 22 mentally retarded and 32 are normal children. This Institution is in a very bad condition and it needs upgrading. It is one of the Institutions that anyone with humane feelings entering it must come out feeling depressed. I feel that in these Institutions these people should have a ray of hope. A good environment is very essential to these people. We are trying to move out these 54 children as soon as possible, so that we may upgrade the rooms which they are occupying at the moment and gradually build up the various wards to a higher standard than at present exists.

Now, in St. Philip there is a total of....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. Will the Minister tell us the number of welfare cases over 65 years of age?

Hon G. G. FERGUSSON: I can get that information for the hon. member, but I do not have it here. I was saying that at the St. Philip District Hospital there are 99 adults and 29 children. Of the 99 adults there are 46 males and 53 females. There are 36 sick persons and 63 welfare cases. With regard to the children, 11 are well and 1 is retarded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I should like the hon. member to repeat the last figure.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: There are 63 welfare cases and 29 children in all; 1 child is retarded, and 28 children are normal. The position is that in all of the Institutions there are 821 adults: 467 are sick patients and 354 are welfare cases. There are 87 children in all: 60 children are normal and 27 are mentally retarded. There are two Children Homes: One is at Barrows, St. Lucy, and one is at Sterling, St. Philip. The amount is required for furnishing these two Homes for the Children.

I beg to move that Head 103 stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a small point here. I think, in the first instance, that Government should obviously be congratulated for making the move to concentrate the children who are at present housed in these Institutions with adults into an area where they will have an environment to enable them to develop in a way that children should develop instead of mixing with adults as is the present pattern at these Institutions.

My problem here relates to the fact that at Barrows, St. Lucy, the present building is used or was used as a residence of the P.M.O. for St. Lucy. It is obvious now that some effort would have to be made to provide other quarters for the doctor. I should like to draw to the attention of the Government that adequate provision should be made for the construction of a residence for the doctor, because it is obvious that, if there is no residence for the doctor in the parish, a great amount of difficulty would be experienced by the people there - particularly people who are unable to travel any long distance to get the attention of the doctor. I sincerely hope the Minister will bear this in mind, and take appropriate steps to ensure that a residence is provided for the P.M.O. for St. Lucy.

9.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when the Government must at

least stop trying to fool the public as regards the provision of District Hospitals. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Your father did) If I told you what he never did it would embarrass you and a lot of people. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when the Government must stop fooling people by merely changing the name of the old almshouses and calling them district hospitals, but in fact providing the same type of service, because when we in Opposition talk about district hospitals, we are talking in terms of providing hospitals in the true sense of the word. We would like to see built by Government a number of district hospitals providing for minor operations etc. for people to ease some of the burden or hardships created now upon the Casualty Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and also to relieve some of the burden on the Outpatients Department of that Institution.

When we talk in terms of hospitals like this, we would think that Government would provide at least a hospital of some forty beds, properly staffed and not merely having homes as such. I think that there is a necessity for these homes, but if you are going to talk in terms of hospitals, you should provide proper hospital services and just not change the old almshouses and call them by another name and try to fool people that you have district hospitals in this country, because you do not have five district hospitals. You may have old people's homes, but you do not have hospitals of forty beds to provide for surgery, minor operations and things like that. When you look at the population distribution in Barbados, there is obviously need for such an institution in the South placed somewhere along the Oistins area to serve St. Philip, Christ Church and St. George, there is obviously need for one in the northern area to serve St. Lucy, St. James, St. Peter, and I believe one for St. Joseph, St. Thomas and St. Andrew placed probably somewhere in Welchman Hall where there is easy access as distinct from one at Belleplaine or St. Joseph.

As I have mentioned, there is obviously need for an old people's home. I believe the Government has started already but from the statement made by the Minister about the 354 welfare patients, it would show that a high percentage of the 354 people who were given as welfare cases would be over the age of 60 or 65, and the Government would find it necessary to expand or build more rapidly a number of old people's homes where these people can be provided with proper services. I think this is a first class idea and not merely putting people as was done in the past in infirmaries and leaving

them there just to rust away. You should provide them with proper amenities and have welfare officers who would be prepared to work with these people and ensure that the last years of their lives are spent in happiness.

When I last year visited the United States I had the pleasure of visiting such a home in New Orleans and I think that the people living there were somewhat happy to know that they were at least in the evening of their years still wanted and people still cared about them.

On the question of district hospitals, one of the things I would like to put to Government as a suggestion is that some arrangement should be made with the St. Joseph Hospital so that they can provide a number of beds and in addition Casualty facilities for the people living in the northern areas. I say this because I have had the experience of doing quite a number of cases of people who receive injury somewhere in St. Peter and then you hear that they cannot go to the St. Joseph Hospital because once it involves a Court matter they do not want to see the patient, and you have to drive the patient from St. Lucy or St. Peter to Bridgetown though the person may be suffering from a serious injury. I therefore put out the suggestion to the Government to have some sort of discussion with the St. Joseph Hospital and see what facilities can be provided by way of a Casualty Department, in addition to the number of beds that are provided for the public at the moment.

Now there is one further thing which I would like to draw to the attention of the Government. It arises I daresay out of the children's homes. I think one of the things which the Government must consider is the future of the people who live in these children's homes, because I think the Government must turn its attention not only to the number of children who are orphans or have been abandoned while they are at the tender age, but when they reach the age of sixteen, seventeen or eighteen or whatever age they have to leave the children's homes. I know quite a number of children who have had trouble leaving these homes to find another home, and we believe the Government will want to consider the provision of some sort of hostel facilities for these people to enable them, having left the homes at a certain age, to have proper facilities until they are able to maintain themselves having got a job and being able to provide shelter for themselves. I therefore put it to Government by way of a suggestion and I would ask the Minister to look into it.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that before this Government took

over, these hospitals could be called institutions because they were not properly managed and people were not properly taken care of, and things were in a dilapidated condition, but since this Government has taken over you can afford to call them district hospitals because I have visited them and I have seen the amount of work that has been done. The Government is now asking for more money because it wants to alleviate the problem at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by having some of the patients moved from there and put at the St. Michael's District Hospital.

9.30 p.m.

Before they do this they will have to sort out the patients, and this is what they are doing now, they are taking out the children and putting them into proper homes and then they are taking the well people and putting them into the other four District Hospitals which they will call Welfare Homes. The St. Michael District Hospital will then be upgraded to hospital standards, it will have all the necessary facilities and the Government intends to make sure that this Hospital will serve people with long-term illnesses and it will be staffed with Doctors just like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

As regards the question asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy about the Barrows Home and the need for a home for the Doctor, I would like to say that we in the Ministry advertised for doctors for St. Lucy and no doctor has seen fit to accept the position. There is a liaison between St. Lucy and St. Peter where they are sharing one doctor, the doctor who is for St. Peter. I think this Government should be recommended highly on the stand it has taken as regards District Hospitals, because the kitchens are of a very high standard, the cots are all being removed and they have decent hospital beds, and I would like to ask the hon. members opposite to visit these hospitals at some time and they will see what is being done. We are very concerned about these people and we will do everything possible to see that they are comfortable.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this is the third speech I have heard the hon. lady member opposite attempt to make. She has given us some food for thought, because I am now aware of the fact that we are going to have five Queen Elizabeth Hospitals.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, I never said we will have five Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, I said that the St. Michael District Hospital will be upgraded on a similar line as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and that the other four District Hospitals will be termed Welfare Homes.

Mr. CRAIG: I take it that we are going to have Surgeon Specialists, Physician Specialists and this type of staff at the St. Michael District Hospital. I went in there a few weeks ago and I wonder if the hon. member who just sat down realises that they are still cooking the food in big, rusty cans and treating the people like animals still. What nonsense am I hearing now, that this Government has done this and that and give the Government a chance? Give the Government a chance to do what, send a man to the moon?

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, the hon. member said they are cooking in rusty cans, I would invite the hon. member to pay a visit and he will see that he is wrong. He is talking about what was happening about 12 years ago, but we have up-to-date stainless steel utensils, we have only the best.

Mr. CRAIG: I realise there are two Ministers of Health on that side. I have visited the St. Michael's Infirmary, about eight months ago, and all they have in there they inherited from the Local Government. If you have one or two utensils in there which the Government of the day brought in a few weeks ago that is not my fault, I am telling you that the conditions there are almost the same as they were 12 years ago, you only have to pass there and look at the walls outside and see it is an almshouse, the people are getting poor cold soup warmed up. The people are housed in conditions that no one as a Barbadian can be proud of.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member is saying that the people are living under these conditions, but this is what we took up from them; they should be ashamed to talk about it because now we are trying to make matters good and spending money on people and thinking about them, why did they not think about them before? We should be complimented.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I realise the hon. member seems to be a saga dancer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We do not have any saga dancers in here.

Mr. CRAIG: I will withdraw the remark, but there is nothing unparliamentary about being a saga dancer. I am not saying the member is a saga dancer, I am saying that the actions lead me to believe that she is a saga dancer. Mr. Chairman, what is a saga dancer?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You would know.

Mr. CRAIG: The way the hon. member expressed herself I thought of her as James Brown. She said that they inherited this, and this

Government, that I should go out and shout about on the housetops, has been in power for 10 years and they boasted about having something like \$100 million coming in. We went out leaving \$30 million in these Infirmaries; They call them now District Hospitals but it is only when I am satisfied that they are really old people's homes that I can accept and respect them as old people's homes and then I will stop calling them almshouses. When you come here and ask for money for the purpose of removing the children from these places to put them in homes I will support that, but I will draw to the Government's attention that I am getting concerned about this youth which is being overstated. Nobody is prepared to pay attention to the senior citizens of this country, they still exist on a mere \$5.00 a week. The hon. member is now saying that the Government should be complimented and I am saying that the people who are living there are living in almost the same conditions as they were 12 years ago.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, we took over from them and we abolished Local Government which was run mainly by the father of the hon. member for the City in 1968. The hon. member knows the responsibility for Local Government was taken over in 1968, so what is he talking about 12 years ago?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I know Government cannot make a man but Government can do anything else.
9.40 p.m

In spite of what you inherited three years ago, you abolished Local Government some time in early 1966 in February or March. You abolished Local Government, because the Prime Minister said that if you cannot....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want to correct the hon. member. If he does not remember, let me tell him that we got Independence on the 30th November, 1966, so how could we take away Local Government at that time?

Mr. CRAIG: Somewhere in early 1967 the Prime Minister said that if you could not move the hon. member for the City out of the City, then you would have to remove the City from the hon. member, and he abolished Local Government and denied the people of their rights. If you had any interest in the same old people, then you would not be giving them a \$1 at Independence time and \$5 to go and have a meal when a tin of milk costs 31¢ and a tin of Corned Beef costs \$1.39.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, there is absolutely nothing in this Resolution about Corned Beef. Please keep to the Resolution you were going fairly good.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to the Resolution states:

"With the completion of the Children's Home at Sterling", St. Philip and "Barrows," St. Lucy, it will be possible to remove all the children from the St. Michael District Hospital...."

To the best of my knowledge, Sir, in the District Hospital you have old people. This is a money Resolution, therefore, with great respect to Your Honour's Ruling, I have the right on a money Resolution to make reference to anything where old people are concerned. This is a money Resolution, and I have enough scope to speak on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not in my opinion.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not going to quarrel with you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The price of Corned Beef is not in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Even if you decide to buy Corned Beef to give the patients in the District Hospital, cannot I talk about Corned Beef for the Hospital? The hon. member for St. Michael West will argue with you, but not me. My contention is that I agree to remove the children from these Homes. It is a good idea to put them in areas where they can have a feeling that they are still wanted and are not neglected, but what I am worried about is that I have not seen anything coming to this Assembly to take care of the senior citizens of the country.

Mrs. EASTMOND: May I ask the hon. member to give way on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CRAIG: Are you on a point of order?

Mrs. EASTMOND: No.

Mr. CRAIG: Then I am not giving way.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order then.

Mr. CRAIG: I will take my seat now.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell the hon. member that the Government is making provision for senior citizens. There will

be a Home for senior citizens at the Pine very shortly, maybe next month, in the form of a Development Plan in all of the new Housing areas new Senior Citizens Homes will be built. The hon. member referred to the old people in the District Hospital. The people who are well and old and are in the St. Michael's District Hospital will be removed to the other four District Hospitals which will be termed Welfare Homes. Can you understand that?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, the hon. member is asking you if you can understand that, because she is addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not in the least.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I was addressing the Chair at first, but I am addressing you now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, as time goes on the Lady member will understand what it is to get something from this side. It is now peace and love. It is near Christmas and we want her to have a happy holiday. I am going to support this Resolution, but I am looking forward to seeing a great deal more done for the senior citizens of the country. The Government should do more than it is doing for these people.

I look in the newspapers and I see a lot written about the youth. I want to hear something about what is being done for the old people who are responsible for us — old people who gave so much with so little. Let them have something, too, in the evening of their days. Let them realise that something is being done for them. It is all right to talk about having four District Welfare Homes. I know about these fancy names. Once I went to the United States; they told me that a man was the Superintendent of the Building, but I did not know that he was a scavenger. Are you going to put these old people at the Pine for people to throw rocks at them. In any housing area you may put these old people, you can rest assured that there will be trouble. You now have some youngsters walking about raping old people, too. do not come here with any nonsense talking about providing Homes for old people. If you intend to do something for the old people, then you should put them in a proper area. Let us give them something good. Do not come here and tell me about putting them at the Pine housing area or at Farm Road.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like the hon. member to put his suggestions in writing and send them to the Ministry of Health and tell us where we should place these Old People's Homes. If the places

where we are putting them are not suitable to him, then it seems as though he wants us to put them in St. Vincent and not in Barbados!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, there is a place called "Gertz Supermarket", and I should like that to be used as an Old People's Home.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member wants me to make my supermarket an Old People's Home, then I would gladly do it so long as he pays for the site and gives compensation to the Company.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to know that at the next election I will be able to tell the people that Gertz has offered her supermarket to be turned into an Old People's Home for them. I should like to see something done for these people, and I sincerely hope that in the New Year the people will be placed in an area where they can feel relaxed. The housing areas are crowded; the areas are built-up, and we know what can happen in them. I would prefer to see them living where there is a nice ground for them to walk and live in a healthy atmosphere. If you put them in a housing area, you will be looking for trouble. I sincerely hope that in the New Year we will see more improvements in the Welfare Homes for the senior citizens of this country.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I want to draw to the attention of the Committee that these District Hospitals have been upgraded to a great extent over the last few years and the sanitary conditions have improved considerably. I refer to the cooking of meals, the tiling of the kitchen, etc. The hon. member who has spoken just now, probably, has not visited the District Hospital recently, otherwise he would have noticed that not only the standard of the cooking of the meals, but the standard of Nursing care has improved considerably.

9.50 p.m.

We are not saying it is ideal yet, but has certainly improved a long way, and to say that we are ignoring the senior citizens and nothing is being done for them is not correct. Conditions have been improved a great deal.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. member for St. James, he said that he had visited one of these institutions in St. Michael a few months ago.

Since we have taken over, I will give you some of the alterations that have been made. I have visited them since I took over as Minister, and I can say definitely that the average condition I have found in most of them with the exception of the St. Michael one is fairly reasonable, including the food. The one that has worried me most is the St. Michael's District Hospital which is still in pretty bad condition as compared with the other four.

In St. Michael we have had complete renovation and improvement to one of the units with tiled floors. Work on the second unit is in progress. There are additional lavatory facilities, improvement to kitchen and installation of modern facilities.

At Christ Church — construction of a new kitchen, store-room, washing area and subordinate staff change room; additional toilet block, general improvement to wards and tiling of floors; former childrens' ward converted into adult ward; new dispensary and improved accommodation for nurses.

At St. Philip, new wing with 54 beds, extensive renovation to kitchen, store-room and clinic room; floors to be tiled shortly and arrangements are being made to provide separate quarters for the matron thereby freeing her present quarters for other use.

At St. Thomas, extensive renovations to ward including tiling kitchen store-room; new toilet block and change room for domestic staff; new quarters for matron and nurses; new washing area. Plans have been finalised for the construction of a new clinic adjacent to this hospital. Arrangements are also in progress for acquiring land east of the hospital for further expansion.

St. Lucy, general improvement of wards; old isolation ward renovated and put into use; new kitchen and toilet block, new nurses quarters, extensive renovation to old kitchen in progress to become store-room.

In all these institutions a complete range of modern kitchen and cold storage equipment has been installed; obsolete medical equipment, beds and other fixtures have been replaced. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in four of them I would say that the standard has very much improved and this is one of the reasons that we are coming for this money, because I intend to work. The St. Michael District Hospital is the one that is very depressing. We want to get the children out, there is nowhere to put them at present, and ward by

ward uplift the standard of this one, because it is still in very bad condition. There is not a ray of hope for anybody entering there under its present condition and it should be uplifted.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr, Chairman, I am rather glad to hear the Minister contradict the Parliamentary Secretary because I spoke about the St. Michael's infirmary which I visited eight months ago, but the real Minister of Health is the one who agrees with what I said, because that district hospital is still an almshouse. The Junior Minister had a different approach, and that is why I say there are two Ministers. I wonder if the senior Minister would be able to confirm what the junior Minister said, that it is going to be like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that you will have a surgeon specialist and a physician specialist.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, I never said that they would have a surgeon specialist. I said it would be updated to the standard of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; but when the hon. member is talking about the Minister contradicting me, I told him that the St. Michael District Hospital in his time and before my Government took over was called an almshouse and it could be an institution, but today it can be termed a district hospital because we have done quite a lot. I did not say that we can pull down all the buildings, but they have tiled the kitchen, they have proper kitchen utensils, one ward has been completely renovated and they are setting out to make more renovations. This is the reason why they are asking for money to move the children out because they do not belong there. This is what makes us feel very depressed; but the kitchens have been tiled, the cooking is to the best standard, they have fly screens, and this is why I say the hon. member should visit there now. The hon. member knew it ten or twelve years ago, but he should see what it looks like now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am still dealing with the Minister because the junior Minister says it is going to be efficiently run like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Well, Lord, I hope not! Not like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital! I would like to find out from the Minister if he is going to have a surgeon specialist and a physician specialist, operating theatre and all these things as at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have given sufficient latitude and longitude on this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Give me a little widetude now, sir. On a point of order just now the hon. member spoke for ten minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling now.

Mr. CRAIG: Do you mean I cannot speak? I will get up again, Mr. Chairman. You are not asking me to sit down, are you? You are giving me a little widetude then?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am only asking you to get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I still expect the Minister to give me an answer if he so desires on the questions which I asked just now.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned to the hon. member before, the St. Michael District Hospital will be a hospital in the sense that it will cater for geriatric, chronic and long-term illnesses, and instead of just three surgeons visiting occasionally, part of the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be interchanging with the district hospital. This will even give us a better position at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital because there are a lot of cases over there now that normally could be removed if there was sufficient room at the St. Michael District Hospital to make beds available for patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There are long term illnesses that should not be at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which still have to be there, but they should be moved to a hospital such as this.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want a little bit of altitude at this point because there is no joke about this. The Hon. Junior Minister — I cannot remember the division of the country because they are a bit technical for me — spoke quite long about these hospitals, and I am going to be very generous to the Government because I am going to accept the terms used by the Minister and say that the Government took over in 1968, but a pig by any name is still a pig, and when you change the name from almshouse in 1968 to District Hospital in 1969 and to Welfare Homes in 1971, it is still an almshouse.
10.00 p.m.

I do not mind the junior Minister talking about updating and fitting out kitchens and tiling floors, because that does not contribute one iota in my estimation. What every doctor is saying, including those at the hospital, is that when you call them District Hospitals you should make them the same status as what the medical profession terms District Hospitals. You change the name and call them Welfare Homes, you have one District Hospital in Beckles Road, but it recreates the very problem which this Party came in in the last session and said they were getting away from, that is, the overloading of the casualty at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because

you are now still bringing back into Bridgetown all the cases which need medical attention from the other 10 parishes back to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is now commonly known that if anybody is involved in a fight in the country districts and you go to the District Medical Officer or any doctor he will look through his window first and ask if it is a court case and he will send you to the hospital, so all this fancy talk about creating District Hospitals means nothing whatsoever. We are in urgent need of District Hospitals in the true sense of the word, you want something that will relieve the Casualty at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It shows that the Government does not have any concrete plans of dealing with the sick and the old in this country. They talk about removing patients from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and sending them to Beckles Road, but go back in what they now term District Hospitals, can you go in either one of them and get a certain amount of surgery done? Can you get minor surgery done in anyone of them? you still have to come down here.

Mr. Chairman, this is what you call planning, but all this political talk about taking over and putting old people's homes in the Pine does not look into the life of the population at night. This is why I have often said it is all good and well for the junior Minister to talk but you have to look at the people who live in St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Lucy, St. John and even St. Philip who if they have an accident on the road at night cannot find a taxi to bring them to town. The last man who lived at Sterling would not look at you if you were involved in anything that may reach the Court. District Hospitals are meant to relieve the pressure at the General Hospital, but changing a name from Almshouse to District Hospital or Welfare Home has not done anything yet.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, may I tell the hon. member that an out patients' clinic adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will shortly be constructed to relieve the pressure at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with respect to emergencies.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this is why I say that when you jump up with little bits of paper with answers pushed in your hands and you read something that really does not answer what is being said, that is nonsense. (*Asides*) I have always admired the hon. member who made that loud aside, at some times he goes off the record in defence of something which is indefensible. You have to get into the Casualty before you get up there so they have not yet answered the question. Mr. Chairman, you and I represent country districts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I represent Barbados.

Mr. BOLDEN: Thank you Mr. Chairman, but you had to be elected in St. George and I think it is in your interest as well as in mine that minor surgery and other small matters could be attended to at these District Hospitals, because the Casualty department at the Hospital is always overcrowded.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not seem to understand what is going on because he is saying that the Casualty department is overcrowded. We are aware of this but this out-patient clinic that is being built is to relieve the Casualty department and help with these minor operations to which he is referring.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order, no point of elucidation, and we are now going to get back to this Resolution. I mean what I am saying and I will put the question if this continues.

Mr. HINDS: I have not yet spoken.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am to decide whether I feel enough has been said on the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Without my speaking, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not prepared to deny anyone his right.

10.10 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I represent a constituency, and I want to speak on my constituency's needs in this respect. I should like to make it clear that, although like you I feel sometimes that I represent Barbados, I am very conscious that I am here because of a constituency. With the abolition of Local Government it is necessary for us to do a bit of constituency straight-talking. In the Pleasant Hall area there is no room for expansion for putting what your Minister referred to as an Old People's Home; therefore, it becomes necessary in the Christ Church West area, which abounds St. Michael South East, St. Michael South and St. Michael South Central, for the Government to bear in mind that we have one of the biggest incidence of population per square yard or per square foot. I am asking the Government seriously to consider the establishment of a suitable Old People's Home within this area to serve these three constituencies, particularly the area in Britons Hill. I see the Hon. Ministers agree with me as if we are together. I trust that this will be borne in mind in the coming Estimates, because I intend to speak at length on this matter then.

Sir, I think, representing a Christ Church constituency, which borders a suburban area, that I should also talk about the necessity for upgrading the District Hospital, not to a Welfare Home, but in some respects particularly in Christ Church, to serve the southern so far as minor surgery is concerned. I think the Parliamentary Secretary is right when she says that the building of an Out-patients' Division at Delamere Land will create some relief for the Casualty Department. I do not think it will create all of the relief which the Government imagines. I also do not think it will provide an answer for all of the problems which are occurring in the Island as a whole.

I think that hon. members are right when they draw to the Government's attention areas like St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. Philip, parts of Christ Church and St. George where there is difficulty at night and even during the day, having regard to the pressure in St. Michael, to get surgery at a minor level. There is no reason why, given the existing plant and building in Christ Church and with the removal of the old people and the children to central areas, the Government could not provide enough funds for establishing basic equipment to carry on minor surgery. I should like to suggest to the Government that it would be a good thing to ask some of the doctors to give some of their time in this direction.

It will be remembered that last week we had a discussion in here about socialising medicine. I believe that the doctors could make a contribution and some of the work could be done voluntarily. In the same way as you have a Legal Aid Scheme there could be a Medical Aid Scheme, and the doctors should make a contribution by giving some of their time in doing minor surgery at some of these Hospitals. I have spoken on these matters in this manner, because I feel that when it comes to the health of our citizens, regardless of whether they are old or aged, none of us can feel quite happy regardless of whether it is the old Vestry system that brought about this, whether the father of the hon. member for the City was in charge of it, or whether Government took it over 10 years ago, none of us Barbadians can feel happy where people are confined to Homes in difficult circumstances and we are not carrying their burden.

I do not believe that this is one of the things that we should play politics on. I think that the health of our people is too important for us, at this stage, to try to score political plaudits out of this. I am asking for this on two levels: I

want the Minister to bear in mind the necessity for the needs of my constituency in particular and, secondly, for the Minister to bear in mind that I think a strong case can be made out for maintaining and upgrading the Christ Church District Hospital. You should not merely upgrade St. Michael and tell me that the people in Beckles Road, Dayrells Road, St. Matthias, Bonnetts, Bay land, Dalkeith and Collymore Rock will benefit from it. I should like to see the people of the other part of Christ Church such as Sargeants Village and Worthing View are being taken care of. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central would agree with me on this, if he were here. We would like to see an equal status given to the District Hospital in Christ Church. I am asking the Government not to be too speedy in its plans for making it into a mere Welfare Home.

There is another point I should like the Government to bear in mind, but I am not going to prolong the debate. Government has been acquiring quite a lot of land, and some of it is in very good areas. Take, for instance, Graeme Hall where there is a lot of rab land where one could construct a proper Old People's Home and a proper Welfare Home in nice surroundings, make proper gardens, and make people feel in their old age, at least, that they are part of an affluent society.

I hate to think that we are relegating some of our citizens to third-class housing areas and keeping them as housing areas, when we can only integrate the society by moving people like these into middle-class areas, so that we can break down the social barriers. A part of the Government's policy in health should be directed into this type of exercise as often as possible.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the hon. member is now repeating what he said before, and I move that the question be now put.

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

The question that Head 44 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now agreed to.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. CRAIG: Make it 11 a.m., Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is accepted.

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

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

On resumption :

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House resumes Committee of Supply.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72, No. 21

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution deals with the Ministry of External Affairs. The notes are fairly explanatory and if there are any additional questions I should be very pleased to answer them. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is well aware that our first query would be in connection with the sum of \$7,045 asked to pay overtime and with special reference to the note to Item 16. I think I remember the debates which took place in this Chamber from time to time, and especially when we were given to understand that the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom had been occupying two residences, or a residence which is some considerable distance from the office. I think then that an excuse which was proffered was to the effect that it was because of this officer's children and his preference for a school to accommodate his children. I wonder if this overtime that the chauffeurs are called upon to put in is in that connection particularly. I would certainly like to hear what light the Minister can throw on this.

We have it, reading from the Addendum, that formerly this overtime was paid on a monthly basis but this is something inevitable. This raises another point, Sir, surely before the decision was taken to base the overtime on a monthly basis or on a fixed basis, or have it as a monthly allowance as the note says, all the then existing circumstances had been taken into account. If then, as it would appear has happened since, that other circumstances have come into existence so as to create the necessity for a change such as we see here, I would like to hear something from the Minister as to what has taken place to bring about this change of system,

and is he now certain that the chauffeurs are satisfied, and exactly how it works out now as compared with what they received formerly on the monthly allowance basis. What we want to address our minds to is this, when did this change-over from the monthly allowance to the hourly rate take place, and consequent upon that, has the Minister had time during which he could have seen what the chauffeurs earned during their monthly allowance period, or for a period of three months or six months, as the case may be, as against the hourly basis on which they now work. I do not think that the late presentation of bills as the note explains as sub-paragraph (c) could cause any particular query apart from the fact that the Minister should be in a position to give us some idea as to the contents, what items those bills referred to, because all of that would then determine if it is necessary to debate this particular Item. We would certainly like to hear what the Minister can tell us on that score.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have not risen to give any specific replies to questions posed by the hon. member, I leave it to the Minister who has introduced the Resolution to do this, he will have access to the information in the files if in fact such information is forthcoming. Of course, we know that a Resolution on External Affairs has traditionally been the whipping horse of the Opposition and they will never really come to terms with the fact that we have a Ministry of External Affairs arising out of our independence, because our independence is something which has been opposed by the Opposition Party, and because of this we know that any time any Resolution comes here dealing with External Affairs we are going to find this kind of attitude.

11.10 a.m.

Now the question, Mr. Chairman, of overtime is a very simple matter. From time to time and this is not the first time, of course, we have heard allegations about the High Commissioner living at more than one place in the United Kingdom. It has been said here before that the High Commissioner maintained a residence a long way from "Chancery." Of Course, there is a difference of opinion on this. I have heard the Prime Minister say that he himself made the trip by car in 10 minutes. In a place like London or any big City a 20-minute drive from one's residence to one's place of work is a short distance. I know that when I was a student in London - students in London never have money - it took me over one hour to get from where I lived to where I had to go and study. The question of overtime because the High Commissioner is living 20 minutes away from his work never arises.

I believe it has been pointed out in this Chamber from time to time that two residences have never been rented for the High Commissioner in London. In fact, one residence was acquired for the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom, and there was a flat attached to the office which the High Commissioner used when he was High Commissioner for Barbados. He used that flat on weekends, and his house was a bit further away from "Chancery." There was never a question of renting a flat for the High Commissioner because it was part of "Chancery" so overtime could never be related to this.

Now, the Washington diplomatic mail is collected in New York and then sent on to Washington. The diplomatic mail arrives in the United Kingdom at all hours, and when it arrives a chauffeur has to be there to collect it at the Airport. You also find that the High Commissioner and other office staff have to make appearances at various parts of the country at any time, and usually it is not within office hours. For instance, there are a number of Barbadian Welfare Groups, West Indian Groups and other Groups in the United Kingdom meeting at various points in London, in the suburbs of London, and in other provinces, High Commissioners or other officers are expected to go and address these groups from time to time in the evening after office hours. That is the kind of overtime that is envisaged in this Resolution. It is not a question of overtime for taking the High Commissioner's children to school when, in fact, he was in London and his children were going to school in London. This is part of the normal function of having an Embassy or a High Commissioner abroad, where chauffeurs have to work overtime.

At one time I got the impression that the hon. member was himself under the impression that it was a change-over from an hourly basis to a monthly basis, but it is the other way round. We have found that this is a more equitable way. It is not a question of averaging the amount of overtime that one does during a month and paying a fixed rate. The chauffeur is now paid for the actual amount of overtime work that he has done. In other words, if he has done one hour overtime, he will be paid for that hour. If he has done three hours overtime, he will be paid overtime for three hours. This is a more equitable way of paying for overtime. Formerly a chauffeur might have done six hours overtime beyond that which was fixed for the month, and he would not have been paid for that. He will now be paid for every hour that he does overtime.

With regard to the other question as to the various figures, I cannot answer that, because I do not have the files, and I will leave that for the Minister himself to give the Committee that information.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this question of overtime, this sum of money is required to meet additional expenditure which is expected to be incurred by the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom, the Permanent Mission to the United Nations and the Consulate-General at New York. It is suggested that there should be a change in the payment of overtime from a fixed monthly allowance to an hourly rate. The former method was found to be inequitable, having regard to the amount of overtime chauffeurs were called upon to work. There was an increased amount of overtime required of non-established staff and, in particular, the chauffeurs, and a supplementary vote of \$1,100 for the High Commission in the United Kingdom was not expended in the 1970/71 financial year and bills incurred in that year were presented and paid early in the current financial year.

The position is that the method of payment for overtime has been changed. The hon. member wants to know what balance we have for the last three months, but I am not in a position to tell him that. I can only tell him that the vote has been depleted. The estimated expenditure under this Item in the Draft Estimates, 1971-72 was \$4,000, but provision was only made for \$1,820. The conditions of service now offered to the Drivers/Messengers provide for payment of overtime in lieu of the extra duty allowance. This proviso has drawn heavily on our Overtime Vote, which carries a balance of \$3.56, as at the date on which this was written.

This amount asked for is to supplement this vote which was not provided for in the first instance. A very small provision was made in the vote for this. A very small amount has been left in the vote, and it is for this reason that we are asking for a supplementary to pay overtime on a changed basis based on the number of hours worked, that is, payment for hourly work instead of an allowance.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, all that has been said so far is that the chauffeurs have been paid a monthly allowance for the overtime they did in the past. The chauffeurs felt, after a time, that they were called upon to do too many hours overtime, and that the monthly allowance was not sufficient remuneration for the hours they had worked. They want more money, and a decision has been taken

to put them on an hourly basis. I am asking the Minister to tell me from what time this hourly basis came into force.

11.20 a.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: From my file the changeover became effective as from 15th October.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Item 52 – Rental of Machines. There is an amount of \$360 asked for the rental of a Copycat 200 Photo-copier for the Mission in London. The present copying machine has proven uneconomical and it is unable to give the service required and is constantly out of order. Does the Mission own the machine that is presently in use, and if so, what plans have we got for its further use or disposal? Has any attempt been made to find out what is the cost of a new one or whether one can at all be acquired? We have on our own premises in Parliament matters affecting us quite similarly, that is, the rental of machinery for the work of Parliament, and whilst the amount of \$360 might appear infinitesimal, what we would like Government to consider, because there is no idea of closing these Missions(Mr. WALCOTT: Make a motion that they be closed.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: As long as Standing Order No. 29(6) is complied with by hon. members, I will carry on. Mr. Chairman, it would be of some interest if Government tried to find out the cost of a new Copycat if this is the type of machine for copying that is now required, and get away from entertaining these rentals that we are going in for, because in the long run you will find that you have paid away more in renting than the actual cost of the machine. If we go into it we might find that we can effect a saving.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Copycat machine, what I would like to know is whether the Ministry, in considering this question of the rental of machines has considered the experience of the House of Assembly in this connection because the Government appears to be speaking with two voices. On the other hand they are saying that to rent a machine for the House of Assembly is too expensive and they have to pay so much per sheet and they are going to buy one, but in London, having bought one they are now saying it is too expensive and they would have to rent one instead. I wonder if there is any Minister opposite who can give some indication why you have two different policies on the question of copying. What is Government's policy generally, to pay the rental

to people who rent out first-class copying machines, or to buy the machine. Is the Government suggesting that the House of Assembly necessarily has more copying work than the High Commission in London? (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask hon. members to observe Standing Order No. 29(6).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on Item 59 — Public Relations, I do not see how we can be asked to vote money for this Newsletter if none of us has ever seen the Newsletter except perhaps one or two Ministers concerned. There might be material in that Newsletter which may be offensive to hon. members. It might not reflect what should be put out by the High Commissioner of Barbados in London. If no copy of the Newsletter arrives at the House of Assembly, and being published in London it is a document to which we might not have easy access, it is not fair to hon. members to ask us to vote this money upon the grounds that continuing efforts have been bearing fruit. I am not going to hide from hon. members that I think it highly possible that Newsletters put out by these Missions in Britain, the U.S.A. and Canada may very well contain material perhaps more appropriate to the Democratic Labour Party's newspaper than to a Government publication, because there is still a difference despite the appeals by the hon. member for St. Michael West for a one party State.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on this Resolution but the hon. member has said that the hon. member for St. Michael West is advocating a one party State.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member spoke earlier in this session and said that while everybody should have the right to say something, maybe before the end of the session we will see a one party State, and issued a specific invitation more than once to hon. members on this side.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I said so because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to be in so much agreement with the Government that I did not see the necessity for the Opposition. 11.30 a.m.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member must not confuse agreement with income tax as agreement with the Government. I would just say this, in my view it is more likely that the hon. member for St. Michael West will occupy a seat on this side of the House; certainly I do not think the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Michael North East could be in

the same company for very long, but that is not part of this.

Sir, the Newsletters mentioned in Item 59 are not very well explained in the notes. \$3,000 is a lot of money to vote for presumably cyclostyled letters, and we have no idea of circulation figures.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, very often I have observed that the hon. member has the ability for saying nothing in a lot of words. The Government has no objection to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seeing the Newsletter, and I am sure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has seen the Newsletters of Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, if I said I have not seen the Newsletters and the hon. member gets up and says he is sure I have seen them, that means I am lying. I have not seen the Newsletters, I want to see one.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is peculiar that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition always boasts he has been in here for five years, this Item has been in the Estimates for five years and he has never shown interest to find out what it is for. It is only now in this supplementary he will say he has not seen it. One would expect that the criticisms levelled against this Government by other members of his Party would at least arouse his interest to the point that he would have asked about this Item before. What is so magical about all this when it was in the Estimates for the last five years? He has never asked for it before, we have no objection to giving him any information about it. The purpose of the Newsletters is to keep Barbadian nationals in touch with the Missions, to make them aware of what is happening in Barbados, to make them aware of the visits of the High Commissioner to Toronto, Montreal, etc. and to let them know what jobs are going in Barbados for which they are eminently qualified and for which they can so apply. The Newsletter is in keeping with this Government's policy of presenting the best image of Barbados abroad; what would you mention the Opposition for? Do you think somebody in Canada is interested in the Opposition of Barbados? It is not Government propaganda generally, it is to let the people know exactly what is happening in their native land and to keep the interest of Barbadians alive so that those who have acquired skills abroad and who might be interested in returning and contributing to the build-up of their native land would know what is going on. I can get any number of copies from the Ministry of External Affairs, any Clerk in the

Ministry can get a copy, but do not get up and give the impression that this is some propaganda sheet, an off-shoot of the *Democrat*, when this Item has been debated in this Hon. Chamber for five years, I will send copies to him today if he wants them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was referring to something I said and I would like to reply to him on this matter. It is not a new Item so it is not a principle that is now being initiated, he as Leader of the Opposition thought his Party would have agreed to this Item because the principle has already been accepted. I think that if hon. members request that copies should be made available to members of Parliament this could be done and the Government would not object to that, I think Parliament would at least have a right to see these newsletters. I for one would say that if a document published by the Government is offensive or contains things which are considered not in the best interest of the country it should be brought to the attention of the House as a document so that members could see it, and I think the hon. member would be quite in order if he requests that copies be made available to the House. Twenty-four copies would not make any difference in the cost.

Mr. ADAMS: What the hon. member for St. Michael West has asked is at least what we would like. For such a relatively small Item the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has taken time out to attack both the *bona fides* and the experience of the Leader of the Opposition. In fact the Item in the Estimates reads: "To meet the cost of advertising, newsletters and authorised association membership fees". There is nothing in the Item in the Estimates to suggest that it is to meet the cost of printing or circulating a newsletter, if you put the cost for newsletters and membership fees it can as well be construed that it is the cost of subscribing to Commander King Hall's Newsletter on Diplomatic Affairs and so on as anything else. There is nothing in the Estimates, notwithstanding the apparent plausibility of the arguments of the member for St. Michael South Central, that will tell you that these newsletters are newsletters which are circulated. I have checked all the Estimates to see if when the Item originally appeared this explanation was given. I myself have never dealt with External Affairs on behalf of the Opposition, therefore I may not have given the same attention to these matters as others may have. It may very well be, but I do not know that it appears for example in the Estimates for the year 1968-69, and if the member for St. Michael South Central can say on his feet that it

has appeared in the Estimates for the last five years, I want him to say which Item it was. If that Item appeared for the last five years as the Minister has said I would like him to tell me where it is.

Arguments are made in here and people who do not know the parties concerned, although they should know them by now, may believe that the arguments have weight. I can see this Item in the instant Estimates, 1971-72, but I would like to know which part of the Estimates other than that contain a vote for sending out overseas newsletters, and where in the Estimates can be found the words which would draw to the attention of hon. members that such newsletters are printed at Government's expense and circulated to Barbadians abroad.

11.40 a.m.

It may be there. I have never given these Estimates any close analysis, but it is a monstrous and unfair argument to say that this has been in the Estimates for the last 5 years and we on this side should know about it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Probably this may assist the Committee. With regard to Item 59 — Public Relations — a renewed effort to reach the Barbadian community in the United Kingdom through the media of the Newsletter is expected to result in the distribution of up to 1,200 Newsletters per month for the remainder of the financial year. The monthly cost of the preparation of a 30-page Newsletter is given, and when added to the cost of advertisements of vacancies will produce the need for the supplementary for which we are now asking. I will give you the breakdown, Sir:

1200 fronts at \$34.80 per thousand,
36 reams of duplicating paper at \$4.80 per ream - \$146.88
30 stencils at \$7.50,
1200 stamps at 12c each - \$144, and
1000 envelopes at \$57.60 per thousand,
making a total of \$397. 74. That is all the information I can find. I have no copy of the Newsletter on the file, but if the hon. member would like to see a copy, probably, I could get a copy before the sitting ends.

Mr. ADAMS: I would not like, behind the hon. member's back, to say that he has misled the House, but from what we have been able to make of this Head it indicates that is precisely what he has done. For the sake of making a valueless Party point or a valueless debating point, the hon. member has just got up out of the blue and said that this has been there for 5

years and why are we now objecting. That is not true. I should be glad if the Leader of the House could tell us when these Newsletters were first published. There used to be a separate vote for Publications and Public Relations, which said nothing whatsoever about Newsletters. It is clear from the notes which state "Provision for books and publications..." Those votes were previously for buying books... (*Asides*) It is only a \$3,000-vote, Sir, but it shows how things can happen. The original note that was forced upon hon. members' attention was that a 30-page Newsletter was being sent out to people. Nothing would suggest that, despite what was said by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, earlier Estimates do not reveal any such item. I should be glad if the Hon. Leader of the House, in the circumstances, would permit this Head to be postponed until a Newsletter can be obtained.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition can request that. The obvious answer to this is that it is a supplementary vote to the Estimates of 1971-72. You do not have to go back 5 years. You are merely voting for the supplementary. You have already voted for the Estimates for 1971-72 and you are supplementing that. Now, in the Estimates for 1971-72, Item 59, the Head was Public Relations. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the explanation to the note is not law. There is nothing improper in the note. It says: "Provision to meet the cost of advertising Newsletters..." You do not have to go any further. You have already agreed to the cost of Newsletters in the Estimates; so you cannot now say that before you can vote for the supplementary you must see the Newsletter. (*Asides*).

You do not understand what I am talking about. I am dealing with the Estimates. Why do you not learn? Do you think you can learn by being the son of somebody? Why do you not try and understand what we are talking about? Some people will not learn no matter where you put them to be associated. We are talking about Item 59. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition cannot now ask for this to be postponed. There is no relevance in postponing this Head, because one Minister said that you have voted for something 5 years ago. That is irrelevant, because you are not now supplementing a 5-year-ago Estimate. You cannot come now and say that what is in the 1971-72 Estimates must be in the 1968 Estimates in order to verify what we are doing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of clarification, Sir. I said that 5 years ago the Item was there, and every year after that the Item was

there. I am saying that this principle started 5 years ago and has continued every year since then.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Find it in the 1967-68 Estimates!

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, even if the Minister made that explanation and it was not in the 1971-72 Estimates, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be able to say: "I am not voting for it, because it was not in the 1971-72 Estimates." I am insisting in telling the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he cannot now ask for a postponement of this Supplementary Vote, because a postponement of this would be to say that it is not a supplement to the 1971-72 Estimates and that is all he is required to vote for now. He is not now required to vote for a supplement to the 1967-68 Estimates, because that would be irrelevant.

Now, in the Estimates voted last year there was provision for the Newsletter. If you have voted money to meet the cost of the Newsletter – the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows this – then the cost of the Newsletter would include circulation. The note does not have to say the cost of the Newsletter circulated. The note is merely an explanation as to how the money should be spent, and the hon. member knows that. He can ask for a breakdown in the amount when he is dealing with the Estimates. The cost of a Newsletter includes several things and not merely the cost of printing it.

I assure the hon. member that in the 1969-70 Estimates it was mentioned there, and the note was reading differently. (*Asides*) It merely shows that notes are not the law. In the 1969-70 Estimates you had Public Relations under a different Head with a different number. It was Item 108, and it was to deal with the increase in the cost of the publication of a Newsletter.

11.50 a.m.

That item was Item 108 under Consul General Office at New York. Now this was dealing with the New York Head, but the point I was making was that the explanation of the note was the cost of publishing the newsletter in New York. Now they come back in 1971-72 under this Head and it reads "Public Relations" – to meet the cost of advertising newsletters, and authorised association membership fees. What you get from year to year in the construction of the Estimates is that there is no legal position on how the Estimates should be constructed; it is a matter for the House that you come down this year with the Estimates constructed this way, and you come down next

year with Estimates constructed another way. You did not accept a separation of New York, London and Canada last year; you accept Barbados as headquarters being responsible for the submission to these people of this money under the Items "Office Expenses" and "Communications", and what you have done this year is to put this under the Headquarters vote of Public Relations. It seems that the reason for this is that the Ministry of External Affairs in Barbados is responsible for this Head which is controlled from here, and I do not see any reason why the Leader of the Opposition should ask for this to be postponed because we have already voted the Head when we passed the Estimates and we are only supplementing the Head.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to adopt the arguments of the hon. member who has just sat down when he said very wisely and succinctly that we are dealing with this year's Estimates and we do not have to go back five years, that this is a supplementary of this year's Estimates, and I only wish that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who is the person that took us back five years had been present in the House to hear the hon. member for St. Michael West say so, because the parliamentary experience of the member for St. Michael West is sufficiently great for him to be able to teach the hon. member for St. Michael South Central a lesson or two, lawyer or no lawyer. I am glad that the hon. member said what he did although he did make a mistake about the note; the note controls the vote, make no mistake about that. The Auditor General will not certify money that he sees spent outside the wording of the note, otherwise as the hon. member will recall, you would not ever have to come in here with a Resolution to amend the note. If the note is unimportant it would not be there and you would not ever need to amend it. If you want to go outside the note, you have to come in with a Resolution to amend the note which is something that is done from time to time; but I would just like to make the hon. member understand....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I am sorry that was a misunderstanding. What I said was that the note is not a law in that it is a Head you are voting; the note is an explanation of the Head, and I pointed out that the auditor General could not refuse the cost of circulation on the grounds that it is not a proper charge, but you have to explain in the note what you are going to do with the money you are voting. All I was pointing out was that the cost of circulation whether it is printing or sending it out by post would come under this, but it is the Head that has to be the important thing. By all means the

note would have to indicate how you are going to spend the money under the Head.

Mr. ADAMS: Now apparently far from being true that this Item has been there for five years, they started publishing the newsletter in New York in 1969 and the item then was divided up between the different overseas Missions and either last year or this year it was consolidated as a Headquarters expense. We now know this as a result of the analysis in here. The analysis is important to hon. members on this side, and that is what must be understood. We want to know what is going on. Whether you read "advertisements, newsletters and authorised association membership fees" or whether you read earlier notes "books, publications, newsletters and so on", there is nothing there telling you that these are newsletters which we are preparing as opposed to newsletters which we are buying. In Britain and New York there are a lot of newsletters to which people subscribe, and they subscribe to books. We have had arguments in here about newsletters from the Central Intelligence Agency and so on. Most of them I believe are circulated free, but I dare say there are some that you have to pay for.

Mr. Chairman, I resent circumstances in which our *bona fides* in questioning this item have been attacked. That is what we on this side are complaining of, and if the hon. member is suggesting that because we voted for this Head — and whether or not we voted for it he does not know because he was not here — we now cannot vote against it or when he is telling you that the Leader of the Opposition cannot do this, I must tell him with great respect and with no offensiveness that I am not the member for St. Lucy. The hon. member for St. Michael West cannot tell me what to do. If we want to vote against it, we will vote against it and we are going to vote against it unless we see the documents, and even then if there are other items upon which hon. members are not satisfied, we are going to vote against it, and no hon. member on that side as far as I know has ever proposed any rule of the House by which the power of the Opposition to vote according to their consciences, their feelings and the programme of policy of their party or the interest of the people of Barbados can in any way be abridged. I am sorry we cannot vote against individual items without moving proper amendments in due course, but we can and we will vote against it if it does not satisfy us.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would just like to say that the hon. member for St. Lucy is intellectually emancipated and he does not need me or anyone

to tell him what to do. (*Asides*) I could not say it for you because you have not been emancipated intellectually; I can say if for him.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind this lot of intellectual words. When it comes to University boys the hon. member for St. Michael West is no tyrant, but I know he has a little temper too. In here is a University of its own and the hon. member for St. Lucy will sit down for five years without saying a word. (*Asides*) Let them know that I am a rough house.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know what I will do with all the rough houses in here. If you are going to speak on the Resolution carry on.

Mr. CRAIG: They are heckling me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not supposed to hear them, but when I hear I will call on them.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I was not here at the beginning of this meeting and I am wondering if the Minister would be able to tell me anything about Item 54. It says: "Unforeseen repairs have had to be undertaken at "Pelham", the official residence of the United Nations Permanent Representative." Did the top come off? I would like to have an idea I do not want to know how many nails they are going to buy, but I would like to have an idea of what is wrong. If the house was a good house, do you mean that all of a sudden it needs these repairs? Does it need treating by Rentokil. We cannot support it just like this.
12.00 noon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking all hon. members to observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. CRAIG: I do not know if the Minister will be able to give us some breakdown of the repairs; do not let us do this in a piecemeal fashion, if we have to overhaul the whole building let us come for all the money one time. I would like to hear the Minister on this because I have to say a little more on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 24 stand part.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is willing to give us the information, he indicated that to us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already put the question.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am going to respect you but do not tell me you have already put the question when I am awaiting the Minister's reply. If there is one member in here who is going to respect you it is this member but do not press me all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I looked at the Minister and he did not get up so I put the question.

Mr. CRAIG: The Leader of the House indicated that he would give us the necessary information.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, at Item 55 there is an amount of \$9,318 which is being asked for, and the note reads that supplementary provision is needed to meet the unexpected heavy cost of repairs to the official cars and increases in the cost of petrol, oil and servicing, and in insurance premiums as well, especially in New York. I would like to know from the Minister how many cars there are at these Embassies for this amount of money to be spent.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, the rule which says that the decision of the Chair is final. You put the question when the hon. member for St. James was speaking and if no answer is coming from the Minister the question remains. There is no rule that says that the Minister must answer, but when the question is put there can be no further debate. What I am pointing out is that the Minister does not have to answer and if he does not that does not nullify the fact that the question was put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 24 stand part.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I was addressing the Chair when I was interrupted by the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I had already put the question.

Mr. HINDS: You permitted me to address the Chair since then, and it was after I was addressing the Chair that the hon. member got up on a point of order. You permitted the point of order which means that you were accepting that I was addressing the Chair, hence you entertained his point of order. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not have to check with the Reporter, I was awaiting the Minister to see if he was going to reply to the question which the Hon. Member has asked. The Minister made no indication of that to me and I put the question.

Mr. HINDS: The point is that you permitted me to address the Chair and you entertained the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish to bring it to the notice of the hon. member for St. Peter that he had asked the Minister a question which I allowed because it referred to the expenses incurred for the cars. You asked the Minister to give you a breakdown when you were on a point of order, I heard the point of order and since then I was waiting on the Minister to see if he was going to reply to the question you had asked.

Mr. HINDS: Question or no question I was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already heard the hon. member. There has been a lot of contention in this matter and I am going to put the question.

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

AYES: Hon'bles. C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, P. M. GREAVES, L. E. SANDIFORD, F. G. SMITH, P. G. MORGAN and G. G. FERGUSSON; Messrs. A. MORRISON, E. E. GREAVES and F. L. WALCOTT; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND — 11.

NOES: Messrs. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, E. D. MOTTLEY, L. S. CRAIG, W. C. B. HINDS and C. L. BOLDEN — 5.
12.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$221,293. It seeks to authorise supplementary provision as included in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 22. It is supplementing.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot get up on a point of order now. What Rule is he breaking? (Mr. CRAIG: "Send them out.")

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to send out both of the offenders, but I will do it. I am not going to send one without the other. I am willing to hear the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister referred to Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 22. Is this the one we were handed in this Chamber yesterday?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want the hon. member to tell me what I must accept as a point of order. The question that is being asked by the hon. member is a point of order in my opinion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, no leave has been sought to deal with this Resolution. We were only handed this Resolution yesterday; it was not on the Order Paper, and it would be out of order to discuss it today unless leave was given for it to be dealt with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is in order.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. WALCOTT: On what the Minister has just said.

Mr. BOLDEN: No, Sir. I cannot argue with the Chair, but.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not on a point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit, please. I want all hon. members to understand here and now that the debate on this matter is closed, and I am putting the question. The question is, "That I do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply." Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and hon. members against will kindly say "No." I declare.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the question that was put to you is, "That you do now report progress."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question was, "That I do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply." (*Asides*)

Mr. CRAIG: The hon. member cannot address the Chair like that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have a right to speak on this. Mr. Chairman, the point that I have risen on is.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Could I treat you like this and remain in here? (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know what is the trouble. All of you will either behave in here or.....(*Asides*)

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member for the City cannot get over there and talk about Frank Walcott. There is no Frank Walcott in here my friend.

The question, "That Mr. Chairman do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
12.20 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Resolution was read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LOWE — 12.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — 5.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Resolution was agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended last night we had only the Resolution which we have just passed. During the sitting yesterday Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 22 was introduced. We are asking leave to deal with this Resolution today because it is a supplementary as such and the notes are all clear. The appropriate Minister will be giving additional information, and it is very important that this matter be dealt with today in all its stages because we hope to take the Christmas recess today, and we will probably adjourn until the middle of January; so we are asking leave to deal with this Resolution although it was not on the Order Paper, because we have to carry on Government Business and the various appropriations must be made to the Post Office.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today and unless there is any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave is granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 22.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$221,293 for the Post Office. The various amounts are set out under watchmen, overtime pay, overseas airmails etc., and all the notes are very explicit.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. CHAIRMAN

reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION *re* COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. JOSEPH

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I have moved so many of these Resolutions in this House during this session that there is very little I can add to what has been said before except that this is a Resolution to acquire 4,070 square feet of land at Branchbury in the parish of St. Joseph. I do not see the member for St. Joseph in his seat, but it is really not to buy the land as such, but that the Government might have a clear and indisputed title to the property.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

12.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION *re* COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FAIRCHILD STREET

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the House the Government acquired areas of land in the vicinity of Fairchild Street for the express purpose of constructing an office block there. I think it was made known at the time that it would be a multi-storey block. It has come to light that the area of land there is

too small for Town Planning permission to be given for such a building because the ratio of block coverage is somewhere in the vicinity of 1:5 and the amount of land Government then owned after that acquisition was 26,299 square feet. The total floor area of an office block is 80,000 square feet, therefore it will be necessary, if we are to obtain Town Planning permission, for us to acquire other lands in this area, and the purpose of this Resolution is to acquire an additional 12,650 square feet so that we would have enough land in the area at Fairchild Street in order for us to construct the type of block for which we had originally planned. This is the purpose of this Resolution and I beg to move that it do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RELEASE OF THE CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION FROM LIABILITY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we now resume consideration of Order No. 6.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we in the Opposition have always objected to is the fact that the Statutory Boards will not produce a Statement of Accounts and a Report that they are required to give in sufficient time so that any money which will be voted as required to be voted by this House can be voted after we have seen this report and financial statement. Mr. Speaker, I think I should begin by saying that as far as I am concerned I am not going to support this Resolution, and as far as the Party is concerned we are not going to support it, because we disapprove of the management of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The last report and the financial statement of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation which was laid in this House was the report for the year 1969. I do not believe that the Government would come to this House to ask for permission to write off the loss of \$2.1 million and generally to reconstruct the whole Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation if the

Government did not have the successive reports and financial statements for the following years up to 1970, as I would hate to think that the Government is so reckless with the taxpayers' money that they will take these decisions without knowing or having in its possession the financial statement and report for the year 1970.

I do not believe that the Ministers of Cabinet would sit down and agree — and I am not only speaking about the present Ministers, because this Resolution came before the House in the last session — and I cannot really believe that the Ministers of Government would sit down and agree to this unless they had in their possession the Statement of Accounts and the Report for the year 1970. If it is in their possession, then it is the duty of the Minister under the 1963 Act to lay in Parliament that Report, and I would like to find out from the Minister why that Report has not been laid on the table of the House of Assembly. Why is it that this Report was not made available to the Opposition? In accordance with sections 18 and 19 of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation Act 1963 this should be done. As I have said, it is the duty of the Minister to lay the Report in Parliament, and I am not concerned if the members of the Government care so little as not to ask for this Report, but I find that we can only talk in terms of any sort of reconstruction of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation if we know how the Corporation was operating in the year 1970. I am not sure whether the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation year ends on 31st December or if it goes down to 31st March, because some Statutory Boards run the year to 31st December and others to 31st March.

12.40 p.m.

But even if it is to the 31st March, 1971, I think the time is ripe for us to have that Report in our possession. It leads me to believe that there must be some reason why, in discussing a Resolution such as this, the Government or the Minister in particular has not seen it fit to perform the duties required under Section 19 of the Act. For that reason if for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, I could not, with any clear conscience, vote in favour of this Resolution. I should hope that, since the Minister does not have that Report in his possession, some explanation would be given to this House as to why the Government should introduce a Resolution such as this without first obtaining a full Report pointing out what the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was doing in 1970.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that one of the difficulties which the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation at present encounters is the question

of advertising. One of the things that seems strange to me — and this was done from the time the station was opened — is why after 9 p.m. there is absolutely no advertising on CBC. I think CBC is broadcasting 16 hours a day. If you take it in terms of from nine o'clock to twelve o'clock when the station goes off the air, then you will find that for at least a quarter of the broadcasting at CBC per day it is operating without any sort of advertising and, therefore, without any sort of revenue coming in during that period. I would, seriously, ask the Minister to look into this matter, because it seems strange to me how from nine o'clock to twelve o'clock at night no advertising is done. The answer cannot be that people do not listen to the radio, because if you are going to broadcast during that time the Corporation must be satisfied that there are people listening to the radio. If people are listening to the radio, then why is not CBC selling advertising time and advertising between nine and twelve o'clock at night?

I can go a step further. On Saturday nights CBC is on the air until up to two o'clock, but even if it is a pre-recorded programme CBC should still be able to sell advertising time for that programme. In the circumstances, you will see that one-third of the broadcasting time is done without any advertising and without any revenue coming in.

With regard to the question of television, there is very little advertising on television after 9.30 p.m. I am not blaming the Government for this, because I know the reason why there is no advertising on the television after 9.30 p.m. is due to the fact that the advertising agents in this country have decided themselves that people do not look at television after 9.30 p.m. I think that the difficulty here stems from the fact that most of the advertising agents in this country are non-Barbadians.

As the Minister of Communications and Works will remember, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said yesterday that you can see families around a television set looking at television, and he would know that this idea of people not looking at television after 9.30 p.m. is nonsensical. It stems from the fact that the people responsible for advertising in this country do not really know the habits of Barbadians and, therefore, I would suggest to the Government that on its own record, either through CBC direction or some other means, some survey should be carried out to see what the percentage of viewing is at that time.

I appreciate that the period between 6.30 p.m. to 8 p.m. or 8.30 p.m. is regarded as the

peak viewing time and, therefore, everybody tries to get his advertising done between that period of time. I think that the Government and CBC should have some sort of scheme whereby they could encourage the advertising agents to spread advertising right through. It may very well be that the Government may consider — I do not know whether the rates for advertising at the moment are standard from 4.30 p.m. right through — having high rates for advertising during 6.30 p.m. to 8.30 p.m. and cheap rates after that period. This would, I think, encourage advertising agents not only to pick 6.30 p.m. to 8.30 p.m. which is the peak period for advertising, but to spread the advertising throughout the time CBC is on the air. If advertising agents can be encouraged to take advertisements on television after 9.30 p.m., you may well find that it will build up a source of revenue in that the agents will realise that people do watch television after 9.30 p.m. in Barbados.

On the question of local programmes, although one may say, as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has said, that there is not enough talent in Barbados to enable us to produce local programmes every night, I still think that every effort should be made to encourage the talent that now exists in Barbados. By talent, I do not mean people going on television and trying to imitate American singers. I am talking now in terms of drama, folk music and so on. Let the Broadcasting Corporation encourage this sort of thing. I know it will be said that there will be some difficulty with the advertising agents, because I understand that when they go to pre-view a programme they tend to promote the imported programmes because they are of a much higher standard than ours.

You will find DaCosta & Musson promoting the Flip Wilson Show, and Manning, Wilkinson & Challenor promoting the Dean Martin Show, but you do not find these people doing anything to encourage locally produced programmes. I say to the Minister that I hope the Broadcasting Corporation will look into this matter and do something to ensure that the advertising agents do not only try to sponsor the foreign produced programmes, but will also encourage the locally produced programmes.

12.50 p.m.

Sir, we had one or two plays with Frank Collymore, "Tijohn and His Brothers", but I think there is a lot more talent in Barbados which could be used and encouraged. I do not know much of the mechanics of it, but perhaps a lot more can be done particularly on Sunday afternoons rather than have television come on at

9 o'clock and go off at 1 p.m. Perhaps something could be done between that period and the evening broadcast to have locally produced programmes. Perhaps the Minister can say when he replies whether the cost is prohibitive, but I put this out by way of a suggestion to the Government.

Now, Sir, I think that one would like to see — and I would compliment C.B.C. for this — more programmes of the type by Mr. H. A. Vaughan who did what I would consider a good lecture on Prescod, and I also would say that it is unfortunate that the *Advocate* cannot see fit even to carry the series which he writes in the *Democrat* which I find very interesting. I would like to see some sort of programme whereby Mr. Vaughan and a lot of other people could be put on television and given an opportunity, and thereby encourage local programming. Two weeks ago Edward Stoute was on the programme talking to Pat Castagne, and I believe that a number of people found what he had to say rather interesting. I could think of a lot more people. This is a sort of programme which I would seriously like to see on television. I can see absolutely no merit in a programme like "love that Bob" and "Father knows best". I know that the trouble in the past was that when you bought one good programme you bought a package deal and you had to buy these other programmes. I do not know if this is still so, but I would like to find out from the Minister what at the moment is the policy of the Government in buying programmes from overseas, I would also like to know whether the decision on the type of programmes that are bought is the sole responsibility of the General Manager and the Programme Director for television, or whether there is an advisory panel that advises C.B.C. on the type of programmes that are suitable for presentation. Again, Sir, I would put out to the Government if there is no such consultative body that the Government may find it necessary to establish, in view of certain protests that are made, some sort of body to keep the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation in line with the ideas of the public.

Sir, quite a number of people have been complaining about certain things on radio, and hon. members yesterday complained about somebody getting on radio and saying he is a lover of fast women and fast cars. I personally do not see much in that myself, but there are a number of people who have various objections not only with C.B.C. but also Rediffusion and particularly to the press, and the government may well consider the establishment of a Press Council which will look into complaints from the radio,

television and the press. It is not only the politicians who complain. There are a lot of other people who will complain about the quality of the programmes, the conduct of people on television and various things like that, and it may well be that the Government may find it necessary to have this sort of body.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most depressing things about the television is to sit and watch people conduct an interview. Most of the questions are not related to each other and as a whole — I believe the Ministers may have found this and indeed the member for St. Michael West in his press conferences — the questions asked are not very intelligent. There is no mistake about this, and this may have something to do with the educational qualifications of the persons you are having at C.B.C. The very fact that you are losing money or not making money, and the very fact that this Resolution has to come before this House may have something to do with the educational qualifications of the persons you are now attracting to C.B.C., because Government has got to be satisfied that if it is going to spend money, and nobody is against the Government spending money, it must spend it wisely; and despite the member for St. Michael South Central saying that you are a socialist Government, and you are providing a service, at the same time you must make sure that you are providing a service of quality and not just merely a service, and therefore Government should review the type of person it is at present employing at C.B.C. and see whether they can do the job that is required of them effectively.

I would like to congratulate C.B.C. when congratulations are due, and I think they are due in the case of the Horizons Link-up with the Caribbean which is broadcast on Sundays. It is a very good link-up and I think they should be given praise for that. I would like to find out on the question of storage of programmes whether programmes such as the lecture to which I referred earlier by Mr. Vaughan and other important locally produced programmes are stored in the archives of C.B.C. There are one or two other points which I want to find out from the Minister before I sit. I did not hear this part of the speech but I heard in the news that he said that shortly C.B.C. would be broadcasting on FM twenty-four hours a day. I would just like to find out from the Minister if he or C.B.C. is aware that at the moment there is difficulty in picking up the FM station north of the Lazaretto and whether anything can be done to ensure that this difficulty is removed. To put it another way, I wonder whether the Minister or C.B.C. is aware of any difficulties in picking up the FM station

in all parts of Barbados, and if he is so aware whether anything can be done to help this situation.

There is one other problem. I think the quality of broadcast from C.B.C. has recently declined from the point of view of the actual broadcasting. It does not seem to be as clear as in the past.

1.00 p.m.

I am told by some people who know that the reason for this seems to lie in the fact that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has removed one of the aerials and this has affected the type of broadcasts we get today. I think that in the past we had clearer broadcasts but at the moment we are getting a lot of disturbance, and perhaps the Minister can assist us by throwing some light on this.

I would also like to find out what programmes of training for the staff of C.B.C. are being considered other than occasionally sending one of their Announcers overseas. I believe one of the difficult things with CBC at the moment is with the editing of the video tape, and I would like to find out what plans there are for improving this. I do not even believe at the moment that CBC can edit a video tape, and I would like to find out what plans CBC or the government has for training people in the editing of video tapes and other such things.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters which I can raise but I think they will be of a highly controversial nature, but as I say I am going to vote against the resolution and I do not think I should raise these controversial matters at this time. What I would say is that I would like to see that CBC broadcasts news of what goes on in Parliament, and that it gives a fair and accurate report all the time remembering that it is not only the Prime Minister or the other Ministers of Government who constitute the Parliament but that the members of the Opposition as well. I would go a step further and say that if you are providing services in the country to educate the people, there should be on television a weekly half hour programme which is designed to give a report of what goes on in Parliament. It is rather strange that you have a Government-owned station, CBC Radio and Television, and a privately owned Rediffusion, and that Rediffusion will give you a special programme on the proceedings of Parliament, yet the Government-owned station does not see fit to publish the proceedings of Parliament, and I would suggest to the Government that we should have a programme dedicated to what goes on in Parliament. You

may very well feel that you may not be able to permit any of the people at CBC to do it, you may very well feel that you would prefer certain members of the Government Information Office to do it, but if again you are going to have CBC do it obviously you would have to establish at the earliest opportunity a Press Council, but I do not think that should be a deterrent. I feel the staff at CBC – the Announcers and the people in the News Room – should feel that they have a duty to perform not only to the Democratic Labour Party but to the people of this country to give a fair and accurate report of any news.

Another thing about CBC is that they must realise that if they want to have a public discussion programme, as happened about two or three times in the past, if you ask a man to express a view on CBC it is extremely rude for the Announcer immediately after the man states his view to say "that is your opinion, it is not the opinion of CBC." What is the purpose of asking people to go on television to express opinions and then say that those opinions are not the opinions of CBC? If CBC finds that some view expressed is offensive, at the end of the programme let it be known that the opinions expressed during that programme are not necessarily the opinions of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation or that they are not in keeping with their policy, but do not invite a person to a discussion on television and immediately after an opinion is expressed say that it is not the opinion of CBC, that is not right.

I believe some time ago the question of the broadcast on radio was being looked into, perhaps if the Minister could give us some information about that it would be helpful. I think it was the former senior member for St. Joseph in the last House who asked a question as to whether the debates of Parliament could be broadcast. As I said, the matters which are more controversial I will not deal with today.

One other question, Sir, I would like to find out from the Minister to what extent has the introduction of colour television influenced this Resolution today; in short, how much has colour television cost CBC in terms of hard cash. I do not want to find out what percentage, I want to know how much money has the introduction of colour television cost CBC. I expect the answer to come from the member for Christ Church North Central and not from the member for St. Michael West.

1.10 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I was a bit late in getting up is that I enquired

whether the hon. member for St. Michael West had already spoken, because I know that it would be impossible for any item to come before this Parliament without the hon. member addressing this Chamber. I am not a cinema goer; I am not a TV viewer; I work too hard during the day looking for money, and I cannot sit down and watch something man-made – a girl kissing a boy and so on. I am a robust kind of person; I like cricket, football, boxing and so on, but some people like the cinema. I do not mind looking at an old Western which has action, but CBC seems to be a station of action.

Now, I am going to read from page 1521 of the Hansard of the 26th March 1968. This is what the then Leader of the Assembly had to say. I think CBC was then under the Minister of Education, then it was under the Ministry of the Prime Minister, and I am now more than grateful to see that it is now placed under the Ministry of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central, because I do not think there is a better salesman in Barbados than the hon. member for Christ Church North Central. (*Asides*)

I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the member for St. Lucy not to interrupt me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not an interruption; it is an aside. If it is to be an interruption, he will have to rise to his feet. It is an aside, and it is for you to ignore it.

Mr. CRAIG: He is a bit too loud in his aside, Sir, and he is interrupting me. I will refer to what Senator Tudor said:

"The proposal now is not to take money out of the Treasury to give the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation;..."

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that the hon. member may not have been in the House when this same passage was quoted by the Minister of Health.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you sure that the words about to be quoted are the same words that were quoted earlier today?

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: As far as I can recall, it was in the same context. I do not know if any other member recalls what was said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I give the hon. member for St. James the benefit of doubt.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, fools rush in. I was saying:

"The proposal now is not to take money out of the Treasury to give the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation; the proposal is to borrow to lend to CBC, to be repaid by CBC and to repay the Bank from CBC's revenue."

Sir, I am asked to vote for money to relieve CBC of its indebtedness to a Commercial Bank, and I have not yet seen a single Report or a Statement of Account to prove if we can pay CBC. According to a former Leader of the House, no money is to be taken from the treasury. Today we are asked to vote for a sum of money to free CBC. I should like to know how much money CBC owes the Bank. The Government is asking for \$2,100,000. Suppose CBC owed the Bank \$100,000, is it going to use the balance of money to do something else? I will vote against this Resolution. I cannot come here, sit down, and be pushed around by my Government but not my Party. It is my Government, my Prime Minister, and you are my Speaker.

I cannot vote for this Resolution when Senator Tudor the then Leader of this House said:

"This is the proposal and I would like this to be made quite clear. This is no attempt to substantiate or rather to insist on one policy when in fact it is another policy we are pursuing. If the government - I know the Prime Minister certainly feels this - were not itself convinced that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation would be a viable economic concern once it has been refinanced, the Government itself would recommend to Parliament that it be disbanded and sold out for whatever we could get for it."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, this is about the third time while sitting here that I have heard this repetition of Senator Tudor's speech.

I beg to move, in accordance with the appropriate Standing Order, "That the question be now put."

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, there is an old story that numbers count, but may I draw to Your Honour's attention that it is at Your Honour's discretion. If it is Your Honour's discretion that the question be put now and there is a closure of the

debate, then I shall take my seat. I have to warn hon. members on the other side that might is not right, and it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to protect the minority group at all times.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

The question, "That the Resolution do now pass" was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. LOWE - 10.

NOES: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 3.
1.20 p.m.

RESOLUTION *re* THE JOINT AMENITIES COMMITTEE

Be it Resolved that the following hon. members along with Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, be members of the Joint Amenities Committee of both Houses of Parliament, namely, the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour, National Insurance; the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works; the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare; the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology; the Hon. member for St. Michael South East; and myself from this side of the House, along with the nominees made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for the City; the hon. member for St. Peter; the Hon. member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition; and the hon. member for St. Joseph.

I beg to move that these be the members of the Joint Amenities Committee from this House.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just draw the attention of the House to Standing Order No. 32(1). With all due respect, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Resolution for CBC has been properly passed. I just draw this to your attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is out of order.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe the hon. member for the

City is in fact correct that the procedural motion that the question be now put was made on a point of order....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, if the hon. member for the City was out of order, how can the Hon. Minister be in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister continue.

Hon. E. L. SANDIFORD: I was drawing to your attention.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only listen to one point of order at a time. Two hon. members are on their feet. Will the hon. member for St. Peter please take his seat? The hon. member for St. Michael South caught my eye first. Let him make his point of order first. Will the hon. member for St. Peter please take his seat?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was in fact.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was in fact drawing to your attention as indeed the hon. member for the City was doing that in accordance with Standing Order 32 the procedural motion that the question be now put should have been put forthwith. I am sorry this was an oversight in as much as the question was not put and then the question which was before this Hon. Chamber should have been put.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I can recall, the hon. member who has just sat down seconded the motion for the closure.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That the question be now put

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate has been closed upon a motion for closure moved by the hon. member for St. Andrew and seconded by the

hon. member for St. Michael South. It has been drawn to my attention by the hon. member for St. Michael South that the question should have been put and was not put. That I now proceed to do.

The question that the Question be now put was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. members of the Opposition left the Chamber.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before we rise it is customary at this time of the year to extend the season's greetings to Your Honour and your family and wish you and your family all success and good health in the New Year. I think hon. members would wish me to express these sentiments, and if there are any hon. members who would like to join me in these sentiments, they are at liberty to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am indebted to the Hon. Leader of the House for extending the Seasons Greetings to myself and my family. I shall convey them to my family, and on my own behalf and that of my family I would like to take this opportunity of wishing all hon. members, including members of the Opposition who unfortunately are not now in their seats, a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 18th January, 1972 at 2.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
1.32 p.m.