

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th July, 1971

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 4.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Social Welfare*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C. M. G., M. A., (*Leader of the House*); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time being 4.20 p.m., it is now time for Private Members' Business.

Mr. ADAMS and Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the Second Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the year ended 31st March, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 162, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, I

beg to give notice that Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:

No. 180 and No. 185 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James; Nos. 192, 193 and 199 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; and No. 205, asked by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. St. JOHN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 197, asked by the hon. and learned junior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I should at this stage draw to Your Honour's attention that, according to Standing Order No. 8, there are certain defined procedures to be adopted at each sitting. For instance, we have gone past (a) Formal entry of Speaker; (b) Prayers; (c) Announcements by Speaker. I have heard no announcements by Your Honour.

My chief reason for rising at this stage is that at that point Your Honour ought to make some reference to the Minutes of the last meeting of this House or to the last Minutes that have been circulated. Something has gone wrong, and I would like to see that the business of the House is conducted according to the laid-down procedure. I should, at this stage, draw to Your Honour's attention that I have in my hands the Minutes of 13th July, 1971.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under Standing Order No. 8(c), I am informed that the Minutes of Tuesday 13th July, have been printed and circulated, and unless there is any objection, these Minutes will be confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that confirmation of these Minutes be deferred for the following reasons:-

On page 1 after the line "Prayers were read" I think the following line should begin "Confirmation of the Minutes was deferred". As it stands, it wo

appear as if the Minutes of the meeting were deferred, but I think that only the confirmation was deferred and not the Minutes themselves. In the following line, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I quote "Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a telegram from the Chairman of Committees to the effect that he (the Chairman) regrets being unable to attend today's sitting of the House." I think I am right in saying that His Honour the Speaker immediately after mentioning the word "telegram" made use of the following words "purporting to come", and if we were to move that those words be inserted, the paragraph would then read "Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a telegram purporting to come from the Chairman of Committees to the effect that he (the Chairman) regrets being unable to attend today's sitting of the House."

If we were to go further down on the same page, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find immediately after Document No. 626 the following line which now reads "Hon. G. G. Fergusson gave notice that the 3 following Replies to Parliamentary Questions were ready." I am submitting that it should read "the following 3 Replies". As it now stands, this is what you call faulty construction. In the same way if we were to turn to page 2, we will find that the same error to which I have just referred is repeated in four places. Whilst on page 2, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to Private Members' Notices.

4.25 p.m.

On page 2 - Private Members' Notices - it says: "Mr. L. S. Craig gave notice of the following Resolution", and at the end of each paragraph I am suggesting that there should be a semi-colon instead of a full stop. These matters may appear trifling, but this is an important body and, as a consequence, we are entitled to assume and to accept it that the Minutes of such a body as this must be equally important if not more so. If we turn then to page 3, in the first paragraph we read: "Hon. J. C. Tudor moved, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma that the following Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting: 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 38, 39, 40 and 45", and then it goes on to repeat "for the remainder of the day's sitting." I am moving that the words "for the remainder of the day's sitting" be deleted.

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is that confirmation of these Minutes be postponed; all those in avour please say Aye and those against please say o. I think the Ayes have it, and accordingly the confirmation of these Minutes is postponed.

MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House, and I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: the motion is that the same be taken up at 10 o'clock, and I should like to know if it is all right at this stage so that we can proceed with it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the "Private Members' Business" Order will commence immediately after the conclusion of the debate and will not continue after 4.30 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. In respect of the motion which has just been moved, I believe that there is a Standing Order which says that the Chair shall not entertain a motion unless there is general assent of the House. I have always had the impression that the general assent of the House is sufficient to cure any motion which infringes upon the Standing Order, and I would invite the Leader of the House to indicate whether the Government, since it has so many replies ready, would allow those replies to be given to hon. members. We are up to question 222 and we have a very fat Order Paper, three quarters of which has been taken up by questions which the Government has been so weak in answering, and I would regret if the Leader of the House blocks any motion such as this for reasons which I have already given.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think hon. members opposite know that they find me most accommodating at most times. The position is this, we have tabled some Oral Replies to questions and hon. members opposite would be doing less justice to themselves if they thought they could dispose of those questions within any foreseeable time; the supplementaries which would follow the replies would take some time, and I would have thought that hon. members opposite would have preferred, perhaps tomorrow after they have done their main business, to let the House go on with Question Time and everything else so that we would finish our work in order to rise for the recess, but to press for Question Time now is to do themselves an injustice.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Question Time is normally 15 or 20 minutes; we are asking for half an hour, so we are giving ourselves a chance. I think the Leader of the House is being very ingenuous, if he is suggesting that the time for answering questions is less.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member would know that most of the questions which come before this House are like Irish questions. I take it then that since it is now Government time Your Honour should first dispose of the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In my opinion rule 18(6) is mandatory, and as the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas said it can only be cured or changed by general assent; there being no general assent the motion cannot be entertained at this stage.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a suggestion to put to hon. members opposite. Since

I believe they would wish to make their reply to the budget tomorrow at the same time at which the subsequent statement is being made, I wonder whether they would consider making this session a continuous session; therefore, when we meet tomorrow we can start with Private Members' Business a little outside its own time. For this reason I suggest that we could suspend the Standing Orders to enable us, first of all, to sit later this evening and then to suspend the sitting so that when we meet tomorrow afternoon it will be in Private Members' Time.

4.35 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

I, therefore, beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition must oppose this suggestion of a late sitting this evening. Obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition is being a little pressed. The Government has had 14 months in which to prepare its Budget; the Government is seeking to give the Opposition 24 hours to prepare its answer; the Government is now seeking even to erode those 24 hours! Hon. Members must not have an opportunity of going away and digesting the Budgetary proposals, Sir? Why could we not sit late into the evening? On all the numerous sittings that have been inflicted on us over the last two weeks by the Leader of the House, when on repeated occasions the Government's own Ministers stayed away from the House and failed to form a quorum; when on repeated occasions when the Opposition was willing to go on after dinner the Government Ministers ate their dinner and went home. When we were pressing to have certain items of Private Members' Business discussed, the Government refused to allow the Private Members of this House to set their own timetable. Now, Sir, we must take the Budget, sit all evening, and then come back tomorrow prepared to reply to the Budget?

I am sure the Leader of the House is not seriously going to put that forward. If he has business to be done, then the recess must be delayed. I know it is within the contemplation of the Leader of the House to come back here on Friday, in any event, to dispose of such matters as have to be disposed of before the recess. If that has to be done, then let it be done; but let Budget Day be Budget Day, and let Budget Reply Day be Budget Reply Day, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would ask the Leader of the House to withdraw the Motion rather than trying to bludgeon us with the majority however exiguous it may be in the light of events that may be forthcoming in the next few months.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me meet the hon. member half-way. I will not withdraw the Motion, but I will give him an undertaking that we will not detain him very much longer after the presentation of the Budget. I cannot be fairer than that.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken. In making this Motion, I do not know which hon. member will be addressing Your Honour, say, at five minutes to five, but whichever one it is, whether on this side or the other, I would like that hon. member to move that further consideration of the matter be postponed.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business, and I am asking leave to take charge of it in the absence of the Prime Minister.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 13 OF HEAD 19 - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to invite the House to amend the note to Item 13 of Head 19 in the Current Estimates as follows:-

After Regiment add the words "Also includes payment of Duty Allowance at the rate of \$1,200 per annum to the Commanding Officer".

The reason for this is as follows:

This post of Commanding Officer to the Barbados Regiment is, as Your Honour knows, an honorary post and appointments to it are made by the Governor-General under Section 5 of the Volunteer Act, 1909. In this way, of course, no emoluments are attached to this post or to the person holding this appointment. The Commanding Officer, in addition to his normal duties and responsibilities which adhere to his office, finds himself from time to time required to attend and perform certain ceremonial and official duties returning calls by visiting Army and Naval Commanders, entertaining his opposite numbers when they visit Barbados and incurring some personal expense.

In the circumstances, the Government feels that these expenses incurred by him on these occasions should not be met from his personal resources. For this reason it is proposed to give him a duty allowance of \$100 a month in order that he may defray such expenses arising out of his ceremonial duties.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition would be wanting in courtesy to the Commander of the Barbados Regiment if we did not say loud that we support this Resolution. Colonel Walcott is an officer for whom, I am sure, all Barbadians have the greatest admiration. It is pleasant that within Barbados his military duties are not of the most extensive, but in many ways it is a tribute to Colonel Walcott's own character and the character of all Barbadians that he has been able so successfully to carry on these duties at the head of the Regiment.

In passing, I would like to congratulate those officers of the Regiment who have been recently promoted: Lieutenant Colonel Walcott on his promotion as full Colonel, and Major Banfield on his promotion to Lieutenant Colonel. It is always difficult in these regiments of limited strength and very small turnover to have an adequate line of promotion, but I think that Barbados after all of these years can very reasonably carry a colonelcy instead of a mere Lieutenant Colonelcy.

On behalf of the Opposition, Sir, I would like to say that it is somewhat surprising to us, for indeed it has never occurred to us before, that the Colonel of the Regiment should have been called upon for all of these expenditures, both of time and from his own personal pocket, as I can speak from personal knowledge, without any duty allowance having been made available to him. I certainly welcome this expenditure which although small, I am sure, is appropriate and suitable in the circumstances.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I join with the hon. member opposite in extending congratulations to Colonel Walcott and Major Banfield who have both received promotions which have been announced by the Governor-General yesterday. If I did not myself volunteer the congratulations but waited to second that part of the hon. member's speech, it was because, in the light of recent history in the Sudan and elsewhere, one does not now know what the Opposition and the Army are doing; so I wanted to hear from the other side that it was all right with them and the Army before I added my own congratulations. I certainly join with the hon. member in this. I wish both officers the best of everything and good fortune in their promotions.

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

4.45 p.m.

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill asks this House to make provision for retiring benefits for the holders of the office of Governor-General. At present provision is made for the emoluments appertaining to this office under the Governor-General (Emoluments) Act, 1967, and this Act was deemed to have come into operation on 30th November, 1966, the date on which Barbados assumed independence. The salary and duty allowance payable to the Governor-General were revised with effect from 1st April, 1969, by virtue of the Governor-General (Emoluments) (Amendment) Act of that year, and it has been agreed that the Governor-General's contribution towards the wages of the unestablished staff at his official residence should be \$2,000 per annum with effect from 1st April, 1969. All of this is well known to the House, and provision has been made in the Estimates for it.

It would appear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the trend in the Commonwealth Caribbean area has been, and in two or three other Caribbean territories legal provisions do exist, to provide for the pensionability of Governors-General. Now Governors-General in all Commonwealth Caribbean territories, at least in that office which is retained by those who still retain the monarchy, are all of them appointed by Her Majesty on the advice of the Prime Ministers of the day. They are, therefore, non-Civil Service appointees and are not Heads of Civil Service as they would have been as was normally the case with Governors in colonial days. We, therefore, think that it is quite in keeping with this modern trend to provide a pension for the holder of the office largely on the same basis as we have provided retiring benefits - not on that same basis but somewhat like it - for Prime Ministers, and in another context retiring benefits for members of Parliament.

Now as a basis for arriving at a reasonable arrangement for the provision of the Governor-General's pension, we have taken cognisance of the main features of legislation in force in the neighbouring independent territories of Jamaica, Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago. In Jamaica, there is provision for the payment of a pension for the holder of that office at an annual rate of £3,000. Provision is also made for the grant of widows' pensions and children's allowances. In Guyana provision is also made for the payment of a Governor-General's pen-

sion and of course now that there is a Republic, of the President's pension and the rate of pension is determined to be two-thirds of the highest annual rate of salary paid to such person or \$10,000, whichever is the greater.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be now postponed.

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

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

PERMISSION GRANTED TO C. B. C.
AND REDIFFUSION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of all hon. members at this time that His Honour the Speaker has granted permission to C.B.C. radio and television and Rediffusion to carry the Prime Minister's Budget Speech. Permission has also been given by His Honour the Speaker for replies to be so carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY
PROPOSALS 1971 - 72

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the next Item under Government Business.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Finance, and it is to present to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the fiscal year 1971 - 72.

Let the Hon. Minister of Finance proceed.
4.55 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,

Nine years ago on the 26th day of June 1962 I delivered my first Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals to this House as the island's first Minister of Finance.

We have just passed through the era which was designated the development decade by the United Nations Organisation a decade for which targets of economic growth were set for developing countries such as our own. The growth rate of the economy of this island has on the average more than reached the target despite rising world prices for the goods which we consume and consequential unfavourable balances of trade.

In my first budget I was most concerned with the task of placing the economy of the island on a sound footing so that the measures which were approved by the Legislature sought to balance our revenue with the expenditure which we had undertaken in the approved estimates on current account.

In each and every year of the development decade subsequent to 1964 we have not only matched but surpassed the expenditures in those years with one exception when revenue fell short of expenditure by the sum of approximately \$1 million.

As I have explained to the House from time to time I have pursued a policy of deficit financing. That is, the community has on no occasion been taxed to the extent that anticipated revenue would equate with far less surpass approved expenditure.

I am an unrepentant product of the Keynesian revolution in economic thought. My confidence in this approach (rather than the good-housekeeping putting-by-something for a rainy-day-school) has been more than fortified by the steady relentless growth of our economy and the accumulation of surpluses, which have assisted in defraying part of the cost of our capital expenditure during the same decade. These surpluses when added to the annual charges of debt constitute this generation's contribution to the permanent assets of our country. The total actual capital expenditure during the development decade was \$94.5 million; the surpluses available were of the order of \$29 million so that they underwrote approximately one third of our capital expenditure during the period.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, 20th July, I laid before Parliament the 'Economic Survey - 1970' which, as Members know, contains a comprehensive review of the performance of the Barbadian economy in the recent

past. This review provides an appropriate background against which to present my financial statement and budgetary proposals for the year 1971. As you are aware, due to difficulties in obtaining information from various sectors, it was not possible on the last two occasions for me to lay the Survey before I presented the budget, but I am happy to say that this year we have experienced much greater co-operation from the public and private sectors, possibly as a result of an address which I delivered to a large gathering of businessmen.

I do not think it necessary at this time to go in great detail into the economic behaviour of the various sectors during 1970, as this has been done quite adequately in the Survey. I propose instead to examine very briefly and in a general way, the performance of the economy as a prelude to the presentation of the budgetary proposals.

General

During 1970 the Gross Domestic Product of Barbados (which is a measure of the total value of goods and services produced in the economy) rose by \$41 million – from \$237 million to \$278 million. This represented a rate of increase of 17.6%. With the price level rising by about 9% and with population growth in the region of 1%, the per capita Gross Domestic Product advanced last year by some 7%. The real growth rate achieved in 1970 was, therefore, one of the highest recorded for the decade, and was due in large measure to the stimulus provided by the expansion in the Distribution, Government, Manufacturing and Service sectors. For purposes of comparison, the growth of real per capita Gross Domestic Product in 1969 was in the region of 3½%.

I think you will agree on examination of the facts and figures that during the decade 1960–70 there was a significant expansion in the Gross Domestic Product of the island, which has resulted in quite marked and appreciable increases in the standard of living of our people. In fact, between 1960 and 1970 the Gross Domestic Product at current prices rose by \$159 million from \$120 million to \$279 million, an overall rise of 133%. Even taking account of price inflation (which up to 1967 was about 3% per annum and since then has fluctuated between 5 and 10% per annum) this represents a very good record of achievement in terms of growth. To be more specific; during the development decade for which a target growth rate of five per cent per annum was set for developing countries, the growth rate of the Barbados economy exceeded seven per cent per annum on the average.

In real terms the growth rate was closer to six per cent per annum which is still in excess of the target figure. Few countries achieved the target figure and our own achievement is all the more remarkable in the absence of mineral resources or heavy industry.

During the debate on the estimates of revenue and expenditure passed earlier this year I ventured that assistance from foreign sources amounted to perhaps six million dollars since independence.

There is still a number of people in this House and outside who believe that the right of a nation and a people to ordain its own affairs must be a by-product of a profit and loss accounting.

I have had an opportunity since the end of March to do the calculus of independence for the benefit of members on the other side.

The grants we have received amount to some \$11.25 million dollars. Five million from Canada; \$690,000 from the United Kingdom; \$1.2 million from the United Nations technical assistance programme; \$61,600 from the Organisation of American States; \$70,000 from P.A.H.O./W.H.O.; \$332,000 from the Inter-American Development Bank; \$3,753,000 from the World Food Programme – the draw down on the last grant designed for the school meals programme is at the rate of \$1 million per annum for the years 1971–1973.

The \$732,000 was for the programme from 1967 for two and a half years.

During the same period since independence loans negotiated direct with foreign governments on very easy terms amounted to \$5.7 million most of which were from the government of Canada.

The figures which I have given do not include the loan from the Inter-American Development Bank to the Barbados Development Bank which I will mention later.

5.05 p.m.

Sugar

There was a moderate improvement in the performance of the sugar industry in 1970 as compared with 1969. Total production in 1970 was 154,000 tons, an increase of 15,000 tons over the 1969 figure. The average yields of cane and of sugar last year were also above the 1969 figures. Receipts from the export of sugar totalled \$29.4 million, an increase of \$1.6 million or 10% over the previous year. There is need for improvement but we have to endure the vagaries and changes of the weather and distributions of rainfall over our crops.

Tourism

The tourist industry in Barbados continued to make significant gains during last year. The number of visitors rose by 22,000 to a record figure of 156,417, which represented a rate of increase of 16.5% over 1969. The estimated tourist expenditure also rose significantly from \$56.8 million to \$63.5 million, an increase of \$6.7 million or 11.8%. There was a significant increase in the average length of stay last year and this combined with the increase in visitors, resulted in a quite high increase in expenditure. Physical expansion of the industry continued and an estimated 710 beds were added to accommodation in 1970, bringing the total number of beds available in the industry at the end of December, 1970, to about 7,000.

Foreign Trade

Total merchandise trade increased significantly in 1970, with total imports rising from \$195 million in 1969 to \$235 million in 1970. This represented a rate of increase in the total value of imports of 21% as compared with an increase of 16% in 1969. As the economy grows, the demand of consumers and investors for a wide range of goods continues to expand and imports, which are required to satisfy a large part of this demand, continue to increase at relatively rapid rates. The biggest increases in imports were registered in machinery and transport equipment and manufactured goods. Food imports continued to constitute a large though decreasing proportion of total imports. In fact, since 1968, food imports have decreased from 23% to 21% of the total.

The improved performance of the sugar industry and increases in the exports of manufactured items resulted in an increase in total exports in 1970 by about \$6 million or 7.5%. As shown in the Economic Survey, exports of some of our manufactured commodities such as garments, are now assuming quite significant proportions. The growing adverse balance of trade (which totalled \$155 million in 1970) indicates the importance of increasing domestic exports of manufactured goods both within the CARIFTA area and to the markets of the developed world.

The large gap between imports and exports has been to a considerable extent financed by tourist receipts and by remittances from abroad. Even taking account of these items, however, there is still an appreciable deficit on visible and invisible transactions which presently is financed by various capital inflows. These capital flows are linked in turn with the growth of the economy. The overall strategy for containing the size of the current account deficit involves a combined policy of import-substitution, export promotion and mobilization of domestic resources.

Prices

After a decline in price levels in 1969, which seemed to indicate a return to the more normal trend of price increases of the order of 3-4% per annum experienced in the late 1950's and early 1960's, the index of retail prices in 1970 rose by 9%. Naturally, price increases affect every section of the community and there is, of course, a lot of concern being felt about the effects of rising prices on our standard of living. However, as pointed out earlier, the output of goods and services in the economy during 1970 rose by 17.6%, while the price level rose by 9%, so that in real terms the community was in fact substantially better off than previously.

Government for its part is doing what it can to contain price increases by the investigatory procedures of the Prices Commission and by the selective use of price controls. I think, however, that we would be deluding ourselves if we did not admit that we, in a sense, are the victims of a world-wide inflationary spiral initiated in North America and the United Kingdom, where the level of prices has been rising during the past two to three years in the region of 10-12% per annum. Furthermore, as an economy which depends to a large extent on imports, we find ourselves importing inflation, over which we have no control. Our aim must be to do what we can to insulate ourselves from the effects of these infla-

tionary pressures, ensure that advantage is not taken of the situation by increasing prices more than is absolutely necessary and to do our utmost to make sure that through higher productivity our output of goods and services exceeds the rate of price inflation, so that our real standard of living continues to rise.

Regional Economic Integration

In the year which has passed since I presented my last budget, the Caribbean Free Trade Area has been enlarged by the accession of Belize to membership. Trade between member countries continues to expand and our total trade with CARIFTA countries has grown from \$28.7 million in 1968 to \$42.5 million last year. Our imports from the CARIFTA areas have risen from \$17 million to \$26.3 million – this represents a deflection of trade from outside to within the area and increases in volume and prices of petroleum products – and our exports to CARIFTA from \$11.7 million to \$16.2 million between the years 1968 and 1970. These statistics should be sufficient answer to those skeptics who still endeavour to belittle the initiative taken by this Government in establishing the Free Trade Area.

International Monetary Scheme

During the first week of May there was a speculative rush into the West German Mark and other Strong European currencies, the Eurodollar being used as the vehicle. As a result of these currency disturbances the German and Netherlands authorities allowed their currencies to float outside the normal dealing margins, while the Austrian and Swiss revalued theirs. The currency changes had little effect on sterling and the exchange rate of sterling was not greatly affected.

5.15 p.m.

Barbados foreign reserves are in sterling and these are guaranteed by the British Government under the sterling guarantee arrangements entered into in September 1968. These arrangements were for a period of three years with an option to renew for a further period of two years. The option to renew must be exercised by September of this year. The Scheme appears to have worked satisfactorily but the next two years will be important as consideration is given to the scaling down of the reserve role of sterling if Britain enters the European Economic Community.

International Monetary Fund

Barbados became a member of the International Monetary Fund on the 29th December, 1970, with a quota of US\$13 million and a gold subscription of \$2 million. In January 1971 Barbados was allocated 1,391,000 units of special drawing rights which represent 10.7% of the Barbados quota of U.S. \$13 million. Special Drawing rights are intended to supplement existing reserve assets and may be used to meet balance of payments needs or in the light of developments of the country's official holdings of foreign exchange.

In April a team from the International Monetary Fund came to Barbados on a familiarisation visit and in the middle of June two experts arrived to advise on the establishment of the Central Bank.

Inter-American Development Bank

Since we joined this institution in 1969, we have been engaged in an intensive process of identifying priority areas for external financing and carrying out the economic and technical studies which are the necessary prelude to any loan application. As a result of this arduous but necessary preparation, projects in the following areas are being prepared and will, it is hoped, shortly be ready for implementation: agriculture, vocational education, fisheries, airport expansion, sewerage and industrial and tourism financing.

Commercial Banks

For the year ended 31st March, 1971 loans and advances by commercial banks increased by \$26.8 million to \$168.4 million while for the same period deposits increased by \$16.5 million to \$191.3 million. The ratio of advances to deposits stood at 88% compared with 81% at the end of March, 1970. Of the total increase in loans and advances \$3 million went to agriculture and other industries bringing the total advances to industry to \$105.4 million while \$23.8 million was in respect of personal and other

loans increasing the total advances under this head from \$39 million to \$62.8 million. This is one illustration of the need for a Central Bank in Barbados to regulate the flow of credit to appropriate sectors of the economy.

Central Bank

Two years ago I announced my Government's intention to establish a Central Bank. Progress has not been as rapid as I would have wished. An approach was made to a friendly Government for an expert with experience in Central banking in a developing country but the services of the expert in view have also been requested by another country. The International Monetary Fund has readily responded to our request for technical assistance in this respect and as I said above two experts have already visited Barbados. I am confident that plans for the establishment of the Bank will now move forward smoothly after the initial delay which we have experienced.

Barbados Development Bank

The Bank has just completed its second year of operations. It has been engaged in financing several development projects which contribute to national economic growth particularly in those areas which create new capital formation. The Bank also pays regard to the volume of job opportunities and income generation, foreign exchange earnings or savings, promotion of local entrepreneurial and technical skills as well as the use of local inputs. The resources of the Bank are very limited but during the year it assisted in the financing of twenty four projects to the extent of \$1.03 million.

With a view to increasing the resources of the Bank an approach has been made to the Inter-American Development Bank for a global loan. Negotiations are now nearing completion and it is expected that very shortly a first loan of E.C. \$2 million will be available from this source. I shall be making proposals for increasing the resources of the Bank.

Revenue Expenditure 1970/71

I shall now turn to a review of the financing of expenditure for the year 1970-71. The approved Estimates of current expenditure for 1970-71 amounted to \$89.5 million which together with Supplementary Estimates of \$3.9 million made a total approved expenditure of \$93.4 million. Actual expenditure amounted to \$85.6 million. At the time of budget statement last year the estimate of revenue for the year was revised to \$83.6 million though it was felt that from our examination of the growth pattern over the past few years the yield might have been somewhat larger. Actual revenue for the year amounted to \$90 million yielding a surplus on current account of \$4.4 million. The revenue yields were obtained from the following main sources -

	\$ million
Customs Duties and Internal Consumption Duties	37.02
Taxation (Provisional)	37.25
Other Revenue (Provisional)	15.74
	<u>\$90.01</u>

The last two figures are provisional figures, whereas the figures for Customs Duties and Consumption Duties are firm figures.

The main source of additional revenue was taxation \$6 million.

While Customs excise and internal consumption duties yielded \$37 million as compared with \$31.5 million in the previous year 1969/70 it is observed that the receipts for January and February 1971 were below those for corresponding period in 1970 and while the receipts for March 1971 were in excess of those for March 1970 yet the increase was less than the average for the nine months April to December 1970. It is also noted that the receipts for April and May 1971 are slightly less than the total for the same period in 1970. The June receipts however show an increase over June, 1970.

Capital Expenditure 1970/71

The approved Estimates of capital expenditure for 1970/71 was \$24.231 million. Supplementary Estimates for the year amounted to \$1.739 million making a total approved for the development programme of \$25.9 million. Actual expenditure was \$15.7 million.

The record of expenditure for the past five years will show that in 1970/71 there was a considerable increase in Government activity under the capital programme as compared with previous years. The details of expenditure are as follows –

1966/67	capital expenditure	\$11.0 million
1967/68	" "	8.5 "
1968/69	" "	8.8 "
1969/70	" "	11.0 "
1970/71	" "	15.7 "

5.25 p.m.

The Capital expenditure for 1970/71 was financed from the following sources –

Loans raised		\$ 6.9 million
Contributions from current revenue		4.4 "
Treasury Bills		3.5 "
Borrowing Revenue Equalization Fund		.6 "
Advances – Joint Consolidated Fund		.3 "
		<u>15.7 "</u>

Public Debt

At the 1st April, 1970 the funded Public Debt stood at \$54.9 million while outstanding Treasury Bills amounted to \$5.3 million. At the 31st March, 1971, the Public Debt had increased to \$61.8 million while Treasury Bills outstanding had increased to \$8.9 million. The external debt remains at \$25.7 million while local debt has increased to \$36.1 million. For 1970/71 the estimated cost of servicing the public debt was \$6.4 million or 7.1% of the revenue for the year.

Revenue and Expenditure 1971/72

The Approved Estimates for 1971/72 call for expenditure on the current and capital services of the Government to the extent of \$130.22 million. Current expenditure is estimated at \$98.96 million while capital expenditure is estimated at \$31.26 million. This compares with a total expenditure in 1970/71 of \$101.3 million and represents an increase of 28.6% over the total expenditure for 1970/71.

The current revenue is estimated at \$97.44 million and the deficit on the Current Account is \$1.5 million. Unspent balances at the time of Independence of development and welfare grants amount to \$468,000 to be spent on Quarters at the Mental Hospital; District hospital for Saint Michael and a forensic and pathological laboratory at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Apart from this the capital programme for this year will have to be financed mainly from loans to be raised.

Budget Proposals

The 1970 Budget imposed one major new tax, the Hotel Tax, and increases in certain existing charges, duties and taxes. The main increases were the road tax in gasoline and other petroleum distillates, consumption duties, landing and airport service charges and the property transfer tax. Returns under the Hotel Tax Act were due to be filed with the Department of Inland Revenue by the 31st May, 1971 and no payments on account of the tax were made during the financial year 1970/71. In general our targets from increased revenue have been reached as I have indicated in the out-turn for the year. I now come to the fiscal measures which I propose for the year 1971/72.

You will, I regret have to observe the "No Smoking" sign until I have come finally to a stop, but you may slacken your belts.

There will be no increased taxes on beer, rum, whisky, gin, cigarettes, motor vehicles, refrigerators, swim suits including bikinis, cocoa tea, cocoa or tea by themselves, coffee or any of the things to eat or drink or wear or carry which it has been customary for the mercantile community to hoard and keep in short supply in anticipation of the budget.

I offer my condolences to all those who have overstocked and under-sold during the past three months. Government revenue has already benefited by the excessive imports of a large range of such commodities.

Indeed I am so satisfied with the momentum which has been generated in government revenues by the fiscal policies which I have pursued during the past ten years that I do not propose to raise any additional taxes either of a direct or indirect nature but rather I propose to rely on our self-sustaining growth to see us through.

In other words Mr. Speaker, this is a *tax free budget*.

Income Tax

During the years 1965 to 1970 the number of income tax payers increased from 10,300 to 29,600. The actual number of cases reviewed increased from 14,000 in 1965 to 39,400 in 1970. The growth in the number of tax payers and potential tax payers is evidence of the rate of growth of the economy of the country. More people are receiving more in salaries, wages and income. The Income Tax collections have increased from \$12.7 million in 1965 to \$28.6 million in 1970/71.

Mr. Speaker, on the 7th May, 1963, I declared in the course of my budget speech that "the essence of our financial strategy is that we should be prepared to withdraw to prepared positions when the pressure on our resources is too great, but that we should always be ready to attach with all the resources we can muster when an opportunity, for expansion of the economy presents itself".

I have just declared this to be a tax free budget but I shall now proceed to outline the plan of attack in order to generate increased purchasing power in the hands of all income groups by what some may deem to be drastic changes in our income tax legislation.

The present allowances in respect of a single person and a married man have remained unchanged since 1957, while the child allowances have remained at the same level since 1959 except for a small increase of \$120 in the case of a child being educated outside the island which was granted in 1968 when the new Income Tax Act came into operation. The rate structure was also then revised in 1968 and while there was an easing of the burden mostly in the middle income brackets a maximum rate of 75% continued to be charged in respect of incomes in excess of \$24,000.

I am of the opinion that the time has come for a complete revision of allowances and the rate structure.

I propose the following scale of personal allowances.

	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Present</i>
Single Individual	\$ 1,200	\$ 800
Married Man	2,000	1,400
Child under 12 years	300	270
Child over 12 but under 16 years	400	360
Child over 16 years	500	420
Child over 16 and being educated outside Barbados	800	720

5.35 p.m.

As the law stands at present where a child in respect of whom the child allowance may be claimed has an income in its own right the allowance is reduced one dollar for each dollar that the child's income exceeds \$120. In view of the high cost of higher education I do not consider that the allowance in respect of a university student should be reduced because the student obtains a vacation job and has a small income of his or her own for the income year.

I therefore propose that there should be no reduction in the allowance granted in respect of a child who is receiving full-time education in an approved educational establishment where the child's income is derived from employment and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is satisfied that the income is applied towards the cost of the child's education.

The estimated cost of granting personal and child allowances on the proposed scale is \$1.579 million.

I am also proposing the following Schedule of rates should apply:

Taxable Income		Rate
Not exceeding	\$1,000	5%
1,001 —	2,000	10%
2,001 —	3,000	15%
3,001 —	4,000	20%
4,001 —	6,000	25%
6,001 —	8,000	30%
8,001 —	10,000	35%
10,001 —	12,000	40%
12,001 —	16,000	50%
16,001 —	30,000	60%
Over	30,000	65%

Honourable Members will note that the bottom rate of 3% has been abolished and incorporated in the 5% bracket of 1–1,000. The increase in the personal allowances ensures that no tax payer will suffer as a result of this change in the lower brackets. The relief increases from 5% in the case of taxpayers in the \$4,000–5,000 bracket to 10% in the case of those with taxable incomes in excess of \$19,000. The maximum rate has also been reduced from 75% to 65%.

The estimated cost of reducing the rate will amount to \$845,000. I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, parenthetically, that when I cite these rates they are on taxable incomes, so that a man who is married will not have to pay any tax at all until he works for more than \$2,000 a year. A man who is married and has a couple of children will probably not pay until he is working for something like \$2,700 or \$2,800 a year. This is what is being charged on your taxable income, so that a man who is married and has no children who is working for \$3,000 a year and has no insurance or no mortgages or anything of that kind will have to pay approximately \$50 in tax, which is \$1 a week. When he is in receipt of an income of \$60 a week, he will have to pay \$1 a week in tax.

Hon. Members will also note that the maximum rate of 75% has been reduced to 65%, and for very good reasons which, at least, two members on the opposite side would be familiar with. That is that when people get in this bracket the evasion is so great and so many legal devices and usages are resorted to that it is not really worth our while trying to collect the tax in that bracket. We hope that many more of them will invest in the economy. All of us in the legal profession are acquainted with customers of that ilk.

Despite the significant reliefs which I have already announced, I know that Honourable Members are waiting to hear whether I have anything further to say under the head of income tax and in particular about the subject which is raised annually at budget time, whether in the form of Questions, Resolutions or Statements from the Minister of Finance himself. I refer to the separate assessment of the wife's earned income. Let me say at the outset that I do not have to be converted to the concept of separate assessment of the earned income of working wives, but as Minister of Finance I must examine the realities of the situation. So, Mr. Speaker, since the last Budget, you will not need any conversion yourself.

In my budget speech delivered on 30th June, 1964, I said that the middle income groups in this island were hard pressed to meet demands placed upon their resources for housing and even the normal requirements of comfortable family existence. I had therefore

examined the feasibility of assessment of the wife's income separately from her husband's. That was in 1964.

In my 1970 budget speech I said "Government is not unaware of the effect of the rates of tax on earned incomes whether that income is derived by one person or jointly by husband and wife. I regret that in 1970 I can make no concession in this respect, but the position is being kept under review.

Under a system of separate assessment of husband and wife, the real benefit is that the wife's earned income is taxed from the bottom of the scale. That is under separate assessment.

It may be of advantage to some couples to have a joint assessment of their earned incomes as under separate assessment the husband cannot claim the allowance as a married man nor the wife's earned income allowance. The separation of the earned incomes may be claimed at the option of the taxpayer so that he may elect to be taxed in the manner which suits him best. I therefore propose that with effect from year of assessment 1972 (i.e. in respect of 1971 income) provision should be made for the separate assessment of the earned incomes of husband and wife, subject to such tax avoidance safeguards as may be necessary. The system of separate assessment of earned income of husband and wife requires the retention of provision for a wife's earned income allowance, and I propose that this should be increased from \$540 to \$800. It is proposed that where separate assessment is claimed the allowance of \$2,000 for a married couple be available, \$1,000 to the husband and \$1,000 to the wife.

Each may claim the life assurance premiums payable on policies on his/her life, but the maximum which the husband and wife may together be entitled shall not exceed the maximum allowance of \$1,300 as at present provided for under the Act. Each spouse will not be entitled to the maximum allowance of \$1,300 on life insurance policies.

The estimated cost to the revenue of separate assessment (husband's and wife's earned income) is \$1.476 million and some 3,000 married couples will benefit from this provision. The total cost of all the reliefs will therefore be in the region of \$3.9 million.

Some hon. members may wish to know what is in it for them. I can only say that, from calculations which I have made, the average husband and wife claiming separate assessment will benefit to the tune of approximately \$521. Some will benefit more. Those in the joint income bracket of \$18,000 a year, a \$1,000 for the husband and \$500 for the wife will benefit to the extent of \$110 per month or roughly \$1,300 per year from this separate assessment. I do not think we can do more.

5.45 p.m.

Under the present system of self assessment of income tax no changes affecting the rates and allowances of a year of assessment should be made after the income tax returns of that year have been filed. The changes proposed above in respect of rates and allowances will apply in respect of 1971 income, i.e. year of assessment 1972.

It is not possible to make this retroactive to 1970. That would be both unrealistic and almost dishonest to the Treasury of this Island.

It will however, take about three months for the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to revise administrative machinery to give effect to these changes.

What I should say there, Mr. Speaker, is that there are persons like ourselves, that is you and I, who do not see part of their emoluments. They are deducted under the Pay As You Earn system. In my opinion we are entitled right now to some kind of refund. Maybe not in your case because Your Honour may be in receipt of other large sums of unearned income, but I am not in that position. I said "may". But certainly with the exception of the Hon. Shadow Minister of Finance who might be in the same position as Your Honour, people like me and the Deputy Prime Minister get straight salaries, not unearned incomes, and we feel that we should get what the hon. member on the opposite side, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would call our "berry" now in 1971; but we may have to wait for another three months before these refunds are paid out. But it does apply to all those deductions which have been made in respect of P.A.Y.E. in this year 1971, but not for last year.

It will be necessary to prepare New Tax Tables and to give employees the opportunity to file new Declarations in respect of claims for family allowances.

Investment allowances

Substantial assistance is being given in promoting industrial development. During 1970 the manufacturing sector accounted for 10.1% of the Gross Domestic Product and sugar also contributed about 10%. In 1969 the sugar crop amounted to 139,000 tons and in 1970 154,000. In 1971 it has dropped to approximately 135,000. The prospects for the 1972 crop are not good in view of the low rainfall so far this year. The sugar industry faces technological problems associated with its reorganisation. The Government is actively pursuing a programme of diversification which calls for new skills and new equipment. I propose that the investment allowance in respect of agricultural and sugar machinery and equipment be increased from 20% to 40%. The increase will take effect in respect of the income year 1971.

If a planter buys a D9 tractor for \$100,000, this is part of his expenses and he will be allowed to deduct 40 per cent as his investment allowance and then depreciate on the normal straight line basis of 20 per cent over the next five years. So he can claim it on both sides, both as an expenditure and an investment allowance before he is assessed.

Social Security and National Insurance Pensions

It is the policy of this Government to encourage persons to retire to Barbados and many Barbadians have returned to Barbados to live after having spent most of their working life abroad. Under the existing income tax law the Social Security Pensions of those persons are liable to income tax in Barbados while they are not liable to tax in the country of source because the contributions were not admissible as deductions for income tax purposes when paid. These persons are placed in the position that tax has been paid on the contribution and tax is now payable in Barbados on the pension. In fact they are taxed twice. I therefore propose that social security pensions received in the island should be exempt from tax in Barbados. We shall try to secure similar exemptions in respect of National Insurance pensions flowing from Barbados. This is where Barbadians have gone to live in the United States or Canada, we are hoping to negotiate with these Governments in the course of our double taxation agreements, which should come shortly, that they too should be exempt from the payment of tax.

In order not to open myself to the charge of granting tax exemption on U.S.A. Social Security pensions but not on Barbados National Insurance Pensions I also propose that pensions payable under the National Insurance Scheme should be exempted from income tax. However, I do not propose any change in the admissibility of contributions payable under the National Insurance Scheme as deductions for income tax purposes. In other words Barbadians will have it both ways. The contributions will be deductible in arriving at taxable income and pensions will be tax free.

National Pensions Plan**Mr. Speaker,**

I hope to introduce a National Pensions plan during the next financial year and a general review of old age pensions is being undertaken as well as a re-examination of the "means test".

Estate and Succession Duties

Under the Estate and Succession Duties Act, estates not exceeding the value of \$4,800 are exempt from duty. About 45 – 50 cases are received each year in the range \$5,001 – 10,000 and the duty involved is less than \$10,000. It is considered that the exemption limit which is at present \$4,800 should be raised and that estates should not be liable to duty unless the 'principal value' exceeds \$10,000. The loss of duty is estimated at \$10,000. The rate will be 1% between 10,000 and 15,000 and 2% between 15,000 and 36,000.

General Rate

I propose that the general rate be levied at 25% of the ratable value, the same as for 1970/71. It is expected that this is the last occasion on which the general rate will be levied on the present system as the new system on which the Valuation Division of the Ministry of Finance has been working with the help of the United Nations technical assistance for the past four years will come into operation in the 1972/73 financial year.

Barbados Savings Bank

The total deposits of the Savings Bank at the end of December 1970 amounted to \$17.8 million an increase of \$1.2 million or 7.2% over the same figure for 1969. Although the level of deposits for 1970 was higher than that for 1969 the volume of savings has remained fairly static over the past 10 years. For 1971 there has been an improvement and at the 30th June, 1971, deposits amounted to \$18.35 million. Lack of proper physical facilities has contributed to the stagnation in the growth of the Bank and I propose to remedy this by the construction of a high rise building to house the Bank and other Government departments. As a further inducement to attract deposits I propose to raise the tax exemption limit of \$400 to \$600. At the present rate of interest this means that the interest on deposits up to \$15,000 will be exempt from tax. In the case of married couples each spouse may be granted the exemption and therefore \$1,200 or interest on savings of \$30,000 may be exempted from income tax.

National Development Bonds

In its fiscal policy my Government is guided by three main principles:

- (1) the maximum mobilisation of local resources.
- (2) an equitable distribution of the tax burden.
- (3) stimulus to the investment of capital in productive enterprises.

This Budget gives relief to every tax payer more especially to the working wife. I consider that the additional income which will be available to our residents should not all be used in consumer spending, but opportunities should be available for increased saving. In pursuance of my policy to maximize the mobilisation of local resources and at the same time provide a stimulus to the investment of capital in productive enterprises, I propose that National Development Bonds be made available to investors. These Bonds will be issued by the Barbados Development Bank and will be guaranteed by the Government. The issues will be tax free and the first issue will carry interest at the rate of 6% but the rate will be reviewed from time to time according to market conditions. The Bonds will be available in multiples of \$100 and the interest from holdings up to \$20,000 will be free of income tax. The Bonds will not be subject to Property Transfer Tax as under the Property Transfer Tax Act property transferred not exceeding the value of \$25,000 is exempt from the tax.

5.55 p.m.

I also propose that Government Debenture issues will be made more attractive. I propose that the interest from Government Debentures should not be aggregated with other income but be taxed separately at the rate of 12½%. This will apply to interest from outstanding issues as well as from

new issues. By this measure resident investors are placed in the same position as non-resident investors who are now subject to tax at the rate of 12½% on interest from developmental enterprises. I estimate the immediate cost of this proposal to be in the region of \$400,000.

Summary

During the past 10 years I have introduced many measures which have succeeded in putting the revenues of this country on a sound basis. In 1966-67 the year of independence, revenue was \$43.9 million. For 1970/71 it was \$90 million and represented an annual increase of 19.8%.

In this budget, a tax free budget, I propose a significant easing of the tax burden. The main features of the reliefs are —

- (1) to separate the earned incomes of husband and wife for purpose of assessment to income tax;
- (2) to increase the personal allowances;
- (3) to increase the wife's earned income allowance;
- (4) to increase the allowance in respect of children;
- (5) remove the provision for reduction of the child allowance in certain cases;
- (6) to provide a new income tax rate structure;
- (7) to increase the investment allowance in respect of agricultural and sugar machinery and equipment;
- (8) to exempt social security pensions received in Barbados from income tax;
- (9) to exempt from tax pensions payable under the National Insurance Scheme.
- (10) to exempt from Estate and Succession duties certain small estates;
- (11) to fix the general rate on property;
- (12) to issue National Development Bonds income tax free;
- (13) to levy tax at a rate of 12½% on interest from Government Debentures.
- (14) to increase the exemption on Savings Bank interest from \$400 to \$600.

Conclusion

Mr. Speaker, the measures which I have outlined are expected to cost the revenue some \$4.3 million. The deficit on the Approved Estimates is \$1.5 million. This brings the total deficit to \$5.8 million.

At the end of 1970 there were 103,500 persons paying contributions to the National Insurance Scheme. In the same year there were just under 30,000 taxable returns filed with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. Only 30% of the working population therefore had to make any contribution to personal taxation.

With the new reforms which I have introduced today a further 10,000 persons approximately in the lower income brackets will be relieved of income tax. While it is true that many more persons have been required to file tax returns than before, one must realise that this increase is due to rising wages and salaries so that more and more workers have been moving into those levels of earnings and activity which for many years appeared to be sacred preserves of the classes.

I am confident that the reliefs which I have granted to the masses and some classes can be made good by accelerating and intensifying the investigation programmes of the Department of Inland Revenue. Already the results achieved are encouraging and I intend to strengthen the Department to enable it to deal even more effectively with the problem of tax evasion by those who should and can afford to pay.

Our aim is voluntary compliance with the income tax laws and my advice to all those who are not complying with the law is to do so NOW.

In my 1970 Budget Statement I stated that in pursuance of my policy to rely upon the principle of deficit budgeting to avoid a deflationary situation and to encourage consumer demand I did not seek to raise the further sum of \$6.0 million which would be necessary to eliminate the deficit for that year altogether. The result was a surplus on the current budget of \$4.4 million.

Today I am faced with a similar situation and my policy remains the same. The hope which I expressed a year ago that our expected perform-

ance for 1970 would go even further in improving not only our improved standard but the very quality of life which we enjoy in this country which has been fulfilled, and I have every confidence that our performance in 1971-72 will mean an even fuller life for our people.

The decade of reconstruction has been successfully negotiated. It has not been easy. The society we have inherited bears within it many social and economic contradictions which material advantages such as we have secured cannot alone eradicate.

Those of us in public life ought to concentrate on the upliftment of our people who still have such a long way to travel rather than devoting our efforts to the personal destruction of those whom we envy.

Some of us will have to mark time to allow those who have been kept back to catch up with us. That is why we redistribute the wealth of the country on the principle of the maximum social advantage. No member of this House has any right to complain about the burden of taxes. There are many countries where no direct taxation exists which are far less congenial places to live in than this land of ours.

If we are to go forth into the decade of the seventies with confidence then there can be no looking back. No carping criticism. No "I am all right Jack" attitudes. No exploitation of workers. No victimisation of minority groups on the excuse of colour or race. No leaving the weak to go to the wall. There is only one command to Barbados for the seventies now that we have left the security of our prepared positions. **ADVANCE.**

6.05 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until tomorrow at 4.30 p.m., for among other things and for 68 minutes thereafter there will be Private Members' Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
6.08 p.m.

On resumption

REPORTS LAID

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the business starts, I have the honour to lay the interim report of the Debates Committee, and also the interim report of the Standing Orders Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, apparently there is some misunderstanding here; when I was about to move the motion for the suspension last evening I fixed the time at 5 o'clock, the suggestion came from the other side that we should meet at half past four and I amended my motion to suit, but I thought the understanding was, and certainly the understanding of this side was, that the first thing to be done today would be the replies from the other side to the Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. St. JOHN: I understood that it would start at 5 o'clock. What about the Questions?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think we will take a suspension until five minutes to five. I beg to move that this sitting be further suspended until five minutes to five.

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

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

4.35 p.m.

On resumption

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the leave of the House to move the following motion: "that this House takes note of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the year 1971-72 but regrets that no fiscal measures have been proposed to combat the steady trend of inflation, to reduce the price of basic foodstuffs, to assist old age pensioners, to reduce the incidence of indirect taxation on the great majority of working citizens of Barbados, or to stimulate the sagging conditions of key sections of the economy."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked leave to proceed with that motion now and unless there is any objection leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. member to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, every year, sooner or later, and this year to mesh with the Democratic

Labour Party's election campaign, the budget speech is presented by the Minister of Finance. I say the budget speech rather than a budget speech because it is so much the same every time. Every year we come to the House to hear the Minister of Finance say that the national income of Barbados is rising, except of course during 1964 when the national income fell. We hear that tax collections have exceeded the estimate, we hear that expenditure has fallen below the estimates and every year also, we hear that imports have risen and the balance of trade has worsened. We also hear that the budget is not a good housekeeping budget.

To all these points I will reply in due course, but at the start, Mr. Speaker, I would like to select a phrase from this year's speech, a self-description by the Prime Minister as "an unrepentant product of the Keynesian revolution in economic thought". Keynesian revolution was in the 1920s, and I cannot say a great deal about the university which the Prime Minister attended, but at Oxford University, we in the economic school were expected to read and know Keynesian general theory by the end of our first week of study. It is clear from the Prime Minister's ten years of economic stewardship in Barbados that he has never got past that first week of studies, for he obviously has never appreciated the dangers of wholeheartedly accepting the Keynesian theories; these dangers, of course, are the principal dangers which we think beset the Barbadian economy today, the danger of inflation. The loss of value of the dollar, the steady rise in prices, the vain pursuit of more wages to keep up with the cost of living, all this is as characteristic of Barbados, indeed more, as it is of the full employment economies of Western Europe and North America; the only difference is that Barbados has inflation and unemployment together, a situation that nothing the Prime Minister has ever said suggests to us on this side that he knows how to handle.

To deal first with the cost of living, we all know in Barbados, and we see it every day when we go into a supermarket, that the cost of living is rising, but we are so much bludgeoned by what I may call "Democratic" - and I do not mean Democratic with a small 'd' - economics, that we do not realise how much it is rising. I am going to adopt the Minister's own definition as expressed in the Economic Survey of what is a spectacular increase of price inflation; that is only another way of saying a vast increase in the cost of living. In the Economic Survey laid in the House last week, on page 2 there is a survey of world economic trends, and in the survey will be found the perfectly correct statement that price inflation is on the increase in the developed countries. I quote now from the world Economic Survey: "The most spectacular rate of price increase, 7%, was recorded in Germany", according to the Economic Survey, it is a pity that those responsible for writing that part of the Economic Survey did not turn on a few pages to see that although 7% is the most spectacular rise in the world outside, yet the cost of living has gone up in one year by 9% in Barbados.

5.05 p.m.

This means that in Barbados all Barbadians had to earn 9¢ more in every dollar just to buy the same amount of food, clothing, of services and of the other things that go to make up the cost-of-living basket in this country. The cost of living, Sir, has risen no less than 30% since Barbados has been Independent, and who among us can put our fingers on any measure which would convince us that the Government has done or intends to do something about such a spectacular and dangerous rise?

We have heard a great deal about the increase in the National income - increase, on the face of it, of 17%. The Economic Survey very properly relates this increase to the increase in the cost of living and deflates it down to a more realistic figure, but this is not the only deflation that has to be applied to the, apparent, increase in the National Income in Barbados. It is no accident that our National income is said to have increased last year by \$41 million, and that imports into Barbados have also increased by the precise figure of \$41 million.

Well, what kind of increase in the National wealth is it when every penny that can be accounted for in the increased income column has gone out of Barbados into an import column. It means that, in effect, those who worked for the extra \$41 million in services and who supplied goods have all being working for the countries abroad which traditionally supply us with our imports. Imports into Barbados, Sir, have expanded in a way that I do not think any of us could have conceived 5 years ago, and at the same time our exports have gone up by very little indeed.

I want to emphasise the exact mathematical relationship between the increase in the imports and the increase in National income. If we are generating more income in Barbados only to spend it abroad, what are we doing for the workers of Barbados? What does it mean to say that our National income is going up, if it is flowing out of the country as fast as we are receiving it. Exports have never, at any stage, under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party kept pace with imports. Every year for 10 years the exports of Barbados have gone up only a little in value, while the visible trade balance has widened and widened and widened.

As usual, Sir, sugar and sugar products are our biggest exports. This year, or rather in the year under review, had it not been for some increase in the sugar crop and some increase in the money received for sugar exports, there would be an even worse deficit of our visible trade. Our second biggest export in 1969 and indeed in 1970 was that humble crustacean or mollusc - I believe that is how it is described in the Economic Survey - the shrimp. Shrimps provided in 1969 over \$7 million in exports for Barbados - our second largest export. In 1970 they fell to under \$5 million, but for 1971 when we come to present our Economic Survey for next year, we will have to say that shrimps no longer figure among these statistics.

I accuse the Government of willfully, deliberately ignoring the realities of the export business in Barbados and of the balance in trade when it wantonly only drove the shrimp industry away from Barbados - I am going to use some hard words now, Sir - to make way for shady associates and persons in high places to the detriment of all Barbadians; to make way for people who knew nothing about the industry and whose only qualification was the friendship of those in high places, and we have destroyed our second biggest export for those persons.

It would be obviously impossible for the best intentioned Government, having lost over 10% of its exports, to make any real impact in its first or second year on the balance of payments. Far from meeting our needs, Sir, as we hear suggested from time to time by a policy of imports substitution, the position is worsening every single year. As we get richer, in theory, we are turning more and more to imports. At this stage I would like to employ some figures. Statistics can be made to say anything. When we see them manipulated by those who have sometimes in the past, although I would not say quite so much this year, been responsible for the Economic Survey, we see things which we cannot readily believe.

I am going to go back and try to compare like with like. Now, 1961 was the last year of the Barbados Labour Party rule in this country. In that year imports into Barbados were \$80.263 million. This represented 65% of the National income of that time of \$119.8 million. This figure, the relationship of imports to the National income, can be quite an important one. When imports get too high there is usually an imbalance and a trade deficit that has to be corrected by fiscal measure, but at that time in 1961 the trade deficit of Barbados was only \$37 million and it represented less than 30% of the then National income. Only 30% of the National income had, at that time, to be imported to close this trade deficit.

Now, at this time in 1970, imports of \$235.022 million represent 85% - no less than 85% of the National income of \$278 million. Our trade deficit is now more than half of the National income. If the United States had to face that, no American tourist would be allowed to leave New York. If Britain had to face it the £ would be equal to the \$ - it would be one for one - but Barbados seems to think that it can go along with a situation like that and not worry very much about it.

Our import bill is one of the highest in the world. In these regions it is exceeded proportionately only by Curacao, but Curacao is in a special situation. It imports between \$600 million and \$700 million (US) of crude oil a year and exports it at a profit. Though, on the face of it, Curacao's import bill is three times its National income that is for re-export trade which we in Barbados have not got to any real degree. These are matters that must occupy anybody who has more than a nodding acquaintance of economics. These are matters which we cannot find are being taken with the seriousness that they deserve on the other side of the House.

5.15 p.m.

In the United Kingdom we have seen sterling devalued twice with consequent damage to the Barbadian economy in twenty-five years as a direct result of massive trade deficits and balance of payments difficulties which the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Britain finds it impossible to deal with. It is only the backing of sterling that has served Barbados from the massive economic misfortunes that normally result from balance of payment difficulties and balances of payments that go as wrong as ours. I want to issue a word of warning, Mr. Speaker. The Central Bank of Barbados which was referred to by the Prime Minister in his speech, whenever it comes into being, if it ever does, cannot cut loose from our associations with the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority and our association with sterling without massive re-adjustments to our import situation. It cannot expect in my view to declare war against its former currency associates without the sort of re-adjustments that I do not believe this Government at any rate is ready to face. The need for capital imports from the sterling area to balance our trade deficit remains imperative, and until a real policy of import substitution is put into effect, Mr. Speaker, we will never be able to do without it. What is the Government doing? Nothing except talking? One would believe that when year after year the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals contain a realisation of the problem, that at some stage something positive would be put forward by the Government as a policy to deal with it. Never at any stage have we heard of such a policy.

The shrimp industry, if I may refer to that again, might have been of some assistance. A great deal was built around the prospects of the shrimp industry. The Development Plan so laboriously worked out, so long in gestation, has whole chapters devoted to the shrimp industry. Not only will the shrimp industry fail to contribute anything to assist our balance of payment but whole chapters of the Development Plan will now be obsolete, those chapters relating to the building of special shrimp harbours and giving employment by so doing. Mr. Speaker, my party leader, my colleagues and I are well aware that the problem of balance of payments is going to be one of the most dangerous with which the Democratic Labour Party regime will have saddled us when we take over later this year. We will face it as we at least know it has to be faced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with taxation. I was very amused by the Prime Minister's suggestion that the merchants in Bridgetown have stocked up goods in anticipation of the Budget. In other words, what he was accusing the merchants of, is putting goods which were accustomed at the old rate into the warehouse, to bring them out in the hope that the customs duties and import duties on them would be increased and they could then sell them and make an extra profit at a new price. That is what he was accusing the merchants of. I do not accuse them of that in 1971, because I think that the mercantile community of Bridgetown is as capable of seeing the writing on the wall as anybody else. Could the merchants be so mad as to think that in 1971 taxation

was going to be raised? No, Sir. Everyone knows this is election year. This is the opening salvo in the election campaign. The Government has been saving up for three years to produce a give away Budget. Is it conceivable that the Prime Minister could raise taxes in election year? Never, Mr. Speaker, not at any stage. No Government that was guilty of such political immorality as to redraw and gerrymander the constituencies of this Island in election year to help among others the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to retain his seat could ever think of raising taxes in election year. The two things just do not go together. This Government has not shown the altruism, the placing itself above day to day party considerations that would allow it to raise taxes in election year; so let us not be beguiled by the fact that the Government has been able to save up \$5 million and give it back to the income tax payers in 1971. But, Sir, I would say this: I would like all hon. members to note that the Prime Minister has taken the advice of the Opposition on this question of income tax. On the 8th June, 1971, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown moved a Resolution in this House, and I would like to read it out:-

"WHEREAS there is strong public feeling that the incomes of husband and wife be separately assessed for income tax purposes;

AND WHEREAS the Government has failed during its terms of office to introduce legislation providing for such separate assessments of income;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take immediate steps to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968, to provide for the separation of the incomes of husband and wife for income tax assessments and for substantial increases in the relevant income tax allowances and for exempting from taxation the incomes of all persons earning \$25.00 per week or less."

That was the 8th June, 1971. From the word "go" the Leader of the House wanted to block that Resolution. At a subsequent date he prevented us from debating it, but it is there as a matter of record. It is also a matter of record that for a year now on public platforms we who have seen the position with the collections of income tax have been saying that the income tax payers of Barbados deserve some relief. We have been saying that for twelve months. The reports of our political meetings are no doubt in the hands of those responsible for Security to confirm what I say now.

Mr. Speaker, now a reduction in income tax of course helps the rich more than it helps the poor. For example in the highest brackets here where the reduction is undoubtedly highest, a man earning \$100,000 a year, if there be any such in Barbados, will save \$7,000 per annum in income tax. A man earning \$25 a week if he is a single man, the man referred to in the Resolution of my hon. friend, the learned member for Bridgetown, will save, if my calculations are correct, \$10 a year. An unmarried

Minister of Government will save \$50 a month, but that of course is in addition to the \$500 a month which is already tax free which Ministers of Government enjoy. As for separate assessment of taxes, Sir, that will be a matter for those who have high income wives. I trust that the House noticed when the Prime Minister mentioned that particular aspect in his give-away that the Leader of the House thumped the table more enthusiastically than most. I trust the Leader of the House has not got some secret unknown to all hon. members. That apart, Mr. Speaker, on the Prime Minister's own figures, out of over 103,000 persons who are paying national insurance contributions every week, only 30,000 are paying income tax. This means that over 70% of the working population of Barbados are not helped by this Budget at all. Over 70% of the workers who are paying their national insurance weekly have got no relief whatsoever from this Budget introduced by the Prime Minister, and even for those who were paying, the need for relief was enormous, Mr. Speaker, income tax collections were only \$15 million at the time of Independence in 1966, they rose despite a slight reduction in rates to over \$37 1/2 million in 1970, they multiplied by considerably more than 2; at the same time the national income rose much less than twice, so we have an equation, we have income tax more than doubling the national income less than doubling, therefore income tax payers were paying out tax much faster than income had in fact been rising, and in those circumstances income tax payers deserve some relief and that is why we in the Opposition, when we saw those figures we made our minds up to press for relief for income tax payers and to force relief for income tax payers on the Prime Minister in this year's Budget. There was a clear need, and I only regret that it was not made earlier by a clear answer, but that the Prime Minister saved it up for election year; let us not think of course that the relief has been all that substantial, next year's collection will tell the tale, but as I said if my calculations are correct even for the well paid persons like Ministers of Government with \$1,400 a month the relief will only be \$50 a month, you have to get even richer than that, Mr. Speaker, before you really begin to get any benefit from this budget for the rich. Income tax benefits 30% of the people who are earning money in this country, but what of those whom it does not benefit, what of the 70% who are given no relief in this budget? These are the people who are too poor to pay income tax, they are not however too poor to pay out the same \$37 million every year of indirect taxation, there are still paying that out, they are still paying out import duties on foodstuffs, import duties on the things they buy in the shop, they are still paying out excise duties, they are still paying out consumption tax, the 70% of the taxpayers in this country who get no relief from this budget are still having to face a high cost of living.

5.25 p.m.

It is our view on this side that the Government had a sufficient surplus to play with to have allowed some measure of reduction of indirect taxation. Take

chicken parts, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the item of diet which today occupies the position that salt fish occupied 10 years ago; is there to be no subsidisation, no reduction of the cost of chicken parts? Is there to be no cheaper price for pork? We have gone through a great deal of torment which I will freely confess I cannot understand between the Minister of Agriculture, the senior member for St. Andrew, and the butchers trying to decide on a price for pork that will be equitable for the producer and cheap for the consumer. I myself am still unaware of what the final position is, I only know that pork is no longer a cheap food available to the great masses of the people of Barbados. Fresh vegetables - where is our policy of import substitution? Years ago the Tripartite Economic Survey said that one plantation of 500 acres, properly managed, could produce all the fresh vegetables now imported into Barbados; a proper policy at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, coupled with assistance to farmers, would give some hope to those agriculturalists who are being forced out of sugar because of an uncertain future and the low present prices, and at the same time it would give some assistance to the people of Barbados who by now have higher standards of what to aim at by way of diet, but the Government gives no indication in this budget that it understands those problems.

The cost of living index has not risen overall but for food and drink alone, it rose more than 10 points in respect of food and drink in the year 1970. This I suggest is the most significant thing about the budget, that no help has been given to the poorest classes of the community by definition, because they are too poor to pay income tax, it is the Prime Minister's own definition, the 70% who are too poor to pay income tax have been given nothing whatsoever in this budget except an empty promise that no taxes are to be raised this year.

I turn finally, Mr. Speaker, to what I am going to call as a topic good housekeeping. Without fail the Prime Minister annually reminds us of his immediate predecessor as Minister of Finance and his predecessor's alleged good housekeeping approach to public finance. Anyone who has heard the praise that the Prime Minister lavished at the funeral of the late Dr. H. G. Cummins could not imagine that this was the same man of whom the Prime Minister so often and so contemptuously spoke when he discussed Dr. Cummins' exercises in the office of Minister of Finance, and we are reminded again in this budget speech of little the Prime Minister thought of his predecessor as a Minister of Finance. He said he is not pursuing any good housekeeping policies of putting something by for a rainy day; I want to explode some of this, I want to remind hon. members of what the Barbados Labour Party regime put by for a rainy day, I want to remind hon. members that when we had a budget of under \$20 million we undertook a capital project, the Deep Water Harbour, of an amount greater than the annual revenue of Barbados, we had confidence in the future, we felt that we could raise the money, we felt we should raise the money, we did raise the money, we built the Deep Water Harbour, and let no one in here, Mr. Speaker, say anything about charges of debt. At the time of the

Deep Water Harbour the Prime Minister opposed its building, he said that the Deep Water Harbour should have been left to the merchants to build, - the merchants had been trying since 1880 to build it - it was opposed by that side, just as the building of Government Headquarters was opposed, so was the building of the Deep Water Harbour. We at least have acted as a slightly more responsible Opposition, we hope.

Despite the small revenue of those days we raised the money, we built the Harbour, the Harbour today not only pays the interest on the loan which was raised to finance it, it is paying off for itself at the rate of 2 1/2%, it is sinking its own loan - as the expression goes - and it is helping to pay off some of the public debt incurred by the Democratic Labour Party Government at the rate of 1 1/2% per year. That is the first thing that the Barbados Labour Party Government put by for a rainy day, that is what our good housekeeping went in. Seawell Airport, at the same time as Senator Ronald Mapp, one of the finest executive Ministers ever to sit in this House, was building the Deep Water Harbour, he was also responsible for rebuilding Seawell Airport to take us into the jet age, and building the whole Pine Housing Area and the whole Grazettes Housing Area.
5.35 p.m.

Ronald Mapp as the Minister carried on all three projects at the same time. Mr. Speaker, that is what we meant when we talk about putting something by for a rainy day.

Every time the economics of the Barbados Labour Party regime are attacked you must remember that, with a revenue that went up to the \$20 million towards the end of our term of office, we left the people of this Island with projects none of which have been equalled by the Democratic Labour Party regime. We started the Hospital in addition to the three projects I have already mentioned. That is what, when you talk about good housekeeping, we in the Barbados Labour Party mean. With a revenue of \$100 million, has this Government done anything comparable? Has this Government planned anything comparable for the forthcoming financial year? Is this Government planning any Harbour extensions?

I know it will be in our manifesto, Mr. Speaker, and when the people of Barbados elect us to power we will, again, be taking up the torch where we left off in 1961. Do you know what we have, Mr. Speaker, with this Government? We have a situation where more money is being spent on Foreign Service than on a school building programme. It is more important to maintain diplomats in New York and London in luxury than it is to build secondary schools in which the children of Barbados can be educated.

When the Democratic Labour Party talk about education, do you know what they are talking about now, Mr. Speaker? They talk about what they think the policy of the Barbados Labour Party is going to be. They say that we are going to destroy this and destroy that. Well, just let me explain something, Mr. Speaker. This may not altogether be the

place to outline a manifesto, but we, far from interfering with the School Meals Service, are going to see to it that every school in this Island has a School Meals Service. That will be a cardinal point of our policy; that indeed was in the manifesto of our Party in 1966, and it is our goal to manage the finances of Barbados in such a way that the goal of free secondary education for all which has been shown over the years to be something that the people in Barbados deeply and sincerely want will, finally be achieved. It is our aim that education will be free at the secondary level not only in the Government Secondary Schools, but in every Independent Approved School as well. That is the Barbados Labour Party's policy on education.

Mr. Speaker, we give an undertaking to those hon. members - I much regret not including yourself - who will be with us in this Chamber next year that we will manage our finances; we will so budget as to make our goals possible. The 1971 manifesto of our Party will not be like the 1961 manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party - full of unfulfilled promises.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the first Budget Speech introduced into this House by the Minister of Finance. I have heard him speak of it often enough, but I have every confidence that I have heard his last.

I now beg to move the Resolution standing in my name.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in seconding the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. Ever since the Economic Survey was published by the Democratic Labour Party, and we on this side began to study it, we recognised that it was yet another document in typical Democratic Labour Party form, style and content in that when we looked at the figures we saw that it was pure electioneering propaganda. The more we studied it the more we were convinced that this was a document devised with usual lack of intellectual integrity which is now characteristic of the Democratic Labour Party.

We also know full well that, fed by the Democratic Labour Party propaganda, the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party for weeks and months now have been throughout the length and breadth of Barbados exciting the hopes of the public of Barbados that this Budget by their alleged miracle man would bring relief to the suffering masses of this country. Mr. Speaker, the miracle man has failed to perform on this occasion. The position is, in our opinion, the true test of humanity of man to man in a society such as ours and the good intentions of a Government would be how the Government shares the wealth it has created.

We were shocked to find that the Minister of Finance on this occasion, when in his mood of giving away, decided to dish it out to a small section of the

community who, although hard pressed, could afford to bear their suffering in relation to the large mass of people who could not afford to bear their suffering. We were surprised Mr. Speaker, to find that nothing was done for old age pensioners - 13,000 of them in this Budget. There are 13,000 of them, and \$5 a week is the measly sum on which the Government feels that they are entitled to live. Mr. Speaker, for months and indeed for years, the hon. senior member for St. James, who is our shadow Minister in this respect, has been drawing to the attention of the Government the serious condition of these people, their need for help, and how the rise in the cost of living affected them probably more than anybody else being on a fixed income. Mr. Speaker, what do we have? We have an afterthought by the Minister of Finance. If you look at his prepared speech you will see a little slip of paper that was slipped in after he recognised the attack the Opposition was going to bring on him. What has he done? He has said that he promises them in the next financial year to see what he can do. Mr. Speaker, we give them the pledge that it would not be him who would be able to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has dealt with some aspects of this Budget. I want to deal with other aspects of it because, like the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the next most significant thing about this Budget, as I see it, is its omission. The Government cannot fool any person in Barbados today. We know most people recognise it, and I would have hoped that the Minister of Finance would have had the courage to face it, that at the present moment in 1971 in Barbados many important sectors of this economy are sagging. We have witnessed this year the lowest crop in agriculture for the last twenty-three or twenty-five years. What is most significant, Sir, is that in the tourist industry whose contribution to the economy of this country is probably more puffed up in the financial survey than anything else, in the tourist industry there have been this year for the first time for a long period of time more lay-offs in out of season than there have been for many, many years. This is the industry which Government has pinned so much of its faith and hope upon.

We have been repeatedly calling upon the Government to create staff in the Ministry of Tourism, specialists who can advise them on the true state of affairs in the industry. They have ignored our pleas, but we know that this year many of the things that we have been saying about the Tourist Industry will come true.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to tourism we now come and deal with another important key sector of the economy - construction. For the last three or four years there was a large demand in the construction industry generated by the decision to build apartments, hotels and matters of that kind. Now this year because of the recession in tourism last year in

relation to the number of new beds that were opened, many people have decided to postpone their plans for new tourist accommodation. We have not got from the Government a parallel public works programme to take up the slack. Due to the policies of the Government there is no long term mortgage money available in Barbados to finance private housing. The only new housing that we are going to have is housing in the Housing Authority which is the special preserve of the Government of Barbados and a few of their friends. So that it surprises us in view of the importance of the construction industry as an employer, that the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech took no steps at all to stimulate this industry, and I have information, Mr. Speaker, which I was bringing to this House, but I use this occasion as the most appropriate time that there is one construction company which is about to fold up in Barbados, and it is an employer of 2,000 odd workers - International Construction Company, and I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to investigate this immediately because we cannot afford to have 2,000 people unemployed right now in the construction industry when we have lost earlier this year some 500 workers due to the policies in the shrimp industry of the Democratic Labour Party. These things, Mr. Speaker, are very serious, and it is indeed a great deficiency of the Government not to have recognised the importance that construction has to play as an employer and to have brought immediate relief to the industry. We call on them as a matter of urgent priority so to do.

Mr. Speaker, looking just at these three sectors of the economy, we find that far from being a great heritage which we will inherit, the position is that the Democratic Labour Party is leaving us now with large scale problems of unemployment. Now, Sir, we have got to take immediate steps to remedy this situation. I would hope that very soon the Government would have a policy on the land and on banking in Barbados. I have repeatedly called to the Government's attention the effect of its discriminatory piece of legislation, namely the amendment to the Rate of Interest Act that it brought in here for the benefit of the Banks only in Barbados. I would have thought that the Government would now have recognised that it was the worst piece of legislation ever introduced in any country in the world by a Minister of Finance. To this day the Minister of Finance refuses to accept the fact that by allowing banks only to lend at an unlimited rate of interest and restricting competitors of banks to a stipulated rate of interest that the effect of that is to divert capital from other sources and other financial institutions into the banks, and since there is no control over the banks, the banks are able to lend at any rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious piece of legislation. It is no use the Minister of Finance harping on the fact that he is not able to get the Central Bank legislation down. The position is that many competent economists, many practising and well recognised economists recognise that in a territory such as ours the scope of a Central Bank to provide the controls and to operate on the economy in the

same manner as a developed country is very limited and that alternative controls can be introduced without the cost of a cumbersome Central Bank machinery. The Government had heard our criticisms in this respect and we can only say that the banker's lobby has so taken control of the Minister of Finance that he has decided in his mind that he is going to operate a banking policy against the interest of the public of Barbados. The consequences are very serious. We shall have to remedy this situation, Mr. Speaker, immediately on our assumption, of office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have also been drawing to the Government's attention the situation which has been created in a small territory such as Barbados by the operation of planning legislation, and the vast unearned profits that can be gained because of the operation of town planning legislation. With a limited land supply in Barbados, with the devoting of a certain amount of land to agricultural use, it means that land values rise as a result of the pressure of demand, and in the form of the state is entitled to recoup some of these benefits for the benefit of the people, because after all these values have been created by legislation which is necessarily in the interest of the state. Had the Minister of Finance the courage to implement these policies, had the speculators lobby less influence with him, Mr. Speaker, we are convinced that together with efforts made to reduce wastage arising out of abuse of office and lack of proper supervision not only would relief have been brought to the small section that this Budget brings relief to, but sufficient money would have been there to bring relief to the general mass of the people whose concern it is for the Government if it is a Government which has the interest of the people at heart to look after.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that we can summarise the position. We can say right away that we regard the economic review as a totally misleading document in many respects, constructed on false promises and purveying quite a large amount of inaccurate information. We say that the Budget demonstrates the Government's lack of imagination and vision, its bankruptcy in ideas, the tiredness of its leadership, its indifference to the general mass of the people. Mr. Speaker, after ten years of Democratic Labour Party rule, they end as they began with propaganda, misinformation and false promises.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity to speak this afternoon on the Budgetary proposals, and Sir, it may be the last speech that I will be making in this Honourable Chamber on this occasion.

Sir, before I go further, I have to thank the good people of St. Joseph for conferring the honour upon me of representing them for the last twenty-six unbroken years in this Honourable Chamber.
5.55 p.m.

I thank them again from the bottom of my heart. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas reminded this Hon. Chamber of the projects that the Barbados Labour Party did during their regime; I was a member

of that Party and he could honestly say what it has done, but from 1954 I was bending over backwards, forming fours, hat in hand, knees on the ground, begging that same Party to buy Lammings for the people of St. Joseph. If they could spend so much money on the airport, which is for the island, the harbour which is for the island, the hospital which is for the island, they could also spend some money on the poor people, but I was pleading for the poor people in St. Joseph and nothing should have prevented them from giving the people of St. Joseph that little spot of land so that they could have resited their houses, but it was not until now, the present Government cared more about St. Joseph than my Party, and they have helped me to help them. Now we can all praise ourselves, we can praise and let the praise go up to high heaven, but you must bear in mind, as the old people always say, remember you have birds in the pasture, and the birds in St. Joseph had to fly away before the Government at that time assisted them to get a cage to fly in.

I am representing St. Joseph even up to now; my time will soon be over and I have to bid farewell to the people in St. Joseph as far as this Hon. Chamber is concerned, but I will still be with them to plead for them to any Government in power and to help them, because they are an unlucky lot, they have never received the treatment that they should have. Sir, I am now going into the pavilion to watch the match but if the match is not favourable by that time I will be strong enough to come back and fight again; it is not a question of my leaving because I am a coward, I have been advised by my doctor not to take such a chance again because I am not so strong, but by that time I will be strong enough, this old heart of mine will be strong enough to come back if I see that my people are not getting a fair break. It is the poor people of Barbados, not St. Joseph alone that caused me to be in this Hon. Chamber, it is the old folk and the children, and you will remember that I said in this Hon. Chamber that if I could be assured by any Government that they are going to treat the old people as they should be treated I would resign and go out and let them do it. I said it because I wanted to see the poor people and the children of this country treated as they should be, and I have lived long enough to see that the children are well taken care of and the people up to a point, so my dreams have come true for the old people and the children.

The Government cannot see everything, the Opposition, if they see anything that the Government did not, it is their duty - and the duty of any Opposition - to point it out to the Government and show them where they are lacking. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said in his own words that only on the 6th June or sometime last month an hon. member saw something and brought it to the attention of the Government. Let us take off our hats to this hon. member who has seen something that is wrong and needed to be fixed, and brought it to the attention of those who could fix it right, but there are other things that other members should have seen and brought

to the attention of the Government before the Government got a chance to fix them. It is a pity that the hon. member could not have seen Lammings, he should have seen free education, school meals, the protection of tenants from landlords, five days a week for the workers, they should have seen funeral benefits for the old workers from the Provident Fund, they should have seen lots of things, pensions for casual workers, etc. A Casual Worker never had pension before, and all of these things should never have been seen and there is where the Opposition would have been doing its duty, seeing the things before the Government, keeping the Government on its toes, go to the people and say we are responsible for this, we are responsible for that, but do not keep it until election year to put it in the Manifesto.

6.05 p.m.

Have it done before, and we will get somewhere. I have seen that my dreams have come true in relation to the children and the old people.

Now, some very funny things were said when this Government first came into power. I can remember when the Hon. Prime Minister or the Premier at that time brought in his "Black Box", I said that no sooner than that "Black Box" was opened death would fly out. Sir, I thought that it would have flown out and killed a few people, but death flew out for the good of all and no one has been hurt by it. My good honourable friend and colleague also said that the present Government should be in for 100 years. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Three hundred years.") It should be 300 years. That is also true. I did not know anything about the Government. At that time there was no member of this House who hated the Government more than I did. My colleague either knew whom he was dealing with, or he could see the writing on the wall. He could have seen that the Government intended doing something for the people that he and I cared about. That is what certain people will kill both of us for.

Here you have two different people altogether looking out for old decrepit people who cannot help themselves. We do not want any power; we do not want any Ministry; we do not want to be the Leader of the Government, but we want to see something done for the old people of this country. He has as many enemies as anybody else for trying to help the poor people in St. Joseph. I have fought this Government up and down until they gave me Lammings. I have been able to get more done by the present Government in 5 years than I have been able to get done by my fifteen or sixteen years in the other Government (*Asides*) As a result of that, Sir, I can say thanks to them for allowing me to express myself. The old people in Barbados and in St. Joseph will know what they are voting for, and they can say that Smith was always honest and on the side of the people.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business do now resume.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that (*Asides*)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that members on the other side wish to reply

to the Government today, but we had proposed.....
(Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: "I have to speak, and we cannot finish today.") I think the proper motion should be that further consideration of the matter be now postponed and I so move.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of this sitting for about ten minutes.

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

On resumption

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business do now resume.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I see that we are not quite at home with ourselves. I spot strangers within the Bar.

(At this stage members of C. B. C's staff were removing the T.V. equipment.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you suggest a suspension for five minutes more? *(Asides)* I see strangers. Let them withdraw immediately. I hope that I was fully understood. No one who is not being elected may be within the Bar during the sitting of this Chamber other than the Clerks, Marshal, Deputy Marshal and, of course, the Reporters. (Mr. HINDS: "They have to take away the equipment to use it tonight.")

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact that the equipment is needed immediately, I think that some opportunity ought to be given for it to be taken out of the Chamber. This was not drawn to my attention.

I beg to move a further suspension of 20 minutes.

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

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

6.30 p.m.

On resumption

THE BARBADOS CITIZENSHIP (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Citizenship Act, 1967.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. John to take charge of this item.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. John to take charge of this item, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted for the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to take charge of this Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, shortly after this Island attained independence, one of the natural concomitants of that status was that we should establish the grounds on which a person could be considered for citizenship of this country outside of or in addition to those early parts of the Constitution which describe the qualifications for citizenship of this country. The Bill which we now have is being put forward for consideration of the Legislature in the light of our experience since independence. Certain powers are vested in the Minister of Home Affairs in considering applications for citizenship of this country, and the Bill seeks to clarify certain matters which are mentioned and to make provision for matters which have been omitted and would be better inserted in the Citizenship Act of 1967-50. The basic changes being made are set out in the Objects and Reasons Clause, and they are to provide that the Minister may register as a citizen of Barbados a person who (i) having been born in Barbados, or (ii) having been born outside Barbados and being the child of a father who became or would but for his death would have become a citizen of Barbados on the appointed day which is 30th November, 1966, in accordance with Section 2(1) of the Constitution, would, but for the fact that he was not on the 29th November, 1966, a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies, have become a citizen of Barbados in accordance with sub-section (i) or (2) of Section 2 of the Constitution.

It also seeks to clarify the provisions of Section 4(1) of that Act with regard to the length of the period of residence in Barbados required as a qualification for registration as a citizen. The present provision as far as I can remember provides that a person may apply for citizenship if he has been ordinarily resident in Barbados for a period of not less than seven years ending with the date of his application, and now we are making it clear that of those seven years not less than five must be spent in Barbados in order to qualify. Then provision is being made to specify the grounds on which the Minister may refuse to register certain persons as citizens of Barbados. The

Bill is also making provision for depriving persons of citizenship for very serious reasons - conviction for treason or serious criminal offences. This only applies to persons who were not born in Barbados but who had become citizens of Barbados by the process of registration or naturalisation. This does not apply to people who were born citizens of Barbados or were entitled to be deemed to be citizens of Barbados on the appointed day which was 30th November, 1966.

Provision is also being made finally to bring the provisions of the Act relating to acquisition and deprivation of citizenship in line with the United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. Those briefly are the provisions of the amending Bill.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that an amendment of this nature has come down. From time to time I have met quite a number of Barbadian women in particular who went abroad and studied nursing or other chosen vocations. They got married and when they were ready to return to their native land they found that their husbands were not granted a work permit. On the other hand if a man spends some time abroad and marries a woman, she is entitled to come to Barbados and work. I had a chat with the Minister of Home Affairs on one occasion and he told me that there has been an area of divided opinion as to whether this is right or wrong. He himself felt that it did not matter one way or the other. I would like to see an amendment to the Act which would allow the husband of a Barbadian woman who goes abroad and marries, the right to work in the same way as if a man marries a woman and she can come to Barbados to work. I do not know if laws of this nature exist in any part of the world, but to the best of my knowledge an American male can marry and take his wife into the United States and she can work, and the Barbadian male who marries an American woman can go to the United States and work. Here we have an area of discrimination, if I may say that, against women. I do not say this as a lack of Government policy, but it could be an oversight on that bit of legislation. I would like to hear what are the views of other members on the other side on an amendment of that nature, because I think it is very unfair to say that a woman can go abroad and marry a man of her choice, and then if she wants to return to serve her country her husband is told that he cannot work. The only alternative which a woman has under these circumstances is to go back to the country of her husband's origin, and as a result the skills which she may have acquired would be lost to Barbados.

Let us for argument sake say that a woman won a Barbados Scholarship and was educated abroad at the expense of the Barbados taxpayers. She qualified as a physiotherapist or in some other profession and then marries. When her husband comes to Barbados

he is told that he cannot be granted a work permit and naturally the husband decides to leave Barbados and she goes with him. This would be another drain on the country's skill. I would like to hear if there are any views forthcoming from the other side on that aspect of the legislation which is now before the House.

7.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I can give a reply and if the hon. member has anything further he would like to question me on then he is entitled to get up and do so. First, I want to congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down because it is probably a bit late in his career as a Member of Parliament, but it is the first sensible question he has asked in five years.

Mr. CRAIG: I would just like to thank the Prime Minister for lauding me, but we understand this is also election year and I hope he will match it with a sensible answer.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you ask a foolish question you get a foolish answer and if you ask a sensible question you get a sensible answer. I would like to assure the hon. member that this is always our policy. First, I should like to say that it is a very good question, and we have had this kind of situation arising but it is not as simple a matter as it would appear at first. To begin with, in our kind of society, whether it is right or wrong, it is a Christian democratic society, a man is supposed to provide for his wife and under our system of law the wife automatically assumes the domicile of her husband. Let me take an illustration; you may have a nurse from Barbados studying in England and she qualifies, then she meets a doctor, let us say, from Jamaica, and since doctors and nurses always seem to get together, they get married. According to English law, Jamaican law and our law she becomes domiciled in Jamaica because her husband was only temporarily resident in the United Kingdom, and therefore he is not deemed to have shaken off his domicile of birth or origin.

We had a case of Ramsay, I think, in which a gentleman left England for something like 38 years, he did what I did in 1950, he took off his shoes at the top of the gangway and he shook the dust of Liverpool off his feet, he went to Jamaica, married a Jamaican lady and after 38 years he died in Jamaica. I cannot remember the particular case, it was either Belle or Ramsay against the Liverpool Royal Infirmary, and the English Courts when a case of succession came up for his property deemed that he was still domiciled in the United Kingdom although he had done the symbolic act of shaking the dust of the United Kingdom off his feet. You lose your domicile or origin by taking up permanent residence in another country and either by dispossessing yourself of your acquisitions in the country of origin or by some other positive act, demonstrating that you now regard the new country as your home, then you assume what is called the domicile of choice. Anyhow, I do not want to go into a lecture on private international law, but since it is such a sensible question I want to give a

sensible answer to explain how we arrived at this decision.

The husband is supposed to provide for the wife, and the country that the husband comes from must always keep its doors open both for the husband and for the wife, so that applies equally to Barbados where a Barbadian man marries a woman from another country; we would never require the woman who has become the wife to apply for a work permit, but when the Barbadian girl or woman, a full grown woman, marries a man from another country he is supposed to provide for her in his country. This is common to the United Kingdom, Barbados and Jamaica which are the three countries I should like to deal with because we all come up under private international law in these matters and we have the same law. The husband has to provide for the wife, he cannot do like some of our farm workers when they go up to the United States, they marry a woman and when they are discovered they are sent back down here, but the United States Government puts the position of the woman higher than the position of the man in that society and this is a commonly known fact. Any American born woman can petition for her husband to resume cohabitation with her in the United States, but she has to make an application, she cannot turn up at John F. Kennedy International Airport and tell the Immigration Officer that the gentleman with the Afro hair cut in a brown suit is her husband and he has to let him in, she has to file a petition for the husband to rejoin her, but many Barbadian workers have married women with whom they have never cohabited either before or after marriage or on return to the United States, but good luck to them. This is what you call a marriage of convenience, but in the United States the woman has this prerogative.

Here in Barbados - and Jamaica it is a lot worse than Barbados because Jamaica does not even consider the application - but what we normally do is this, if there is a *bona fide* marriage for *bona fide* reasons, the wife comes back to Barbados, her husband comes back with her, we do not turn him back at the airport, but if he wants to take up a job in Barbados he normally would have to make application because he does not automatically become a citizen of Barbados by marrying a Barbadian woman, and therefore he has to be treated like any other stranger, because a lot of our girls in Montreal and in London, as the hon. member knows better than anybody else, are very lonely and they go and marry just on the rush of blood to the head, on the spur of the moment, and we have actually had a case in which the wife applied for a work permit for the husband and when the Ministry sent the consent to work she, fortunately or unfortunately, received the letter and she came back to the Ministry and said that she wanted the man out of the country because he was giving her a lot of trouble, but she made the application in the first place. I assure hon. members that this is an actual case, and the man had qualifications and the Ministry felt that he could actually be employed, but the wife said she wanted him out of the country.

We have another situation now as regards people marrying and so on. Under our law we have to recognise the validity of foreign marriages if those marriages conform to the laws of the country in which the husband was domiciled. We have to recognise by the international kind of comity of nations that if a marriage is legal, let us say, in India or Pakistan we cannot declare the marriage to be illegal here in Barbados, because there is a certain amount of give and take in these things, and once a marriage conforms with all the essential requirements - I do not want to go into technical terms - all the proper forms and so on, we recognise the marriage. Take a situation like this one; you may have a child born in Barbados of parents in India. Marriages by proxy are recognised in India. The person who is doing the marrying, that is, the girl in Barbados, has never seen the husband. The husband is a close relative of the father of the bride and you receive a letter from a province of the State of Bombay signed by the Registrar stating that these people were married on the 23rd March, 1971. The girl may even be still at school, but we have to recognise the marriage. 7.15 p.m.

The girl is here in Barbados and has never seen the husband. (Mr. ADAMS: "There was a girl at Queen's College.") As a matter of fact, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has just reminded me that the girl may even be at school. He mentioned a particular school, but I am not thinking of particular cases. The girl may still be at school. She may be over the legal age in Barbados which is 16 years and the parents have consented. It used to be 12 years, and we changed it to 16 years, but they can have marriages at 11, which we do not recommend. Once the child is over 16, the husband arrives at the Airport and says that he is married to this girl. In truth and in fact in many cases this is a person for whom the father-in-law may have applied for a work permit for him to come and assist him in the business, when we have certain Barbadians who, as far as certain nationalities are concerned, will never promote them to positions where they are capable of taking over. (Asides) I am making statements of fact, and I am not saying anything against them.

You go all the way down Swan Street and you will not find in any business owned by a non-Barbadian family a single Barbadian in a position of responsibility that he can take over the business. In other words, buying and selling of goods is something which is vouchsafed and is a sacred trust only to nationalities other than Barbadians. They tell you that they have to bring this person from Bombay, because there is nobody to take over the business. What they mean is that there is nobody of their own race or religion, because there are thousands of young Barbadians who are capable as is demonstrated by reaching positions as Managers of Banks - not the brewery - as Managers of Plantations and of all kinds of business.

You go down Swan Street and you find that, having not succeeded in getting the person in on the grounds of capability for management, they marry

him off to one of the children. I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that, in cases like that, we should drop the requirements of a work permit for the husband. I should like to assure the hon. member that where a Barbadian man marries a woman from abroad there is no problem, but we have to be very careful that Barbadian girls, whether they are here in Barbados and doing it by proxy or going up to England and getting married, are not saddled with a lot of undesirables who are really trying to live off their wives.

We recognise in our society that it is the basic responsibility of the man to provide for his family. Now, all of these young ladies who are talking about equal rights and so on do not want that law changed. They want equal rights to do certain things but not to do others. Not one of them will tell you that she wants to support her husband. They will tell you that they want equal rights to go into any rum shop, fire a drink, wear the same kind of clothes and so on, but when it comes to the basic concept of a christian democratic society no woman wants her husband to put her in court for support. If they want equal rights, then the husband must have the right to sue a wife for support. I heard of a case the other day in which the husband actually succeeded in getting support from his wife. *(Asides)* In Barbados the Judge would chase you out of court.

Mr. Speaker, maybe I have dilated a bit, but I like this kind of question because it is an intelligent question, and I think it needs a proper answer. In most cases where a Barbadian girl marries a foreign husband we do not deny them the right to enter the country and live. In most cases where the Minister is satisfied that the husband can contribute something to the economy of the country invariably he is allowed to work, because we do not like the idea of husbands living off their wives. We scrutinise the cases very carefully sometimes in order to protect the women from themselves. I know of no case of which the husband and wife had to return to a foreign country because a work permit was refused. I think that the general thing is very sympathetic. That is not the case in Jamaica, as far as I understand, they do not even look at the application. *(Asides)* (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "Order!")

Mr. SPEAKER: Order on both sides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that Jamaica is much stricter than Barbados in this respect. Furthermore, the United Kingdom is getting very tough in this business, too, of husbands marrying women in the United Kingdom and expecting automatically to qualify for entry certificates. I know of no case of any hardship because of the policy which is based on our system of law and our concepts of society. I know that most cases are dealt with sympathetically. I do not remember a single case in which any hardship was made.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the hon. senior member for St. James gave way to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. Does he propose to continue?

Mr. CRAIG indicated dissent.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have had one or two of these matters to deal with. I have had an interview with the Minister of Home Affairs on one occasion, and I think the formula is that so long as the person is of good character and is not likely to become a charge on the State, he is allowed to stay here and get a job. There is only one problem in this. I feel that what we need in respect of these people is an intermediate status of residence for a certain period of time where they can negotiate, having satisfied the first criterion of good character, for a job and then resubmit their application. The way it is worked administratively is that they are allowed to stay here; they then have to look around for a job, and it places a husband at a disadvantage in that employers do not like to get involved in a commitment which the Ministry requires; so that the freedom of a person in bargaining with an employer is drastically reduced. I think a modification to the formula could be that provided they satisfy the first test of character and are living together - I agree with the formula of living together, because I always remember that there was an Italian man who specialised in bringing people from the continent by marrying them to British girls. They used to marry people from the continent - mostly in the American style - and that used to give them the automatic right of entry and subsequent review. It should be good character, living together, and in other words carrying on a stable family relationship. The hardship is that a person with his uncertain status as to whether he can get a longer period of stay, loses his freedom of action to bargain. That is the modification that is necessary.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about what has just been discussed. I also want to mention some other aspects of the Citizenship Act. With your indulgence and the indulgence of the House, I just want to mention an incident that took place earlier this afternoon while I was speaking, and just in case any hon. member is unquieted in mind, while I was speaking on the Budgetary Proposals someone telephoned the House to say that my father had had a heart attack.
7.25 p.m.

It is quite untrue. As soon as I heard this, due to an hon. member and a servant of the House who did not say anything about it until after I had finished my speech - and I can only regard it as a peculiarly vicious and unpleasant practical joke - I got hold of a motor car and went to "Tyrol Cot" and found that my father and mother were out on the lawn with a friend having tea at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us now proceed. I am sure that every hon. member of the House is very happy to hear the good news.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sure that absolutely nothing is wrong with the former Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now let us deal with the question of citizenship.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before people get the wrong idea about what took place, the Deputy Marshal of the House told me about this incident, and I told him not to mention it whilst the hon. member was speaking. I want this made clear because I heard an aside from the hon. junior member for Bridgetown to the effect that somebody from over here did this. As a matter of fact, he said the Leader of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a point to the House. I advised the Deputy Marshal not to interfere with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and I took it upon myself to call the hon. member outside after the Leader of the Opposition had finished speaking to tell him about it and asked him to check because we were not sure and we know that people are vicious. Before anybody gets the misguided idea that anybody from this side had done this nonsense, I would like it made clear for the records that nobody from this side had anything to do with this. Somebody also called when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking - I do not know whether it was the same person - and used a lot of unsavoury epithets.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow I am sure that every hon. member on this side is very glad to hear that the rumour is unfounded. Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas now proceed with his remarks on the Citizenship Bill?

Mr. ADAMS: I just want to disagree on this question of the husband of Barbadian citizens with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and to agree with the hon. senior member for St. James. I believe that the husbands of citizens of Barbadians should be admitted to reside in Barbados under the most liberal conditions possible and that somebody should show positive cause why they should not reside here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, the question was in respect of work permits, and I have explained to the House that there is no problem about residence. The problem is only in respect of work permits, and since we do not normally expect a husband to be living on his wife's moral earnings, we try as far as possible to accommodate such situations by giving them work permits; so it is not a question of residence. We never turn back the husbands from the airport or anything like that, and residence and work permits are two different considerations.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree with the Prime Minister in what he has just said. The Citizenship Act is not yet in a form where residence and work permits are necessarily two different conditions. Anybody who is lawfully resident in Barbados and who does not have a specific work exclusion entry into his passport by an immigration officer can work, and the Prime Minister and Minister of Home Affairs know that is the law, because upon a particular occasion when a husband of a Barbadian citizen was being prosecuted through the agency of somebody who had a concession at Seawall Airport in respect of the workers' canteen, the

Minister of Home Affairs recognised that since the man had permission to reside in Barbados, he could do what work he wanted unless specifically forbidden, and they then had to revoke his permission to reside and force the man to go to Montserrat and eventually he has come back here and I believe is working now; but I think that was a case which both the hon. senior member for Christ Church and I dealt with professionally at one time or another which has given rise to these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the Citizenship Act is in a bad state anyhow. These amendments are only scratching the surface. I want hon. members to look at a lot of things. First of all, why is it that the benefits of the Immigration Act of 1952 are confined to Commonwealth citizens? It means that anybody who is married to an American female citizen who wishes to preserve her citizenship cannot in fact rely upon the Immigration Act. If you marry an American citizen, she is not protected by the Immigration Act; she is theoretically illegally in Barbados. She can revoke her allegiance to the United States of America and become a citizen at any time by right, but since she is not a Commonwealth citizen she does not come within the class of dependencies set out in the Immigration Act. That should be revoked as part of this. I do not see why American citizens should be discriminated against especially when so many of them are not American citizens in the sense of tourists, but are American citizens in the sense of Barbadians who have gone to America or children of Barbadians who have gone to America who wish to preserve the conditions of American citizenship, but yet wish to enjoy a retirement or an extended visit to the place of their birth or their patriality which I believe is the new word now.

I would respectfully suggest to the Government that we do away with this concept that only Commonwealth citizens should be protected by the Immigration Act. Citizenship of Barbados and women - I am not putting forward that the husband of a Barbadian citizen should be automatically entitled to citizenship in the same way as a wife may be, but if he wants to reside and work here at anything, my view is that the only consideration which the Government should have is his character. If he wants to work behind the counter in Cave Shepherd, if he wants to go and cut canes, he should be allowed to. I do not know how familiar the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is with the constituency which we both represent, but he should know that there are one or two St. Lucians and Vincentians on the fringe of taking the plunge into matrimony because they have entered into friendships with ladies, but they get difficulty in the out of crop season in getting work at other places or are a little afraid because they came here with permits to cut canes. They have a friend, they know they will cut canes again next season, but they are afraid to expose themselves. All these are considerations you have to look at. One or two may go and get married and then they will be disappointed to find they are in no better position as a result of having got married than they were before.

I am familiar, Mr. Speaker, professionally and otherwise with all the matters which the Prime Minister has raised. I have appeared for a gentleman in his difficulties with the Ministry of Home Affairs and the more he insisted that he was married to a Barbadian woman, the more she insisted that she wanted him out of the Island. Every single time I was able to get a little stay of execution before a magistrate, the wife would go to the Ministry of Home Affairs and make a fuss and ask them why they could not get the man out. He even resorted to forging his passport to show that he had been here seven years which he had not. But all those difficulties I am aware of. The difficulty which the Prime Minister has outlined in here and which I believe convinced at least one listener was the Prime Minister's high intellectual capacities, namely that the Marriage Act of Barbados recognises proxy marriages even by citizens of Barbados as long as they are valid by the *lex loci celebrationis*. The difficulty there is that you can in my view specify that in your regulations. You should have Immigration Regulations governing this and you should specify that marriages which would be valid marriages if contracted in Barbados should give rise to certain rights. We have to recognise them as valid marriages for the purpose of private International law. We do not necessarily have to recognise them as valid marriages for the purpose of a right to live in Barbados. I would also like to see a Regulation that says that subject to the interest of national security and public policy the husband of a Barbadian citizen shall be in the same position as a dependent. That is all you want: put a husband in the same class as a child, no more than that. I would even go so far as to say that where people are settled and have children here you should not expel them.

7.35 p.m.

A Canadian couple have recently been expelled from Barbados; the lady could not have been expelled because she was lawfully here for seven years, the children cannot be expelled because they are citizens of Barbados, but the wife was here for eight years and she was never here under any permission because she came in as a dependant and she lived eight years, so she came within the Immigration Act, but the husband, out of the eight years he has lived here, three or four have been spent with work permits and could not be counted, therefore they could not count, therefore he could have been expelled. That family had settled here entirely, the children were at Barbadian schools, they had given up all Canadian connections and so on, but out they went. The Minister of Home Affairs said he did not like the way he spoke to him one day when he came in to bring other people to apply for work permits; he was so settled a Barbadian that he applied for work permits for other Canadians and he ended up by himself going back home, I think that is bad.

Under the Act, I want now to mention a case which would be familiar to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. In our constituency there was an outstanding parish priest, a popular man, who made

himself at one with the citizens. I believe that he got on as well and was as on friendly terms with the junior member for St. Thomas as with the senior member; I know he was absolutely scrupulous as far as I could judge at any Church function or any function of the Youth Club with which he was associated and also in his parochial activities. He was scrupulous to remain on good terms with both of us and to make sure that both of us received such courtesies as may be due to sitting M.P's. He was a man against whom I have never heard an ill word spoken; his wife could have contributed to Barbados, she was a teacher, but they were not rich. Those who work for money as parish priests are not people trying to exploit the financial resources of any country, I believe he is a man of means, in fact. He wrote and applied for citizenship, he got back a letter which mis-stated the law, they told him since he was only in Barbados for five years he could not have applied for citizenship. The law as it then stood said you could apply if you were ordinarily resident for periods amounting in the aggregate to not less than five years during the period of seven years ending with the date of application. He had lived in Barbados five years before he applied, but he still got back a letter full of ignorance from the Ministry of Home Affairs, and if it is one thing I hate is ignorance in people who are paid to know better. If a man writes a letter stating that you are not qualified for citizenship because you have only lived here for five years, in my view he should be fired or put in a post where he cannot do any harm by a mis-statement of the law, he is paid to know that that is not the law, whether he is a lawyer or not. He got back this letter, he became dissatisfied, he made his arrangements and left Barbados, and I now hear that after he has left he has been granted citizenship. (*Asides*) I do not think this Government has got any credit from the circumstances of this priest leaving, because I am hearing it widely said in Welchman Hall that the Government has put out Mr. So-and-So, it is up to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to spread the rumour that it is not true.

All this is foolishness; I am an extremist in this matter of immigration. The only principle that I would admit that I do not see admitted is the principle of reciprocity; if they keep us out of the United Kingdom keep out Englishmen, if they keep us out of Canada keep out Canadians, that is my view, but they do not keep us out of the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom the way we keep out Americans, Canadians and Englishmen, without any question the husband of somebody lawfully resident in Britain is admitted, it is in the instructions. The only case I have ever known of is a man who lives in Spooner's Hill who had property in England, and indeed I thought it was very unfair because the wife wrote and told the Home Office he used to beat her and she then brought a law suit against him for the division of the property and he was not allowed to go back to England to defend the case. I remember I battled with that for several months but there were bad police reports on it from England and he could not go back to England, but even there I think that is an unfair matter because the wife has now sold his house and

so on and he is not in such a good economical position, as well as being relieved of his marital privileges, but that is by the way.

In England, if a Barbadian woman is in England her husband can join her, this is accepted, her children up to a certain age can join her, and the only circumstances against it are again public policy, if the man is of a bad character, if the woman does not want him and so on. In the United States the same thing is true; look at the number of Barbadians who are married in the United States and who live in the United States upon the basis of their marriage to American citizens. I am not so familiar with the Canadian laws, I know they make difficulties for women who apply if they are married, in fact the immigration law must be that a husband may join the wife because what they say is that they will not admit married women who are separated from their husbands. That is what they say, and a man from whom she is estranged subsequently applies as of right could go to Canada; that is the reason for making it difficult for women who are separated from their husbands to go to Canada, so I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, why in Barbados we should be at all restrictive. If the man is of good character and living with his wife, he is not a convict or bankrupt or has not been imprisoned for 12 months or has not been at the Mental Hospital, if he is not any one of these persons he should be allowed to reside here and to work without a work permit.

There is a class of residents, persons who are not excluded from working, and who work, and he should reside here and work wherever he likes; I do not think it could ever be fair to say that because a man is not qualified in anything only the wife must work.

The second point I want to raise in this amendment, although this amendment to section 4 goes some way to getting rid of the obvious unconstitutionality of saying that the Minister can satisfy himself that a person qualifies or applies the subjective test at his discretion to register citizens of Barbados where the Constitution says that only an objective test will do, there is no doubt that the Constitution of Barbados does not intend to allow a Minister to substitute his satisfaction or his consideration for a proper consideration of the facts, and in Select Committee on the Citizenship Bill when it was first passed I challenged Senator Greaves to refuse on his own consideration to register anybody as a citizen of Barbados who is entitled under the Constitution and test it out in the Courts, that I would be happy to appear for the person in a test case, and they are still my views. I am very glad that the legal draftsmen have come up with some criteria by which the Minister's refusal to register persons as citizens may be judged.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to remind the hon. member it is not the legal draftsmen, it is the same Minister of Home Affairs who issued those instructions to the legal draftsmen after putting up the proposals to Cabinet.
7.45 p.m.

No legal Draftsman can insert in any Bill something which the Cabinet has not approved and issued instructions on. When he was criticising he was saying the Minister was this and the Minister was that. Now that the Minister has put in certain safeguards, he says that it is the Legal Draftsman that has done it. It is obvious that the hon. member does not understand Ministerial Government.

Mr. ADAMS: I will soon have the opportunity so to do. Nonetheless, I thank the Prime Minister for his interjection, and I congratulate the Minister, after 3 1/2 years, for accepting what was sent to him in Select Committee. I am glad that he is showing that his mind is open to common sense, even after such a passage of time. Nonetheless, Sir, the Minister may, if he is satisfied that the interests of national security and public policy so require, refuse to register as a citizen of Barbados any person who -

(a) under subsection (2) or (3) of section 3 of the Constitution, or subsection (4) of section 4 of this Act, is entitled to be registered as a citizen of Barbados and applies to be so registered.....

The Attorney-General's legal knowledge goes as far as saying this: The constitution says that Parliament may prescribe conditions in the interest of national security and public policy; therefore, if Parliament says that the Minister is to be satisfied that is a prescription. That is as far as the Attorney-General's knowledge of constitutional law goes. The Attorney-General has stated that he is quite willing to be displaced as Attorney-General by Mr. George Moe should the occasion arise, and he is quite willing to serve as Minister of Latin American Affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have scrutinised this Bill carefully and that does not arise. Even if it appeared to arise, perhaps, in Committee but certainly not when dealing with the principle of the Bill. *(Asides)*

Mr. ADAMS: It is not anticipated that he will have any other position in Parliament. I know that if it had been left to the Attorney-General he would have brought to bear on this problem of citizenship all the qualities and knowledge of law which he brought to bear on the two cases in which he appeared for Government and, having lost both of them, he retired from the fray permanently, for he has never since appeared in court. From the day that we said he has never appeared in court successfully, he has decided never to appear in court at all.

In my view the Minister's satisfaction that an applicant is not of good character is marginal. I am not going to say that it is unconstitutional. If a Minister is going to tell a court that he is satisfied that a person is not of good character, I believe that the Minister will have something to put to the court to show what made him satisfied. I do not believe that he is going to have the nerve to do as Sir John Anderson successfully did and swear to an affidavit:

"I am satisfied that this applicant is not of good character" and leave it at that. That happened in war time at a time when Britain was fighting for its life. No Government, composed of members of this House, I believe, would offer that as justification in these circumstances.

I am sure the Prime Minister would not have a Minister - I believe that this is fundamentally a potentially non-party matter. I do not think that I am praising the Prime Minister unreasonably when I say I do not believe he has a Home Affairs Minister who would offer his satisfaction as sufficient reason for not making a man a citizen of Barbados. I believe that whatever is relied on by the Minister of Home Affairs to support bad character would be put before the court. It also says that the Minister must be satisfied whether somebody is prejudicial to the safety of Barbados or to the maintenance of law and public order and so on. I believe it is a power he should have and it can always be tested in the courts. Subject to my reservations on those two parts of the amendment, I welcome the new section 4(a).....

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not unmindful of the fact that we are not yet in Committee when he may go into details. I think he will be here when the House goes into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Do you want to leave the Chair, Sir? This is one of the three principles of the Bill. (*Asides*) Is there a new born infant found abandoned in Barbados? I wish the Government of Barbados would introduce legislation to give people names and so on. Where you find a new born infant in canes in Barbados, I wonder if the House knows that it is the practice to give the child the name of the plantation and to baptize it in the name of the plantation, too!

Mr. Speaker, I do not quite know what the amendment to section 2 is meant to clear up, but I hope that whatever it clears up that a course will be given to all those responsible for taking decisions at the Ministry of Home Affairs and all those responsible for making calculations as to qualification in exactly what the section that we are going to pass does mean. I very much hope that no more letters will be sent out to priests or otherwise which mis-state the law of Barbados as to citizenship, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be long, but there are two points which I should like to mention in reply to what the senior member for St. Thomas has said. I will agree with most of what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said, provided he agrees with me that the Constitution of Barbados needs to be thrown through the window. The Leader of the Opposition boasted that they were responsible for this Constitution. (*Asides*) You know that the Constitution is a "joke Constitution," too. They boasted that they were responsible for the Constitution and they are now complaining about it. This is really a "joke Constitution" because it is a Constitution where the Attorney-General has no control

over the Director of Public Prosecutions. In England the Attorney-General goes into Court; in Trinidad the Attorney-General goes into court, and in Antigua the Attorney-General has the right to go into court. (*Asides*) Do you want me to go to court to get myself in trouble. As far as I am concerned, law is a guessing game; you make a decision, somebody appeals and another decision is made. In the end you have to abide by the last decision. We have to abide by the last decision. When the hon. member said that.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, The hon. member should not be critical of another hon. member of the Other Place. He is criticising the Attorney-General, Sir, a member of his own Party.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I want you to rule that this is not a point of order, because when somebody gets up and talks nonsense you are always saying "No point of order."
7.55 p.m.

When the hon. member said that somebody ignorantly replied to Rev. Perrygore stating the he was not entitled to citizenship, the law specifically says that unless for a specific reason, the Minister has the right to grant this person citizenship after five years. I think the hon. member knows this.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, after five years you are qualified to apply; after one day for good reason the Minister can give you citizenship.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: But there is another point the hon. member must not overlook. I would not say that it was deliberate ignorance, but when the hon. member says that people should be dismissed, he should know better than to make that kind of statement. The Government has no authority to dismiss a Civil Servant, unlike some other Governments as I saw in St. Kitts the other day. Because of beliefs some of the top Civil Servants have gone through the eddoes.

Mr. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way, I will just read the section as it stands at the present time, or indeed why not read the section we have before us. We are raising the time now to seven years because it says he has to satisfy the Minister that he (a) has been ordinarily resident in Barbados or (b) has been in the service of the Government or (c) has had partly such residence or partly such service for a period of not less than seven years ending with the date of his application of which not less than five years in the aggregate must have been spent in Barbados or for such shorter period so ending as the Minister may in the special circumstances of any particular case accept. I must confess that I have not understood this. I intended to deal with this in Committee because "or for such shorter period" can qualify either the five years or the seven years; but wherever it is placed it only qualified the five in my opinion and therefore you are going to find that where previously the Minister could allow you to be a citizen if you had been here for a day. Is the Prime Minister shaking his head and saying that was not the

law before? The law before said that you could apply if you had been ordinarily resident etc. for the periods amounting in the aggregate to not less than five years during the period of seven ending with the date of the application or for such shorter period so ending, which means that if you are a resident in Barbados for one day within the last seven, the Minister may in the special circumstances of any particular case accept. Do not tell me I cannot interpret a law, Mr. Speaker. I am capable of reading the laws of Barbados and arguing on them, and this section means exactly that one day's residence in seven years would allow the Minister to make you a citizen, and I do not believe that the section we are now adding to it means the same thing, but that is a different point. The Government may have something in mind. I wonder if the Government knows what it has in mind. Five years' residence was enough before and a shorter period if the Minister saw fit; you are now putting it up to seven. If the Minister does not understand it, obviously he cannot explain to Cabinet, and I think I must be wrong in attacking the Civil Servants; it must be the Minister because obviously if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour and the Attorney-General did not understand that the Minister can give you citizenship after a day, if that is not understood on that front bench, obviously the Minister could not know it either in which case he should be the one to be removed as well as the Civil Servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is dealing with a section of the Bill in detail. When it goes to Committee the hon. member may deal exhaustively with that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a point, but I have always said that law is a matter for interpretation, and there is nobody, no matter on which side of the fence, who can argue against this, because you go to the Court and a judge who has studied law like any other lawyer gives a decision. The client is not satisfied and appeals. He goes to the Court of Appeal and another decision is given there. Sometimes another appeal takes place and he gets another decision. You as a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, would be well aware of this; so it is a matter of interpretation; it does not always mean that when a decision is given that it is a right decision. I have seen a lot of decisions that we have to abide by that were wrong decisions, but for the benefit of the hon. member, it is true he has a degree in law, but that does not mean that I have to accept every interpretation which he brings in here. Nobody has to accept every one I bring either. The hon. member has just said what I was saying all the time, because I have heard the Leader of the Opposition on more than one occasion boast that they were responsible for the Constitution. I had nothing to do with it - I was outside looking in - but my argument is that the Constitution of Barbados is a joke Constitution and wants re-writing. Whether the hon. senior member for Christ Church likes it or not as a lawyer..... (Asides) At least it would be a lot better than what you put in here because you have the whole thing confused now. (Asides.) The next five years you would not be in here because I have told you already that

"Peanuts" have you made up like Johnnie Belle with Espinosa.

As far as I know, after five years a person who has been resident in Barbados continuously can make application to the Minister for permanent residence. It is then a matter for the Minister of Home Affairs, but do not give the impression that this is too much power vested in somebody, because the Immigration Bill in England vests everything in the Minister of Home Affairs and the Police, so if the Police do not like you, out you go from England which is the mother country. Do not let us be farcical. When I first started to speak, I said that I had to agree with the hon. member on certain things, but we have to be more than careful. It is all right for countries like Great Britain, Canada and the United States of America which are big industrial countries, because they were underpopulated anyhow unlike Barbados that is overpopulated. What is to prevent people from indulging in practices that I know obtain in England, Canada and the United States where people marry for financial reasons after a limited time? The marriage is never consummated as far as I know and these people then go on their way, and we would have Barbados filled with a lot of people who may be undesirable in the community. I agree that if a woman goes to Canada and sends back for a man after she has permanent residence and provided they get married within thirty days the man is entitled to residence in Canada, but Canada is a bigger country than the United States and only has a population of 20 million. These are things that really take place.

When the hon. member mentioned Rev. Perrygore, I was glad when he went on to say that he had got citizenship in Barbados, but it was not because of any unsavoury action or anything like this. Rev. Perrygore made application for permanent residence before the specified time, but whoever made the application made it out incorrectly; so it is not fair for the hon. member to say that somebody in the Ministry of Home Affairs ignorantly sent back the wrong report to Rev. Perrygore. Furthermore the case was not presented properly at all. The Rev. Perrygore did not leave Barbados because of this, because like most people who live in Barbados, he was never hounded down.
8.05 p.m.

I went to take Rev. Perrygore out to the plane and I asked him why he was leaving when he likes the country so much and he said that as a young man he did not want to stagnate, he wanted to go out for a little while and then come back, and I believe also the reason for leaving was monetary, because he has gone to Ottawa and it is natural that even if he gets the same money there it would be in Canadian dollars, and I know it would be a lot more than he was getting here. I want to assure the House that the priest left this country on his own free will with the intention of coming back here, because from the reports which he has shown me I would say that he

is as much a Barbadian or West Indian as any of us, because I think he came to the West Indies when he was a few months old and he only went back to England for a very short spell, so I do not want the hon. member to give the impression that somebody in the Ministry of Home Affairs was tormenting the priest, the priest left here on his own volition, nobody forced him out, he left with the understanding that he will be back as soon as he can. He has gone to accumulate some money to come back to Barbados; as a matter of fact, his last child is a Barbadian citizen, so I do not want the House to be misled in believing what the hon. member has said.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anybody mention the case of the 74 Barbadians and some 30 odd Barbadian women who are resident in Ghana and Sierra Leone. Under the African laws where the descent of property and the descent of the Stool - which is equivalent to the Crown in English territories - passes down the matrimonial line places women in a situation which is peculiar to West Indian law, and most probably English law, and on my visit to the African territories, and I am sure the Minister of Health will agree with me, these women are particularly disturbed because some of them have been living in the African territories for some 16 years and now find themselves unable to acquire passports of either countries and they are particularly worried to know whether they would be granted passports as citizens of Barbados, because having married to citizens of Ghana or Sierra Leone they obviously become citizens of that particular territory, and as the Act now stands I do not believe they are entitled as of right to a Barbados passport.

I would like to hear from either the Hon. Prime Minister or somebody over there what conditions these persons would find themselves in, particularly since some of them are desirous of coming to Barbados, and I have heard it expressed that their husbands would very much like to reside here for some period of time, and I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that there should be some regulation whereby these persons can come in as of right.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like this consideration to be taken into account when dealing with this particular aspect of the Bill.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E.W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of the Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by the Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed and its title read and agreed to.

ADOPTING OF SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT re STAFFING OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detain the House much longer, but there is an outstanding matter which, I believe, the House may wish to deal with. Your Honour has formally tabled today an Interim Report of the Debates Committee of the meeting which was held on Monday, 7th June, in respect of a memorandum from the Clerk of Parliament dealing with the staff structure of the House and a recommendation that an appointment should be made to fill that vacancy. I believe the Report was circulated some time ago but only formally presented today with an accompanying Resolution. The matter, as set out, gives very accurately the thinking of the Committee and the recommendation of the Committee in respect to this appointment.

I beg, formally, to move that the Select Committee's Report be adopted.

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

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

RESOLUTION re POST OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is also an accompanying Resolution that the House should approve a recommendation of the Debates Committee that the post of Administrative Officer of Parliament be created with effect from the 15th June, 1971, at a salary of \$6,000 x \$240 - \$7,200 per annum.

I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION re SALARY OF SECRETARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is an accompanying Resolution which forms part of the Report received. With effect from 15th June, 1971, the salary scale applicable to the office of Secretary of Parliament and the point in this scale at which the officer should be paid shall be as set out in the schedule, in order to bring the two posts on the same level and to preserve the seniority of the present Secretary.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition as well as the House as a whole are placed in a position

in which they can do nothing but indicate their assent to this. I would hope that the Debates Committee take this House seriously enough that in future when they agree to the creation of offices and the appointment of the people, the jobs should come before this House and the terms and conditions as recommended by them be accepted or not accepted. What we are really doing now is passing a Resolution which will have a retroactive effect. It is well known that the occupant of this office is occupying the office.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly angry over a situation that is existing in this House, and it is with respect to the Deputy Marshal of the House. I see that a Resolution is being brought here to make everybody comfortable with the exception of the Deputy Marshal who has served this House well; he has done extra work, and I have not heard that anything is done to compensate him for the extra work. This matter has been pending for months.

The amazing thing about it, Sir, is that the Deputy Marshal went on leave; someone else was appointed to act for a week or two weeks and that person was paid. Why is it that the Deputy Marshal has not been paid for this extra work? The Leader of the House should have taken action in this matter. Let the man get his money. Mr. Speaker, we ought to be told what is preventing the man from getting his money. He has served all of us and he cannot get the few paltry pennies. The Reporters and every other person got what was due to them, but the Deputy Marshal cannot get his.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I really do not understand this. An assurance was given by the other side that a Cabinet Paper would be prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on this Resolution.

Mr. St. JOHN: A Paper has to be prepared to be sent to the Cabinet because this is extraordinary expenditure. Why cannot the Cabinet Paper be prepared? I understand that there was a token vote for \$1 in the Estimates. The members on this side having indicated their feelings on this matter, I do not believe there is any objection on the other side. Mr. Speaker, there is assent on both sides of the House, and I take it that Mr. Speaker and the Leader of the House should see to it that the Resolution comes into being. A Cabinet Paper has to be prepared. Who is in charge of this House? (Mr. CRAIG: "Mr. Speaker, is the person holding it up.")

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The man is a friend of the wrong people and that is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: Let me get this clear. If it is Mr. Speaker's Office who must send it up, we feel that it should be sent up. If the Leader of the House has to do it, we feel that it should be sent up. We do not want to see any buck-passing of responsibility, Sir. This

is a matter affecting the House and, as I understand it, within the competence and the preserve of Mr. Speaker to issue directives to the Clerk for the Paper to be sent up. Everybody feels that the overtime arose during the period when the House was being repaired. He had to come and open and close back the House outside the normal time and it is on that basis that it went along for some time.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not have to come, but he was assured by a former Clerk that if he came there was a vote out of which he would be paid, then the former Clerk discovered that there was no such vote.

Mr. St. JOHN: Since he came in good faith and acting upon proper instructions and an assurance of a former employee of this House in a responsible position, I think that the least we can do is to see that it is honoured.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, from the time I have been in this House, I have always held the view that anything which has to do with the servants of the House, the House can settle, and it should only then have to ask the Government to make the provision. I have never refused, except perhaps in one case when the thing was the other side, but in any event I have tried to carry out the wishes of the House when I knew they were the wishes of the House. Now this matter came to us during the Estimates. No insertion could be made in the Estimates then. It has since been before a meeting of the Debates Committee. My recollection of that meeting was that the Debates Committee approved the claim in principle but decided that the amount should be checked in respect of the proper rate for such overtime with the Ministry of Communications and Works. I do not know whether...

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I understand that after that decision of the Debates Committee, Mr. Clerk of Parliament wrote the Ministry of Communications and Works. I gather that is several weeks ago. He yet awaits a reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have just been told that the amounts have now been certified as \$671 and this is what we have been waiting to hear. This is in excess of what was first asked for and therefore it is to the gentleman's advantage that we have had this delay rather than the opposite, and I therefore I will inform the (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: I confirm that the Clerk has received no reply.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, which is correct, your statement that they are awaiting a reply from the Ministry as regards the figure, or the statement by the Leader of the House that the figure is so much money?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to move that the Deputy Marshal.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make a motion now because the Leader of the House is still addressing the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: It does not need an address. I want to make a motion that the Deputy Marshal be paid this amount for his overtime.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion cannot be so made. The Hon. Leader of the House was addressing the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a fact that the Debates Committee decided that the matter be referred to the Ministry of Communications and Works to see whether the rate at which the gentleman should be paid was a fair and proper one. It has now turned out that what he is to get is very much in excess of what he was asking for; so how could hon. members say that the delay was not to his advantage?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has said that he has not received any reply and I accept the Clerk's word.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: But, Mr. Speaker, I was not contradicting Your Honour. You said you had received no reply from the Ministry, and I said that it has been drawn to my attention that the amount is \$671, and there are no contradictory statements. I do not know what the point of view of hon. members opposite is. If they want the officer to get the money, the House will agree and decide on this; but I do not want them to feel that they are the only people interested in this thing. The same gentleman was in here acting for three years and nobody even remembered that he had not been appointed. As soon as it was drawn to my attention, I moved that he be appointed, and to this day we have been given no reason or explanation as to why he was kept acting for three years, although I have been told that he was told that they could not risk appointing him because we would object, and the House did not know he was acting, because if the House had known he was acting for so long, it would immediately have offered him a substantive appointment. So there is no problem between us.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this might appear to be a very simple matter. I never expected that a matter of this nature would have occupied the attention of the House for so long. The Leader of the House is accusing this House and when he is accusing the House I take it he would have to be accusing you. You are the chief servant, chairman and principal person in this House, and the Debates Committee would have to be responsible for the long delay in the payment of the money to Mr. Best.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. CRAIG: The Leader of the House is saying that after three years he was not appointed, and as Speaker of the House you are the chief executive officer of the House and therefore responsible for his long acting appointment, and it would appear here again that it is you, Mr. Speaker, who are responsible for the long delay in the man getting his money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing could be more untrue than that; but I cannot allow a protracted debate on the question of the Resolution which is before the House now in connection with another matter. That can be and will be the subject perhaps even tonight of another Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question of overtime due and owing to Mr. Best will be paid and the quantum is being worked out. The claim which he worked out is here and will be dealt with in the proper way, and we give the full assurance that the entire amount will be paid. What we are dealing with now is not Mr. Best's overtime, but we give the assurance that we have it here now for the first time since it has been worked out and it will be paid.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is something more than wrong surrounding this matter of the Deputy Marshal's claim. I am saying that people are deliberately withholding the payment from the officer concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow I cannot allow a debate.

Mr. HINDS: In the same way that the Resolution is brought before the House for the payment for other officers, we feel that something should be done for the poor man.
8.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: What assurances are we getting as to the claim of the Deputy Marshal?

Mr. SPEAKER: The assurance has been given by the Hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. HINDS: That is a misleading statement coming now for the first time. The officer's claim was submitted to the Debates Committee and the Hon. Minister is a member of the Debates Committee; we want to hear something about the officer's pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this straight, the Resolution before us at the instant is in connection with the Administrative Officer and I can only allow debate on that now; mention has been made to something else but I cannot allow a substantive debate on it.

Mr. HINDS: But you allowed other hon. members to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow it as a substantive debate, it has been referred to sufficiently by other hon. members.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak on the substantive motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have so ruled.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Friday afternoon at 4.30 when we propose to resume the budgetary reply, because I understand that an hon. member over there wishes to contribute to that debate and we wish to reply to it as well.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the suspension. (*Asides*) This is a motion which I can speak on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any motion, in my view, can be debated. This is a motion that this sitting be now suspended, and in my view that motion may be debated.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House yesterday afternoon gave the Leader of the Opposition the assurance that we would be able to come here and work until late tonight so as to clear the Order Paper as far as Government Business is concerned. There is a Resolution for \$2 million which I believe is as important to the Government in getting it off as it is to the Opposition in assisting the Government in getting off, and at this hour, 20 minutes to nine, the Leader of the House is moving the suspension of the sitting. Since the 9th June this Resolution was on the Order Paper for CBC to be released from liability to meet any interest or capital instalments due to Government on the said loan of \$2,100,000 and we are asking Government not to suspend the sitting now because we in the Opposition are prepared to assist the Government in carrying out their programme. I am asking the Leader of the House to withdraw the motion which is now before this House so that we on this side would be able to debate this Resolution which is very important, it has been on the Order Paper for several weeks, we have repeatedly come in here and the Government has side-stepped it, I do not know for what reason, and I feel that we cannot support the motion for the suspension when there is so much Government Business to be done. I would ask the Leader of the House to take this matter quite seriously; we all have our duties to do, but I think our duty is here first now. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that we continue working for another two hours.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that motion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter written by the Speaker on the 21st December, 1970 and addressed to the Hon. J. C. Tudor; it reads as follows:-

Hon. J. C. Tudor, C.M.G., M.A., M.P.,
Leader of the House,
Lemon Grove,
Westbury New Road,
St. Michael.

Dear Mr. Leader,

I submit for your sympathetic consideration the enclosed document received from the Deputy Marshal of the House, for an *ex gratia* payment.

On principle, I support the request contained therein and I am satisfied that Mr. Best certainly did considerable overtime work, as stated, notwithstanding hope of reward.

Under the circumstances, you may feel disposed to place this matter before the Cabinet for consideration during this financial year.

Yours faithfully,
THEODORE BRANCKER
Speaker,
House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this straight, if anybody thinks they will work me to the point of exhaustion they are quite wrong, I cannot go on indefinitely and the Deputy Speaker is not available. The question is that this sitting be now suspended till 4.30 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand these threats that are being made, I rose to support the motion made by the senior member for St. James. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No motion was made).

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I moved that the sitting should continue for another two hours with the view to doing more Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. No member of the Opposition can tell the Government how to conduct its business. We are not ready to deal with that.

Mr. CRAIG: We are not telling you how to conduct it. (*Asides*)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the the grave disorder, I declare this sitting now suspended until 4.30 p.m. on Friday of this week.
8.45 p.m.

On resumption

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be taken for a quarter of an hour.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we have replies to Questions Nos. 192, 193, 199 and 205.

STREET LIGHTS FOR OLDBURY/CRANE AREA

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 192 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister treat as an urgent priority in his street lighting programme the improvement of the street lights along the public road leading from Oldbury corner to Crane in the Parish of St. Philip?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 192 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is as follows:

"The installation of street lamps in the areas mentioned has been included in the street lighting programme for the current financial year".

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister say whether the particular area has been lighted since the Question was asked?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip has told me that they are now being installed. I receive a weekly programme on the lighting programme of the entire Island, which I circulate to Cabinet Members every Thursday. Unfortunately, I do not have the list of all of the lights installed with me.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether he is always able to believe the accuracy of statements from the hon. senior member for St. Philip?

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, that is not a proper supplementary!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if it is the custom or policy of his Ministry to issue letters to residents of areas requiring electricity through candidates who are seeking election?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as a proper supplementary in respect of the road leading from Oldbury corner to the Crane.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can say whether or not candidates seeking election in the parish of St. Philip could have been issued letters, which they produce to the residents of the Oldbury area notifying them as to the time that they were likely to receive electricity with which they are now being served?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, in many instances the Electric Company carries out a survey in an area. If there are enough people in that area to warrant the installation of lights, that area would be included in the programme. Petitions may come in to the Ministry and a survey will be made of the area to see how many houses are in the area and how many people in houses in the area are willing to put in lights. If there are enough people in the area to make it a viable enterprise, then the lights will be established in the area.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us, how does the Ministry of Communications and Works can become immediately associated with it?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, there is an amount of money voted for the lighting programme, and it is paid for through the Ministry of Communications and Works. Each street light that is put in will have to be paid for monthly. The more lights we put in the more we will have to pay for the installation of street lights. In many instances what can be done is that if it is viable for the Company to put in lights when they provide facilities for the people in the area, it reduces expenses considerably rather than having a certain number of persons paying for the installation of poles. As long as the street lamps run along that area that will facilitate the people in the district.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has been able to explain what obtains, and this, we believe, obtains in the area leading from Oldbury to the Crane, can the Minister tell us if a similar condition is likely to exist at St. Peter in the district of French Village?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot regard that as a proper supplementary. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is posing a supplementary.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to enquire of the Minister whether he would give the House the assurance that he would tell the electorate that these lights between Oldbury corner to the Crane were put in because of the intervention of the junior member for St. Joseph and not by anything done by the senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: No proper supplementary!

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister say whether Hopeland has been included in the lighting programme?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the area well enough that I can say offhand,

but if it is on the same straight line going from A and C passing through B, then the area will receive it. You cannot go from A to C without passing through B.

4.40 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister was given inaccurate information by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I wonder if he would seek now to acquire correct information in respect of the area of Hopeland?

Mr. SPEAKER, No proper supplementary.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I have received no wrong information from the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said I do not regard that as a proper supplementary.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I do not know the area very well, but I would like to find out from the Minister whether Gemswick is between Oldbury and The Crane.

QUESTION *re* WATER MAIN AT VAUGHAN'S LAND, ST. JOSEPH

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister assist the residents of Vaughan's Land in the Parish of St. Joseph by installing a water main and making the necessary connections as soon as applications for services are made?

(3) Is the Minister aware that a water main has been laid in Blackman's Tenantry, St. Joseph during November 1970 and that several persons have laid their pipes to their homes and are awaiting inspection and estimates?

(3) If the answer is in the affirmative

(1) Would the Minister indicate how soon inspection will be made, and estimates given?

(2) How soon after payment of estimates would connections be made?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"1. A water main has been installed in Vaughan's Land, St. Joseph.

The necessary connections will be made as soon as possible after the estimates have been paid.

2. I am aware that a water main was laid in Blackman's tenantry during November, 1970. All the connections have been made

and the department is now awaiting the payment of deposits before further connections can be made."

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the issue under Question 2 at Blackman's Tenantry because I think the House is aware of the circumstances, but I would like to go back to the first question and deal with Vaughan's Land. Can the Minister state whether a main has been laid in the entire area called Vaughan's Land? Or I can simplify the question. Is the Minister aware that Vaughan's Land, St. Joseph is in two sections, and that the main has been laid in one and the other section has only got two banjo strings supply to two of the houses in that area?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the time allotted for Question Time has expired.

QUESTION TIME EXTENDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be extended for a further fifteen minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say what area is Vaughan's Land, but the hon. member might be in a better position to say whether 1,000 feet would cover the two areas or only one because the amount of pipe used to cover this area was 1,000 feet of 1 1/4 inch main. If there are two areas then only one area would be supplied if the area is more than 1,000 feet.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that as a result of laying water in one portion of Vaughan's Land to the exclusion of the other that the persons living in the area where no water main has been laid are now rather disturbed and annoyed?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I would have to check on that. I agree that if one area has been supplied that it is just like with lights; as soon as you put in one area it creates a disturbance and the other people feel they are left out. I will check on this for the hon. member, and I assure him that if it is not included in the Estimates, I will look into it and see that the other area equally as well gets a water main.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister prepared to give any indication as to how soon a main will be laid in the second area of Vaughan's Land?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I assured the hon. member that I would look into it as long as it is feasible. I would like to inform the hon. member that the money that is spent in the Ministry of Communications and Works is spent on priorities. In other words, if in some part of the area I can spend

that money to provide services for more people, that money would be spent where the most people would receive the greatest benefit.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that from 1961 up to the current time there have only been three amounts of waterworks done in St. Joseph, one when a main was specially laid to accommodate the hon. senior member for St. Joseph back I think in 1964 or 1965, but no other waterworks have been done other than in Blackman's during the by-election in November, 1970?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, no water main was laid anywhere in St. Joseph to accommodate me.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the records of this House will show that an Hon. Minister of Government said that they ran a main to satisfy the hon. senior member for St. Joseph when he complained of not receiving water.

Mr. SPEAKER: This cannot arise now.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am dealing with supplementary questions, and if you allow the hon. member to interject when he was not asking a question, I am entitled to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had to hear what was the alleged point of order. It was no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only water works done have been the laying of this main.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. BOLDEN: Does the hon. member not understand a question yet? Is the Minister aware that the only work on water done in St. Joseph is the laying of a main to accommodate the hon. senior member for St. Joseph?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have already given the hon. junior member for St. Joseph the policy of the Ministry of Communications and Works. Nothing is done to suit a person; it depends on the number of people to receive the service in a particular area. If the hon. member was carrying out a development, he could have the water, but he would have to pay for the main.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the only work done in St. Joseph is (a) the laying of one main in 1964-65, (b) the laying of a main in Blackman's during the by-election in 1970, and (c) the present laying of 1,000 feet of main in Vaughan's Land? Would the Minister not consider that the remainder of Vaughan's Land could be deemed a priority in view of the fact that no work in water has been done in comparison with other parishes in this Island?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have already assured the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that as far as Vaughan's Land is concerned, he would know the area better than I do, and he said that the 1,000 feet of main laid would not supply one area. I have also said that I would look into it as far as the other area is concerned. As far as what was done in 1964, I was not Minister of Communications and Works then.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the Minister said, is the Minister aware that there is a considerable backlog of applications for connections at the Waterworks Department?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I could not say off hand, what might happen is that in an area where repairs are being carried out or mains are being laid we wait until enough people put in their applications to make one thing of it that when we re-surface the road the whole area would have water and we will not have to dig up the roads soon after they have been resurfaced.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the waiting list is such a long one that the Department is refusing to accept money from persons who go there to make payment?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not regard that as a proper supplementary.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that I have been personally told by a senior officer in the Department of Waterworks that there are more applications than they can handle and that Blackman's turn will come up some time in December?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I am not aware of that.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister aware that there is a shortage of plumbers at the Department?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that does not arise as a proper supplementary.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that persons living in Blackman's who have applied for water connections have had their names entered in the book but have found that their names are some 93 pages down the line?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 199 standing in the name of the same hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of the fact that the junction connecting Gagg's Hill, Joes River, Cleaver's Hill

and St. Elizabeth Village has become difficult to negotiate in view of the increased traffic using the above-mentioned area?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister consider the reconstruction of the said junction so as to facilitate traffic using the surrounding districts?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows: Improvements to this junction have been carried out from time to time and further improvements have been planned.

Mr. BOLDEN: Can the Minister state what are the further improvements which are planned and how soon they will be implemented?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say exactly when further improvements will be carried out but minor improvements have been carried out already in this area and consideration is being given to further improvements, but I cannot say exactly when they will be carried out. All these things are done on a priority basis, and where the roads are more urgently used and more urgently needed for improvement, all these are carried out first.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that this junction leads to the hotels in the Bathsheba area and that it is difficult to negotiate from the point of view of coming uphill where there is a major road at about a 1/2 gradient, and that going downhill one has to negotiate a post with a lot of bush around it, and I would like to know what improvements are planned for the area.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the file for the hon. junior member. The Lands and Surveys Department has been approached to undertake a survey of the junction and the Chief Surveyor has informed the Ministry that the survey is scheduled for the quarter ending July, 1971.

Mr. BOLDEN: The Hon. Minister has said that improvements are planned for the junction; will the Minister state what improvements are planned for the junction?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have just told the hon. member that a survey has to be carried out, I would not know what the improvements are until the survey has been carried out and recommendations made.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that as a result of this question they will look into it to see what improvements can be made?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: No, I have already said that improvements have been carried out in the area and it needs major improvements but a survey has to be carried out before I can know what plans are made for improvements.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 205 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown. I am advised that Question Time has again expired.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be further extended by 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what is going on, are they going to extend it for 15 minutes more every 15 minutes?
5.00 p.m.

RECONSTRUCTION OF STEPS AT BANNISTER'S LAND

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 205 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown. It can be found on page 20, right hand column.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that the workers employed by the Ministry of Communications and Works demolished the steps of certain of the residents of Bannister's Land in the Parish of St. Michael when the roads in that area were being repaired?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Minister give instructions that these above-mentioned steps should be reconstructed at the earliest possible opportunity?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 205 asked by the hon. junior member for the City is as follows:

"It is standard procedure in road construction to remove steps and fencing temporarily which are within the limits of the roadworks. These are replaced upon the completion of the basic roadworks. In the interval, every effort is made to give reasonable access temporarily to homes and to secure property where necessary.

Work on the reconstruction of the steps in this particular area was started before May 25th when the Question was asked. Reconstruction of all steps removed was completed by 3rd June, 1971."

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes the Questions to which Answers have been laid.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay replies to Questions Nos. 145, 180 and 185.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more Questions to which Answers have been laid; therefore, I will ask the Hon. Leader of the House to intimate that which he proposes to deal.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to give Notices which I was not able to give earlier in today's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. Hearing no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to give such Notices.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$6,445 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1971-72 Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 5 which form Schedule to this Resolution.

I have copies of this Resolution, and the Resolution meets the desires of the House in connection with the remuneration for certain of the House's servants. It arises out of the discussion which took place in the House two afternoons ago. (Mr. BOLDEN: "Is Best in it?") I am saying one thing and he is saying another. Of course, Best is in it!

Mr. SPEAKER: Some documents are about to be circulated. Will hon. members await the confirmation of documentary evidence?

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am new to the House, and I beg to be excused if I make an error. I thought that if a member sat and made a comment it would be an aside. All I asked was whether the Resolution included the Deputy Marshal. I would have gone on to say in a loud aside: Who has found the note for the Deputy Marshal?"

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyway, no point of order and, of course, asides must be almost silent.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour's permission to have these copies circulated. I also give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later in today's sitting to deal with that Resolution in all of its stages.

Mr. Speaker, I also give notice of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act. Now, I cannot and would not press this amendment on the House today. I shall have copies in a few minutes and will circulate the amendment so that hon. members will have time between now and next Tuesday to deal with it.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read the first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the

House go into Committee of Supply, and that there be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal in all its stages with the money Resolution which has just been circulated to hon. members.

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

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

5.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members are familiar with these three amounts. We are supplementing Head 3 - Parliament. Item 13 represents the difference between the original salary scale of the Secretary and the salary scale to which she has now been raised to put her on all fours with the new post of Administrative Officer with the extra increment which preserves her seniority. Item 15 which is new takes care of the salary of the Administrative Officer from the 15th June to the end of the financial year, and the sum of \$724 against Item 14A (New) is the final computation of the overtime due and owing to the Deputy Marshal.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to tell the Committee that I have since discovered that there was an alternate source from which this amount for the Deputy Marshal could be met and that it was a proper charge on the Renovations vote, but it was thought preferable for the House to express its wishes in this way and have it done in this form.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to say that the administrative arm of Parliament is becoming a much too costly item, and if we were to continue at this rate we do not know where we will eventually end up. In my view not many months hence this matter, that is, the administration of Parliament, will have to be seriously reviewed and the cost reduced wherever possible. That is all I want to say on this Resolution. As regards the Item 14A - Overtime to the Deputy Marshal in respect of the period 28/8/70 to 14/11/70, we are very happy indeed to see that at long last this matter is nearing finality. I do not want to attach blame to the Leader of the House, the Speaker or to anyone else. I am just happy to know that what has taken place during the past forty-eight hours or thereabouts could have been attended to in our view months ago, and it would have removed this considerable amount of waiting which has almost carried the Deputy Marshal to the point of despondency. We are glad to see that it has come about and we certainly do support the measure.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to respectively.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 2nd August, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.20 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd August, 1971.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*); Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS, J.P., (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs*); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Social Welfare*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G.G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications and works*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C.A.E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J.B. SPRINGER; and Mr. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B. (*Leader of the Opposition*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Minutes available for confirmation.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is commenced, I would like to draw your attention to a defect in the Order Paper which has been circulated in that it omits four questions that have been asked by me since two Tuesdays ago. They are not on the Order Paper and I ask that this matter be rectified.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. I will direct the Clerk to investigate and rectify the matter forthwith.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I also want to draw to Your Honour's attention the condition of what purports to be the Order Paper and the documents generally that have been circulated to me. I do not know if other hon. members got theirs in a similar condition. I believe that the Clerk in order to expedite matters had to make some deletions by making big "X" marks, and this type of thing has been circu-

lated to hon. members. I feel it is an insult to any hon. member to circulate this type of Order Paper, and I certainly would not like to see it happen in the future. As I say, I definitely feel that the Clerk was pressed for time, but this is the reason why we have been insisting on having our own printery for Parliament that we can have what we want done. It is a disgrace to circulate this to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the hon. member's point. What I gather may have rendered the situation somewhat difficult was the fact that we last met on Friday, Monday was a public holiday, and so many people other than bank officials seem to regard Saturday also as a public holiday, and today is Tuesday. I appreciate the hon. member's point.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay Notices later in today's sitting since they have not yet arrived.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, leave is granted.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SELECT COMMITTEE DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to discharge the Select Committee which was appointed to investigate the disappearance of the horse shoe table of the House of Assembly with my thanks to those few who attended, although we were never able to form a quorum.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. MILLIKEN

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with Government Business, although I have not mentioned it to the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to ask for leave to deal with the reappointment of the Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank whose term of office has expired. If the Leader of the Opposition would like to see the matter before we deal with it, he can have a look at it and then we can proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. J. Milliken of FitzPatrick Graham and Co. who are chartered accountants be reappointed as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank commencing 1st July, 1970 at a remuneration of £125 per annum.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, 1971

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is the instant Order of the day and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take charge of this Bill, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted for the Hon. Minister of Health to move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to conditions of service of Governors-General and to provide pensions for such persons and their immediate families.

When this matter was previously before the House, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking when he moved, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Health that further consideration be now postponed. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Does the Hon. Minister of Health propose to continue his address?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I merely seconded the motion for further consideration to be postponed, but I did not actually speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is a matter of pensions and the position in relation to the details of pensions are never dealt with on the floor of the House and I would suggest

that in accordance with the usual procedure this matter be referred to a Select Committee. We have not had an opportunity to study the relevant comparative wages in the other Commonwealth countries and we would also like to be in a position to study these *vis-a-vis* those of this country. With respect to former Heads of State receiving pensions, the actual provision is a matter which I think should be sent to a Select Committee, and we should have the relevant information before we can decide whether we can deal with it and I would therefore suggest that this be sent to a Select Committee as has been done in relation to pensions for other members.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now sent to a Select Committee.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. senior member for Christ Church would wish to pass the Second Reading of it because it would be in order to pass the Second Reading and then send it to a Select Committee.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, that would have been the correct procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree; perhaps we can now regularise the situation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill 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 division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I now therefore move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think the Committee ought to be a reasonably small one, and I recommend the junior and senior members for Christ Church, the junior member for St. Joseph, the senior member for St. Thomas, the senior member for St. George and the senior member for St. Michael with Your Honour as Chairman of the Committee *ex officio*.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will invite the following members to be associated with myself as members of this Select Committee;

Both hon. members for Christ Church
The hon. junior member for St. Joseph
The hon. senior member for St. Thomas
The hon. senior member for St. Michael
The hon. senior member for St. George.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1971 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That Order stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to deal with the Bill which stands in the name of the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister has asked the leave of the House to take charge of this Bill which is in the name of the Leader of the House; this leave is granted and the hon. member may proceed to deal with the Bill.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, notice of this Bill was given on 30th July. It is a very short amendment and I should like to outline for the benefit of hon. members why this amendment to the Bill which we so recently passed is necessary today. I should like to give a full explanation so I hope hon. members will bear with me.

The Bill provides that where anything in connection with the publication of any lists, registers or supplementary registers is to be done the Minister will have power to extend the time. First I should like to draw to the attention of the House that this is only in connection with the formalities of preparing the lists which by the 1971 Act have to be done on the advice of the Minister by order. The Minister decides the date which he thinks the lists should be ready and he makes certain allowances for the mistakes of mankind and the Civil Servants - not that they are two categories of persons - but he publishes an order saying that the preliminary list, the register or supplementary register as the case may be will be published on such and such a date. He has the discretion to deal with this matter, he does not have to refer it to Cabinet or otherwise but purely on the advice of the Chief Registering Officer and the people responsible for preparing the list, but once that list for that date has been published there is no provision in the law whereby if the calculations made either by the Minister or the other persons concerned, the printers, the publishers, the Chief Registering Officer or anyone else, if any of these calculations happen to be wrong then there is no provision in the law whereby the Minister can say that the register is not going to be ready on Friday but we will get it as soon as possible thereafter.

12.35 p.m.

I will explain what happened in this particular case. Under Regulation 35 of the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1971, made under the Act, the Electoral Revising Centres Establishment Order, 1971, was by the Minister on the 24th June, 1971, directing the Chief Registering Officer to establish

Electoral Revising Centres in each constituency not later than the 28th June, 1971. The list of the Centres was published in accordance with the Regulations on the 28th June.

Under Section 13 (2) of the Representation of the People Act, 1971, the Minister made an Order under the Registers of Electors Date of Publication of Preliminary Registers Order, 1971 - that is what it is called. *(Asides)*

I wonder if hon. members would mind proceeding with this Bill. The Bill has not been gazetted, but it is a very minor amendment. I have information from the other side that we all feel the same way about rising as soon as possible, so that we can devote our energies to other matters. It is one short paragraph amending the Bill.

I beg to move that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed for a few minutes, while I move that Standing Order 40 (1) be suspended.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 40

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that standing Order No. 40 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House resume consideration of Item No. 6 on the Order Paper.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will resume from where I left off earlier. Under Section 13 (2) of the Representation of the People Act, 1971, the Minister made the Registers of Electors Date of Publication of Preliminary Registers Order, 1971. He did this on the 24th June, 1971. Under this Order the appointed date was the 25th July not later than which the Chief Registering Officer was required to publish the preliminary register of foreign service electors for each constituency. The preliminary registers of electors required to be published under this Order were published on the 5th July, 1971.

Under Section 15 (1) of the Representation of the People Act, 1971, the Minister made the Registers of Electors Date of publication of the Monthly Election Order, 1971, under which the Chief Regis-

tering Officer is required to publish not later than the 15th July 1971, the monthly list of electors and of the foreign service electors for each constituency. This Order was made on the 24th June, 1971, and the list was published on the 15th July, 1971. Everything was done in time.

Now, under Section 17 of the Act, the Chief Registering Officer published a revised monthly list on the 28th July, 1971. It was not possible to publish the supplementary registers within the 3-day period as required by Section 18 of the Act, consequent upon a breakdown of the equipment at the Data Processing Unit which occurred on the 28th July. In other words, according to the provisions of the Act, Section 18, after the Chief Registering Officer has published the revised monthly list, he has three days in which to publish the supplementary registers; so that if the revised monthly list was published on the 28th July, according to the terms of Section 18 of the Act, the supplementary list should have been published on the 31st July.

Now, all of these dates had been arranged and determined after consultation with the Chief Electoral Officer and the Director of the Data Processing Unit which is next door, and the dates originally intended to be fixed were further put back at the request of the Data Processing Unit to take care of any technical difficulties which might have occurred, because it is very complicated machinery. The real difficulty has occurred in respect of the 31st July and no other date. In other words, the machines worked according to plan and the lists were published in accordance with the Orders made by the Minister right up to the 28th July, but it is in respect of the supplementary registers which had to be published on the 31st July that we have had some difficulty. The problem is that nowhere in the Act is there any provision for the Minister to extend the date or to amend the original date either before and certainly not after the date has passed.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, we are now on Tuesday, 3rd August. Monday was the 2nd August; Sunday was the 1st August, and Saturday which was the week end preceding a Bank Holiday, was the 31st and the date on which these lists should have been published. I should like to explain what has been done in order to get the list out in time. The lists were published on the 28th July in accordance with the Order made by the Minister. At ten o'clock on the morning of the 28th July after the 28th July list had been published, they were getting ready to run off on the computer.

12.45 p.m.

These things are done on a 1401 IBM computer, and they have to be so done. They cannot be done even in an emergency on any other computer or by any other process because all the information is on IBM punch cards which have to be run through the main unit of the computer so that it comes out in a printed form from the coded holes which are punched on the computer; so once you have prepared your punch cards with, say, 120,000 names, there is no

earthly way if you do not have a computer between 28th and 31st July on which you can get it done other than getting another computer to do it.

Now there is another computer in the Island of a similar model, what we called the second generation. We are now on the 360 series of IBM computers - the 360/20, 360/30, and the 360/50. The 360/60 is being used by some Governments like the Bahamas, but we are on the second generation of computers which is the 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405 and 1406. There are eight units altogether, but we are concerned with one particular unit. All the sorting could be done at the Statistical Office or at the Registering Centre itself, but we are concerned now about the printer to run these cards and get them translated on to something that you and I can apprehend rather than a lot of peep holes on a small piece of card looking like a blotting paper. There is another 1401 in the island and one of the reasons that motivated us in my office in choosing the 1401 was that there was some kind of back-up potential in the Island. If we had bought a 350 or 360 series, the third generation computer, we would not have had this facility; so the cards were then sent up to Gazettees to the Data Processing Centre there, and that machine broke down. So you had two machines costing over \$1/2 million each which decided to pack up for the week-end before the Civil Servants or the members of the House decided to take their week-end off. The next thing which was done is that on 28th they did effect some repairs and went back into production on the 28th, 29th and 30th, but even up to that time it was still anticipated with the several breakdowns that the list could have been published.

On 31st July, this is on the very last day, the Chief Registering Officer and two technical officers from the data processing unit were sent to the IBM office in Trinidad in order to get these cards run through and get the register published on the day specified by the Minister. They arrived in Trinidad on 31st July, the very last day at 10.20 p.m., they started work at 11.30 p.m. when you know the distance from Piarco Airport is remarkable, and they worked through until 9.45 a.m. it appears non-stop on the 1st August, on which date they had returned and the registers are ready; but they were even then twenty-four hours late and that was a Sunday which is *dies non*. Everything now has been done and everything possible was done to get the register published in time, and this amendment merely seeks to give the Minister responsible the authority to extend the time, amend the time or appoint another day on which these specific acts should be done. It has nothing to do with the election period or anything committed during an election; it is merely in connection with the publication of the registers and the lists.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side understand and appreciate the reason and the necessity for an amendment to the Representation of the People Act, 1971, to cover a factual situation which has developed, as I understand it, due to a break down of machinery which is being used to compile the list, but what we want to be clear on is what is the actual position now with respect to the preliminary list. As I understand it, the preliminary list as revised should have been published by 31st July. The preliminary list with the claims and objections and modifications on the initiative of the Chief Registering Officer himself which obviously arose because of the bad enumeration resulting from the change of boundaries, and which should include people in the constituency up to 30th April, should have been published in corrected form so to speak by the 31st July. As I understand it, that has not been done. In addition to that there is also.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, there was a lot of information which I read out during the course of my second reading of the Bill, but I should like to point out to the hon. member that the preliminary registers were published on 5th July. On 15th July the monthly list of electors and of foreign service electors for each constituency was published. This order had been made on 24th June. The registers of electors were to have been published on 28th July and the supplementary registers on 31st July. Supplementary registers were supposed to be published within three days of the publication of the revised monthly lists which were published on 28th July, and then registers were supposed to be published on 29th and the supplementary registers on 31st July; so the preliminary registers were certainly published well over a month ago.

Mr. St. JOHN: The very point I am making is that the preliminary list was definitely published and the monthly register containing people who were photographed in May and June was published. What occurred certainly in my area, because I went and bought copies and it was similar all over Barbados, is that in those constituencies where the boundaries were changed the preliminary register had defects in it that had to be corrected after claims and objections and after the Chief Registering Officer having certified for himself that the people who were in the new constituencies were on the corrected register. That preliminary list as revised has not been published. When you publish the preliminary register, you have claims and objections, and there must be provision after you have done your claims and objections to have what is called a final register. In addition to that you have the supplementary register. (*Asides*) They were to have been published because applications were made for copies and they were not available.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get this straight. If I may just catalogue what my understanding of the position is because this is disturbing us on this side, it is that the preliminary register which is the master register included everybody who should have been there by the 30th April. That is what the law says. Now you had a monthly register which consists

of the people who came on the register subsequent to 30th April in respect of the first exercise, that is, people who came on in May and June. That was published. The first supplementary monthly register, so to speak, although it contained information for two months was published.
12.55 p.m.

What we have to get and which as I understand should have been published by the end of the month was the preliminary register containing everybody up to 30th May as revised, but that has not been published. In addition to that, what should also have been published was the monthly register containing names as revised, but that has also not been published. I agree with the power to extend time but what I want to be clear on is this "extension of time and validation of Acts"; if it is a Bill in respect of time let it be a Bill in respect of time, but it is really worded in such a way that it can validate anything that was done before. We would suggest that it goes further and if you have validation, unless you have this validation only in relation to time, and then this order omnibus clause "or is otherwise irregularly done in matter of form, the Minister may by order....." in other words, what I want to be clear on is that when a register is published that the time is extended if have any difficulties in preparing it.

I can summarise my position quite clearly. As I understand it, now we should have two registers revised to the 30th April, the revised register for May and June, and by 15th of this month we should have a new monthly register containing everybody who was registered in the month of July. The register we would have would be the big preliminary register, the revised register containing May, June and July, and by 15th August everybody who came on from 1st July down to the 30th would come on in August, but I have not seen any publication in respect of that master register, so to speak. I know there were a lot of problems, certainly in the Christ Church constituency, because one right side of the road was considered to be wrong; obviously somebody thought it would have been South Central, so all that has to be revised. I really want clarification of this, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are two matters which should have been done which have not been done. As the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, a preliminary register was published on 5th July, after that the monthly list was published on 15th July, then the revised monthly list was published on 28th July, and the main register was slated to be published on 29th July. The machine broke down on 28th July, so I may not have made it clear that there are two things to be done, both the main register of 29th July and the supplementary register of 31st July, that is in connection with those particular orders. New orders will have to be made in respect of, let us say, the month of July for the people who have been brought on in July, and as it goes on for August, September and so on, from time to time new orders will have to be made which are not affected by what we are doing today, unless of course the machine breaks down again.

That is the position, Sir, and I would like to assure the hon. member that I have an abhorrence of validating things of substance. We used to have the colonial laws and we used to have the yearly Acts which we validated, and sometimes three or four years after the laws were expired some people still used to be working under those laws. I would like to assure the hon. member that as far as I am concerned I have a vested interest in seeing that nothing of substance but only of form and dates, matters, relating to time and so on should be validated, and I think the amendment to the Act clearly sets out that it is in relation to these matters and to these matters only, this is not anything to do with the election period or anything like that. 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.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed,

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2 we have the words "extend that time or validate anything so done before or after the time required or so irregularly done in matter of form."
1.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, these words "so irregularly done" open the way for manoeuvring, for want of a better word, anything which should have been done in a particular form under the Act. One must take into account that this relates to everything which should be done in respect of an election where certain things might not be done through inadvertence or deliberately. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, those words should not be in the Act. One can remember the instance in Jamaica where certain names were left off a register and certain persons were prevented from voting at the election. They were able to show that they were deprived of their constitutional rights in respect of voting; they brought actions against the Chief Returning Officer and they were awarded damages by the Courts.

Now, if this Clause is allowed to stand as it is - as the Act stands a person can only be registered if he has his photograph taken. If his name has been deliberately left off the register through an irregularity he will turn up at the polling booth to find that he cannot vote. If his card is not placed in the master file, although he has complied with the law in an earlier section, he will find that he cannot vote and he can take no action. In the light of this amendment,

the Chief Returning Officer has been put in such an immune position that nothing can be done about the matter. We should really object to this amendment.

It is commonly known that persons who were registered since the 1965-66 registration are holding registration cards, but their names are not on the register. My wife and I will have to vote in two different voting boxes although we live in the same house. A case has been drawn to my attention in which persons living in the same house have been put in two different parishes to vote. These are irregularities which would affect the validity of any list which has been issued. This Government has placed the onus of certifying that a person is a registered voter on the electorate. A voter must go and check the list to see that his name is there. Having checked the list; having complained to the Chief Returning Officer, he finds that at the particular time his name still does not appear on the list. He can take no action in the matter, because the Chief Returning Officer has been made immune from any action whatsoever.

We have to point to the fact that there are cases where persons have turned up at polling booths and found themselves in difficulties. I know of a case where a man and his wife turned up at a polling booth; the photographer went through the action of taking a photograph, but they were told a few months later that there was no film in the camera. Since then that gentleman has been trying endlessly to have his photograph taken. He went to "Verona" on several occasions and to other polling booths and was told that he could not have his photograph taken. I also know of a case of a man who turned up with a slip of paper which was given to him for registration, and the photographer told him that he did not see his name on the list and, therefore, could not take his photograph.

Mr. Chairman, these people are being deprived of their constitutional rights to cast their votes. Having put the onus on them, they have done all that it is possible for them to do, and if you find that the Returning Officer or somebody has been negligent, what is the redress for the citizen? The amendment to this Act makes such redress impossible. Where does the citizen stand under such circumstances? He can only blame the Government in power, a Government which he elects to look after his rights, but it is now passing an Act to deprive him of his rights.

I do not want to say that the Returning Officer and any of his Assistants are persons who will deliberately do something to prevent a citizen from exercising his vote, but one can think of the time when there may be another Returning Officer who may have some sort of prejudice for any political party whether it be my party or your party. He might have a bias against individual persons and anything can happen.

Mr. Chairman, if you go to "Verona" any morning you will find a lady down there sitting down trying to cope with 100 or 200 shouting electors, who

want to have their names on the list. If an election is called and the list is closed what will happen to those persons? It cannot be said that they were not there. It is not that they did not present themselves to be registered. One can point out irregularities. It is commonly known that certain Civil Servants will sit down and decide that certain things do not affect them, so they need not worry. Here is a person who has a duty to perform and a duty to the public.

Mr. Chairman, we are saying that we do not like an amendment which removes any sort of redress for the electorate and to make the Chief Returning Officer or anybody who deals with the constitutional rights of the citizen to be such that that person can do whatever he feels like without redress to the aggrieved person. Mr. Chairman, one knows that you may come into Parliament and talk a whole day and it does not affect a particular officer. Civil Servants will tell you that Parliamentarians or politicians cannot affect their position; therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see this particular section amended, so that the citizen may be assured of getting redress for what may be done deliberately.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I hope the hon. member will give way. This is not the Court House. It is a matter of form; this is not a Judge and jury. This is a matter of form and not substance.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I accept that this is not the Court House, but certain members could never get in the Court House unless they are in the dock. Some people are supposed to have been qualified, but they do not understand what they have been qualified in. This is a substantive Act, Mr. Chairman, and we do not like it. If the Hon. Minister wants to justify the question that this is not a Court House; if he wants to test it, we can go to the Court House and see who knows what the law is.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, what disturbs me is the width of Section 26(a). I object to the word "preparation". Preparation is an omnibus expression which covers a tremendous number of acts which have to be done by the Registering Officer.
1.15 p.m.

I understand the position in relation to the publication, but when we deal with preparation and we follow preparation right through and see that if we have an irregular preparation in matter of form, even using the arguments relating to form, that is extremely wide, because it is under the preparation that people who should be on the register are not on it, and I do not like the question of form in relation to preparation. I understand publication because by the time you reach publication time, it assumes that the preparation is properly done, but what I do not want is to have a validating Act in relation to an irregular preparation.

I was looking at the old Representation of the People Act, 1957 which was the Consolidating Act. I believe this was amended in 1969, and I do not find a

similar validating section; so it seems, Sir, that it was the habit of previous Parliaments not to permit validating sections in any laws in relation to the Representation of the People Act and the preparation of registers. As I said, we have no objection in respect of Clause 26A with regard to publication. Accordingly I would move that the words "preparation or" in line 2 and "or is otherwise irregularly done in matter of form" be deleted in the last line. So that the section would now read: "Where anything in connection with the publication of any list, register or supplementary register under this Part is omitted to be done or cannot be done at the time required by or under this Part or is done before or after that time, the Minister may by order, at any time before or after the time within which the thing is required to be done, extend that time." In other words, the Minister can have power where anything in relation to publication is not done or is omitted to be done in relation to publication like the situation now because we are going to back-date this, or you can fix a new time or extend the time. Once it comes to the publication of that list, the Minister has complete flexibility. If he fixes a time and it cannot be done at that time, he publishes a new time. He just recites "Whereas it was provided that so and so should be done; And Whereas it is impossible for it to be done; In pursuance of power I extend the time." But not the preparation. That is a cover up. I am not saying anything about the Chief Registering Officer at all because we on this side have always said that we are satisfied that with the staff he has and the time he has he is doing his best, but there are people whom he has to rely on who do not regard the work they have to do with the same sense of importance that he regards it, because nobody can tell me that in Christ Church when the boundaries were changed and you were told clearly in the law that the right hand side is Christ Church East that you could register all people on the right hand side as Christ Church South Central. I do not want, in view of our experience with the slack manner in which some enumerations have been done, for there to be a cure-all position in relation to this, and this is what would happen. They would be able to validate this. I want to give him the power, but I do not want to give him an omnibus power.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to say that the whole purport and intent of this amendment is in respect of time. I have told the House before that I could not agree to any amendment to any Bill of this kind or any Bill at all which would regularise something of substance, that if somebody had done something wrong that they could come and pass a validating order saying I know you have a right to seek redress in the Court by bringing a petition like that, and I am going to say it is not wrong. I could never agree to that. It is against my nature; it is against my whole practice, my career and my whole attitude towards the rule of law.

If the hon. member would read the Bill and not emasculate it in the way in which he has tried to do, he will see that everything in the amendment relates to time, and it does not say you validate what

is irregular, but if something has been done irregularly, that is, against the interest of the constituency, a voter or anybody else, you extend the time so that you can do it right. It does not give power to do something wrong after it has been done right; but if something has been done wrong he can extend the time to do it right. In the case which the hon. member mentioned, he said that in one division all the people on both sides of the street were registered in one district. In a situation like that where something was done irregularly, he could approach the Chief Registering Officer and point out the error and despite the fact that the Minister has ordered a revised monthly list or any other kind of register or list to be published on such and such a date, when this particular error is pointed out, the Minister can then extend the time to correct something which may not have been done through malice or anything like that, because I am sure that the hon. member - I do not have any problem in St. John; I know where the parish boundaries are, and none of them run down the centre of the road - nor anybody in Christ Church can tell me that this side of the street is going to vote that way or that side is going to vote that way; so by registering all in one side or the other you do not achieve anything. I was glad when the hon. member said that it was not done through malice, but it is possible that where you get green-horns, or people who are not familiar with the district or may have misinterpreted the boundaries they go along and register people on both sides. The very mischief - I am using it in a technical sense as a term of art We have in the canons of interpretation a rule called the Mischief Rule and the law seeks to correct a particular mischief, not mischievousness; mischief means something which has been inadvertently done. The very point that the hon. member made about registering people on both sides this particular amendment would allow him to go to the Registering Officer and say "your fellowman like he don't know Christ Church". I am lapsing into Barbadian like one of the candidates in Christ Church. "This man don't know anything about what is being done up there or who the people are or where they live, but he has gone and registered everybody in Christ Church East instead of Christ Church South Central." I do not even know if the two boundaries touch or are contiguous. I am merely giving an illustration. The Chief Registering Officer can then inform the Minister that a mistake has been made and the register could not be correct, and this is the very provision under which that correction could be made.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member goes and emasculates the Bill which only deals with the extension of time, it does not say he can validate an irregularity, it merely says he is given time to correct an irregularity and he cannot invalidate a regular matter; he can only validate something which was done irregularly, in other words, wrongly, although it may not be an offence under the law. I want to make that particular point clear that I am very glad he quoted this illustration, because if he reads the amending section which is Clause 26A, it

says "Where anything in connection with the preparation of publication." - preparation deals with registering people - "of any list, register or supplementary register under this Part is omitted to be done or cannot be done at the time required by or under this Part or is done before or after that time or is otherwise irregularly done in matter of form, the Minister may by order, at any time before or after the time within which the thing is required to be done, extend that time or validate anything so done before or after the time required or so irregularly done in matter of form". I want to get that clear because there is validation and validation. I might agree if the hon. member in giving an illustration was going to say that the Act had not gone far enough, because the transferring of people from one side of the street to the other side, in other words transferring them from one register to the right register, may possibly be deemed to be a matter of substance and not of form.

1.25 p.m.

If his argument was that we have not gone far enough and that we should bring it in line now with the New Zealand legislation which does precisely this, the New Zealand legislation goes further and says that in cases which are not merely matters of form, then perhaps I would even give him half marks or at least 60%. I have done a few laws myself when I had to deal with his brother and himself, but if he had said we should go a little further I would agree with him but we are not single in this respect, the only difference between us and New Zealand is that New Zealand has gone further than we have.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon'bles C. E. TALMA, N. W. BOXILL, K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Messrs. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J. B. SPRINGER, J. W. CORBIN, R. St. C. WEEKES and W. R. LOWE - 9.

NOES: Messrs. C. L. BOLDEN, W. C. B. HINDS, H. B. St. JOHN and ERNEST MOTTLEY - 4.

On the motion of the Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Representation of the People (Amendment) Act, 1971.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon'bles K. N. R. HUSBANDS, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, N. W. BOXILL; Messrs. C. A. E.

HOPPIN, J. B. SPRINGER, J. B. YEAROOD, J. W. CORBIN R. St.C. WEEKES and W. R. LOWE - 11.

NOES: Messrs. C. L. BOLDEN, W. C. B. HINDS, H. B. St. JOHN and ERNEST MOTTLEY - 4.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal now with the Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act but hon. members appear not to have seen it. My impression was that there was debate on it already.

1.35 p.m.

I do not think it is very pressing. If hon. members will agree to come back on Tuesday, 14th September, since we still have some outstanding matters, that will be all right with me. There is some doubt as to whether all members have received the Bill. We have a Select Committee which I hope will report early. I

understand that the other side has run out of gas on the Budget and, that being the situation, they can refuel and come back again on the 14th September.

ADJOURNMENT

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th September, 1971, at twelve noon.

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

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

1.38 p.m.