
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th March, 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*); 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. J. W.
CORBIN, J.P.; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R.
LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Labour,
National Insurance and Housing*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS;
Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 2nd March, 1971, I have been advised, have been circulated, and in the absence of any objection I will declare them to be confirmed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would ask the assurance that the circulated Minutes are as they appear in the Minute Book, and that I will not have to be told as we were last week that there are certain emendations appearing in the Book which do not appear in the circulated copies. Do I have that assurance so far?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am unable to give that assurance as there are certain emendations and I will have them reprinted.

Mr. ADAMS: There is no point putting forward a facade of efficiency by circulating Minutes within a few days of the proceedings, when it turns out that the circulated Minutes do not represent what happened. I would prefer to wait a few weeks on the

Minutes and receive a true copy of the proceedings than week after week to be told that there are alterations.

At the end of the Minutes, I have the most different recollection obviously from the Clerk as to what actually took place. I distinctly heard the hon. junior member for St. Thomas get up and as far as I could judge, very properly put the motion for the closure; I heard him with my own ears, and I saw another hon. member - I would not like to say which one, I do not think it was the hon. member who was then sitting next to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I think it was another Minister - get up and second it. I see no record in the Minutes whatsoever even of that having taken place, and it seems to me, Sir, that certain things can happen when a closure motion is moved. Mr. Speaker may ignore it on the grounds that it is an infringement on the rights of the minority, but the fact that it has been moved must be there, and in fact my recollection is that Your Honour did not ignore it, Your Honour then said "Let the question be put" and the only question that could then be put was the hon. junior member for St. Thomas' motion, and there is no mention of it here at all. If that question was put, a declaration that a certain number of hon. members voted for it in the affirmative, in my respectful submission, has to appear in the record as well, otherwise the question of the Resolution to approve the grant of a lease to Mr. Michael Simmons could never have been put at all, as I understand it.

It is also my recollection - I must say that I am not saying this out of opposition to the Resolution because I intended to vote against it - but I never heard that Resolution put at all, I read in the newspapers that it had been passed. The only motion that I heard put was, as I understood it, the last motion to be moved which was the closure motion moved by the junior member for St. Thomas. Sir, I would suggest that to avoid such contretemps as these in the future that the Clerk should be provided with a microphone, because you cannot put a motion in this Chamber as at present organised in a soft voice, and if hon. members do not hear a motion put, the motion cannot, in my submission to you, Sir, be said to be carried. Before God, Sir, I could not possibly say that I ever heard any Resolution to approve a lease put last Tuesday; never at any stage did I hear that put, and I had every intention

of voting against it and dividing the House. I never heard the AYES called for, the NOES called for or anything, I heard the words "let the question be put" and that was the end of the matter. I had every intention of voting against that; I would not have voted against the closure motion moved by the Minister of Housing, but I intended to vote against that Resolution and I would ask, Sir, perhaps if hon. members can recall what happened on that date if they would take the necessary steps to agree here and now what record of the closing proceedings of the House should go into our Minutes, because I do not remember that Resolution being put and passed, just as I do not recall the Hon. Minister's closure motion being called and properly put.

Before I sit down, I would respectfully suggest that this is eminently a case where the tape recording should be listened to and the record of the Shorthand Writers compared with the recollection of the Clerks and with the recollection of hon. members, because whatever hon. members remember they cannot pass the tape recorder and the recollection of the Clerks. This is eminently a case where what is in the shorthand notes should be used to assist the Clerks with what actually happened on that date.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, speaking from memory, the question, as far as I remember, was actually put that the Resolution do now pass and it was agreed to. I think the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas was so engrossed in his own debacle, if I may use that expression, in trying to establish the point that he had not concluded his speech, he was so pre-occupied in that particular phase of the matter that he really probably lost sight of what was going on, but to suggest that the question that the Resolution do now pass was never put and never properly and duly agreed to, is absolutely wrong.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, this matter affects the privilege of the House. All members must have a chance to vote in any debate; if an hon. member says he never heard a question put, and if it is agreed that a Minister moves a closure motion and there is no record in the Minutes of any closure motion being put, I am asking that the best recollection, which is neither the recollection of the hon. junior member for Christ Church nor mine, the best recollection be used to provide an answer as to what happened. The hon. member has not answered my point about the closure, nor has he answered my point about not hearing the motion put, Sir. Both are important points; one touches on the order of the House and the other touches on the privilege of hon. members.

12.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I am drawing to the hon. member's attention, Mr. Speaker, is that when the Closure Motion was put - (Interruption) I appreciate that the hon. member would, normally, have voted against it.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is misrepresenting the proceedings of the House. At the most, only one question was put. Nobody has suggested that two questions were put. If the Closure was moved and it was put, then as a matter of order and in keeping with the Rules of this House only the Closure could have been put and not the Resolution. The Leader of the House and the hon. junior member for Christ Church have just agreed from their seats that only one question was put. You, Sir, agreed that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas moved the Closure of the debate. Automatically, as a matter of logic, only the Closure Motion could be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the matter need not engender any unnecessary heat. The Clerks will be instructed to consult not only their records, but the *Hansard* and the tape recorder before these Minutes are re-printed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay -

The Customs Duties (Barbados Industrial Development Corporation) Order, 1970, and The Estimates for the year 1971-72.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$40,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1970-71, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1970-71 Part 1 - Current, No. 19 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I am asking for leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. It is a very straightforward Resolution to supplement the payment of Welfare grants to the end of the financial year, and I think hon. members will agree that it can be dealt with at short notice.

BILLS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of -

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the financial year 1970-71.

Also a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on the gross revenue of hotels and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Also a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1972.

Also to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1971-72.

Also to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 141, asked by the senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 146, asked by the senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 154, asked by the junior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,

WHEREAS Zone One, as described by the Water Board, falls east of Speightstown in the parish of St. Peter and stretches from an area known as Maynards Road in the North to Rock Dundo in the South or thereabouts,

AND WHEREAS this area comprises the lands with houses thereon belonging, in very great measure, to hundreds of small-holders;

AND WHEREAS the said Water Board in exercise of its control of the Island's water resources in the said area has, from time to time placed untold hardships on the said small land-owners and deprived them of the full use of the said lands and or buildings thereon to the extent that development thereof is confined to the mere removal and replacement of a board or stone as the case may be;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government call upon the Water Board, Health Town and Country Planning and relevant authorities to carry out an immediate re-assessment of the said situation as it now affects the numerous owners at Ashton Hall, Whim and Mile & Quarter districts - or any other districts falling within the said boundaries and, without endangering national health or otherwise, devise way and means whereby such small-holders may be given an opportunity to make better use of their lands and carry out extensions and such developments as would not affect the water resources of the Island.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter, his question *re* commodities imported from South Africa.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

In view of the statement made in this Honourable House by the Prime Minister on 27th July, 1970 to the effect that "The People of Barbados do not trade with South Africa" would the Ministry of Trade take immediate steps to discover if commodities of South African origin are still imported into this country - from South Africa?

2. Who are the importers? And with whom do they trade to get these goods into this country?

3. Is Government aware that South African fruit is imported into this country in tins without labels, but that each such container bears a serial number?

4. Would Government investigate this illicit trading and the process of direct sale and delivery to West Coast and other hotels?
12.35 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the financial year 1970-71, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on the gross revenue of hotels and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1972, was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be the first 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. 7 is the next 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 Registration, (Births, Baptisms and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple Bill the object of which is to provide for the voluntary inscription with the consent of the mothers of children, of the names of those persons who acknowledge themselves to be fathers of the children, on birth certificates.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the essentially non-partisan measures which come before the House from time to time which we in the Opposition are able to welcome almost without restraint. For a number of years now, people who are aware of the social conditions of Barbados and particularly what is referred to in the law of illegitimacy, have long wanted such a Bill as now appears. I will not trouble the House with the history of the disabilities of the illegitimate child. Sufficient to say that I believe the disabilities and the handicaps, the old days, and the social stigma under which the children of parents who were not married have suffered, must be well known to all of us in here. I don't know, Sir, but I fancy that this Bill takes its genesis in a discussion which was held in a Select Committee of this House in 1967 on the Citizenship Bill. On that occasion the Committee - and I think I can now talk about its proceedings since it has long since been reported - found in the draft Bill certain provisions which assumed the existence of such legislation as is now at this moment before the House, and, we elicited from the Attorney General on that occasion that he thought that as in Jamaica it was possible in Barbados for the father of an illegitimate child to go with the mother to register himself as the father at the time of the registration of the child's birth.

Indeed I remember the Attorney General assured the other members of the Committee that this was so in Barbados and I had to take some argument with him at the time and after an adjournment, he came back and deleted the provisions from the Citizenship Bill since they were based on this which we did not then have. It has taken from 1967 to 1971 for the Bill to reach the Statute Book but it is a wise and sensible measure. My only complaint would be that it does not go far enough.

Sir, in Barbados since the great majority of citizens are born when their parents are not married, we may not worry so much about it, but Barbadians who go overseas are often very deeply embarrassed when they have to produce a birth certificate or a baptismal certificate showing, as far as these countries where these problems are practically unknown, that in law they have no father. It is a very embarrassing thing to pick up a birth certificate and to see rank and occupation of father, and there is a blank space. This is what this Bill will now make provision for, and this is the reason why I welcome it. But I would draw to the attention of the Government that there is a shortcoming in more than one respect. The first of all is this: in my view there ought to be provision to have a putative father's name inserted on the birth certificate as well as the name of a father who goes and declares himself to be such, and that just as when two people marry they can re-register the birth of their children and the children will then get a birth certificate showing the father's and mother's name, so too when a magistrate declares that a man is the father of a child, there ought

to be provision that the Registrar should then enter that name on the birth certificate, and I would urge this on the Minister. It used to be the Minister for Community Development, the hon. junior member for Christ Church. I think he is the last Minister I have heard discussing this matter in the House. I think he introduced an amendment to the Registration of Births Act in which this was canvassed and he may remember that two years ago I urged on him then and he said that the Government would consider introducing a Bill such as this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, the further proposal which is being made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is indeed a very valid one, because this is intended to cover the cases the hon. member has referred to; but over and above that if the name of the putative father were given, in almost every case a father's name would appear as such; so that the trend of legislation not only here but in Scotland, Ireland, the Scandinavian countries and many other parts of the world is to see that the claim and right of an illegitimate child, provided certain requirements are met, for example the name of the father being inserted on the birth certificate voluntarily by the father and of course with the approval of the mother as in this case, or in the case of an illegitimate child who had been acknowledged as such, and whose father has signed a deed poll declaring of his own free will that he is the father of the child and wants the name changed to his name in such cases, Mr. Speaker, the illegitimate child not only will have his normal status established as such, but will be entitled in cases of intestacy to share in the estate just as a normal legitimate child would share. The hon. member is really making a very valid and good point, and the object of this legislation here today is to upgrade the status of an illegitimate child, and the objects and reasons of other legislation which is on the way will be to see that the illegitimate child's interests and rights legally are put on par with those of a legitimate child.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am glad that the hon. member has mentioned Sweden; I am going to deal with that in my speech, but what I would just urge on the Government is this, this Bill provides for acknowledgement of paternity to be a test for entry on a birth certificate. I would suggest to the Government that not only acknowledgement of paternity, but as I have said, a declaration by a Magistrate's Court that such and such a man is the putative father; in other words, a finding of paternity should also be made to enter, and also a declaration by a superior court that somebody was the father. This is something you occasionally get that you have to make an application to the High Court to declare that somebody was your father. You can only do this under the present law if you have some interest in it; in other words in the normal way of business you can only ask for a declaration that somebody was your lawful father, but when illegitimate children are given rights of succession they will also be able to ask for a

declaration that somebody was their natural father even if he is dead, perhaps especially after he is dead. All these things I would submit should be entered on a birth certificate.

The next suggestion I am going to make to the Government is a very revolutionary one as far as English speaking countries are concerned. I am glad the hon. member mentioned Sweden; the point about assisting the illegitimate child, as I have always understood it, is that you must not blame the child, if there is to be any blame for what their parents did not do, which is to get married. My view is that you should not be able to look at a birth certificate at all and tell whether the parents were married or not; in my opinion, it is the maiden name of the mother that should be entered on the birth certificate and the name of the father. I see no justification in law, logic or anything, except a past concept of sin, for having a different form of birth certificate or a birth certificate on which you can tell the difference between a person born to married people or a person born to unmarried people. I am quite serious about this; I do not see why the married name of a mother should be entered, it would take quite a simple amendment of the law that for all cases only the maiden name of the mother should be entered on a birth certificate. If at any time it is necessary to prove that your parents were married when you were born you go and get a married certificate showing that that woman was married to your father. You can at one stroke destroy the basis of discrimination between the minority and the majority of populations by insisting that only the maiden name of a mother be entered on a birth certificate, and the names of a father (a) if he acknowledges, (b) if declared in affiliation proceedings, and (c) if declared by a Court of competent jurisdiction in any other proceedings. When that is done I believe you will find that 95% of the population will be covered, because there are few true *fili nulli*, that is, children of no one, running about in Barbados. There are very few children indeed whose mothers have not either got support or an affiliation order or at least an acknowledgement of some sort from the father.

I am not quite so practised in the bastardy proceedings, as they are still called, an unpleasant name, Sir, and should no longer be used in the Courts at all. The Act is called the Affiliation Proceedings Act, but it is still described in the Courts as bastardy, and they still send out what they call bastardy claims. I am not so practised as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown in these matters, but I would say that except in these very rare instances where a poor young lady - I have heard this myself - she has told the Magistrate, "well, I did not really know his name, all I knew was he used to come on the Ju-C truck every Thursday"; instances such as those are so rare and unusual and difficult to cover in legislation in any event, that I think we have to let them pass. The birth certificates in which everybody's mother's maiden name will be there, everybody's father's name will be there subject to the conditions, this puts everybody on the same footing.

When you go to Court to prove a man is your father you have to carry a birth certificate.

I do not believe the rules of the House will permit me to make one speech on the two Bills, so I fear I will ask hon. members to bear with me at much lesser length when the Affiliation Proceedings Act comes up very shortly, but I urge the Government if it has time to consider these amendments before its demise; our Government certainly will.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the hon. member somewhat, but I do not want him to be complacent about this. I am saying this first and foremost, there is no such thing as an illegitimate child, you have illegitimate parents, because the child is not responsible for himself, but we live in an awkward society which likes to stigmatise people. I have been born out of wedlock and I have no qualms about this because I am living along with those who were born in wedlock, and a lot better than some of them too. It has not prevented me from reaching the heights which I have reached, and probably I will go further.

What I agree with the hon. member on is this; he mentioned about an amendment which somehow or the other never really struck me, because I have always been against this illegitimate talk anyhow. I agree that when you see the birth certificate of someone you see the mother's name, and where the father's name should be, is a big dash unless the people were married. I remember about 20 years ago a question was asked on the floor of this Chamber, and the hon. member who just spoke, whose father was then the Leader of the Government, replied that there was no law prohibiting the father's name from going on the birth certificate. I know this is true, but they have a lot of Priests who refuse to do this and you cannot do anything about it.

There is a point the hon. member is overlooking, because I myself was very strong on this, but we must not forget that we live in a society where a woman sometimes becomes pregnant and she has been ostracized, but in order to get sugar for this baby she gets the second one for a different man, so it means that if this woman has six children for six men, that six different names will be on the different birth certificates. This is the problem that will arise here with this. I know of women who have as many children for as many men as they have children, and I do not think this is unique in this society, it happens outside too, but we can only speak about the things that we are very familiar with, and since I am a Barbadian and I am familiar with these things, this is one of the snags which we have to look into. I would like to say to the hon. member that we propose bringing down legislation in the form of a Bill to deal with intestacy, which deals with wills and so on, changing up this old outlandish thing that when a man dies the first son is the heir and is entitled to come into everything. All of this is unfair and is nonsense. 12.55 p.m.

When we come here with this Bill it will include the points made by the hon. member. It will not make any difference to me, because my father has nothing to leave for me, but it will make a difference to my children.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may not be aware that members of the legal profession knew about this Bill before some members of the Cabinet, because the Bill was circulated in 1963. It is 8 years now that this Bill has been talked about. I have a copy of the then proposed draft in my office for years. For the information of hon. members, who care to look at their marriage certificates, they will find that when you get married there is no objection to telling the Priest who your father was, whether he was married or not; that marriage certificates carry the names of the fathers of the bride and bridegroom, but birth and baptism certificates do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Far beyond a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the information, because in 1963 I was not a member of the Cabinet. We are making very substantial changes in this bit of legislation which will embody what the hon. member has mentioned. I agree with the hon. member that we can do without inserting the father's name. It would not embarrass me, but some of us were not born alike and all of us do not react alike. Some people cry when they see the crucifixion, but I will laugh. I may cry at something else. I agree with the hon. member that it is casting a stigma on children who are not responsible for what their parents have done. This is a modern day, and we should make people feel that they are needed in this society. They are not responsible for the way in which they came into this world, but how they conduct themselves in this world is what counts.

I think the hon. member raised some very good points, but I merely mentioned what I have said to point out the problem we may run into where a mother has more than one child for more than one father. Things will certainly become complicated. Under the Bill of Intestacy, it is legally binding on the person who dies intestate, or on his estate, that if his name is mentioned on the certificate as the father of a child, or if a Judge or a Magistrate has decided that he is the father of the child - if he supported the child before his death, then it would share in his estate as any other child.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the suggested ideas put forward by the senior member for St. Thomas and Acting Leader of the House. I think that one has to look at the whole concept of illegitimacy in the terms of a Barbadian society. For far too long we have looked at it in terms of the English society. Legitimacy has been looked upon in Barbados as something obtaining under the English Common Law system, which we used in Barbados from the time we were colonized in the 17th Century.

Under the English Common Law the term father, mother or parent, is given its natural meaning: the father or mother of an illegitimate child. One of the things which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government, at this stage, is that in 1958 an Act was passed to govern infants in this country. It was accepted up to last year that the Infants Act applied to legitimate and illegitimate children alike. Basically the Infants Act provide for the contracts of infants, the guardianship of infants, the protection of property owned by infants and so on, but last year it was decided by the Chief Justice of this country that the Infants Act of 1958 does not apply to illegitimate children. I think the Government should consider seriously an amendment to the Infants Act to make sure that it applies to illegitimate children as well.

1.05 p.m.

This Act briefly provides for the protection of children after the parents have died, the protection of infants property and contracts made by infants. As I said, it was thought up until last year that it applied to illegitimate children, but the Chief Justice of this country gave a judgement accepting certain submissions made to him that it did not in fact apply to illegitimate children; so that the position today is that the Infants Act of 1958 does apply to legitimate children but not to illegitimate children. We must now look at illegitimacy in the context of Barbados' society and no longer continue to look at it in the context of English society based upon English law.

I think the time has come when, rather than having piecemeal legislation you should have comprehensive legislation which would remove the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children. The time has come when there must be legislation which would give the illegitimate child the same rights as the legitimate child. This was started as far back as 1932 in the Legitimacy Act, and there have been amendments from time to time, but I should think that if one is to get away from any sort of stigma whatsoever being attached to the illegitimate child, one has got to have this comprehensive legislation done.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If the hon. member would give way, he said that some judge gave a different ruling. I do not consider that all judges have this great amount of sense. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I said the Chief Justice.) That is a different thing, but judges give wrong decisions. People appeal from judges' decisions and go to the High Court and win the case. We all know that law is nothing original, because you bring a hook to a judge and tell him about a case that took place in 1312 and he gives a decision on that. I am not castigating anybody, but I do not consider all judges to have the most intelligence.

The Act says that "parent" includes any person at law liable to maintain a child, or entitled to his custody; and "person" includes any school or

institution. It also says that "the minority of all males and females shall cease and determine within the Island at the age of twenty-one years, and every male and female of or arriving at that age shall be of the age of majority as fully, freely, and effectually to all intents and purposes in the law, as he or she may or might have been by the law of England. I suppose you will hear somebody say I am trying to interpret the law, but I did not write this. This was written by the people who are supposed to know law.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Perhaps the hon. member would feel more at ease if I told him that the Chief Justice agreed with my submission and held that the Infants Act did not apply to illegitimate children. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there is too much cross talk. I am listening only to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Now, Sir, I think we must recognise that we have a society in which we have illegitimacy, and I believe that if one were to make any study of the West Indian society in the Nineteenth Century, one would get the impression that under the slave system, because the slaves could not get married, when emancipation came and they were free, this was something instilled already in them and therefore the freed slaves continued to live as man and wife and in those circumstances did not get married. This is the background of our society which we must confess has to some extent a great deal of illegitimacy in it, and therefore we must recognise in Barbados that unlike the English society, because England did not for many years recognise the illegitimate child, we have got to legislate specially for our society. As I said, I think the time has come when the Government must produce comprehensive legislation removing absolutely any distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children.

While on this question of infants, in as much as the voting age has been reduced to 18 years, it will be the policy of the Barbados Labour Party when we win the Government after the next elections, to reduce the age of majority from 21 to 18 years which will bring it in line with the voting age. I need not put forward any real arguments in favour of this because I think hon. members will agree that if people are allowed to vote at 18 years, and there are many other things which they are allowed to do, then the age of majority should be reduced from 21 to 18 years.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, 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. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I wonder if hon. members opposite could give any idea as to the prospects for further amending Section 6 (a) of the Act to allow for the entry on the birth certificate of the father's name in the circumstances which I mentioned in the second reading. Could we hope that this would be referred to the legal officers at an early stage?
1.15 p.m.

If there was a possibility that they could come up with something in a week or two I would even suggest letting us wait until then; if there is no possibility of that, could the members tell us when? If it is agreed that it would be a good thing for whenever the Magistrates' Court makes an order that the father's name be then put on the birth certificate, let us do it without delay. The reason is that it would be necessary to prove that somebody was your father in order to succeed on an intestacy, therefore you should have a certificate with the names of the people whom you can expect to succeed on an intestacy.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assist with that, but a question of procedure now arises. We have passed the second reading and we have passed one of the clauses in Committee; I was going to suggest if there was some way in which this could be done, for us to halt these Committee proceedings and have a Select Committee on the Bill. I do not know if this could be done at this stage.

Mr. ADAMS: I would move that for the purpose of finding a form of words which would allow an adjudication of paternity to be entered on the birth certificate, and also a declaration by a Court of competent jurisdiction as to paternity, that further consideration of this section be now postponed. The first point would be to allow an adjudication of paternity by a Magistrate's Court to be entered on a birth certificate. I deliberately used those words because when you make corrections on certificates of birth and baptism you have to put in the margin of the Register the authority by which you make those corrections, so it would be presumed that you would have to put the finding of a Court.

Secondly, to allow any declaration as to paternity made by a court of competent jurisdiction. There is a difference between an adjudication and a declaration.

Mr. HINDS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to warn this Committee

that the suggestion for allowing an adjudication by a Magistrate's Court to be entered on a birth certificate is, and can be, an extremely dangerous one, for the simple reason that a Magistrate's decision is not always based on fact, it is based on the evidence that is put before the Magistrate. There are lots of cases related hereto where you will find that a man might be convicted before the Magistrate and assumed to be the father of the child, the woman who gave evidence against him knows in truth and in fact that he is not the father of the child, the man is unable for some reason to prove his innocence there and then, and perhaps because of his financial position he is not able to proceed with an appeal, hence what the Magistrate decides stands against this man. Nevertheless, if we were to adopt the suggestion as is offered here, it would mean that the name of a man who is really and truly not the father of a child would appear on the certificate, and it would come about partly because the man is not able to prosecute an appeal to a further court to prove his innocence, and in view of the fact that a Magistrate's decision is not always arrived at or based on fact, one ought to be very, very careful in accepting this suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made an interesting point, but I think the point has logic in it but perhaps it does not have understanding. In my view the number of wrong declarations of paternity made by the Magistrate is infinitesimal compared with the number of times a married man's name appears on a birth certificate for a child of whom he is not the father. In numerous cases wives leave their husbands and when they go to register the birth of another child, when they are asked if they are married and they are prepared to say that they are not living with their husbands, the people at the Registry are not concerned with this, they have according to the law to put down the name of the husband. If the hon. member practised in the Courts, Mr. Chairman, he would be astonished at the number of situations where these certificates come in in husband and wife maintenance cases. The Priest, as a rule, when the wife tells him at baptism that the husband is not the father, he puts down the maiden name of the mother, but at the Registry they can only take the husband's name. That is by no means uncommon, not to speak of the number of occasions where you have a birth certificate where the husband and wife are living together and the child is not the husband's; that is much more frequent than the situation where the Magistrate makes a wrong finding too.

All the hon. junior member for St. Peter is saying is that the system is imperfect, but what he is complaining about is that science has not yet devised the perfect way of telling who your father is, and that only maternity is certain. In the case of King James the Second, the old Pretender, even that was questioned; a warming pan was supposed to have been pushed up underneath the Queen and the baby taken from the warming pan instead of the more orthodox receptacle, but this is merely a diversion, Sir. The hon. member has a good point, and in a recent case

I heard, I think it was one of the younger Magistrates, give what I thought was a most thoughtful and human judgment; he said that all he could do was adjudicate on the evidence given before him, that the evidence was such, and he was going to adjudicate this man was the putative father. After all, he had been supporting the child for four years until a friend told him apparently that he was not the father and that the friend was, and so on. The Magistrate said that he had acknowledged it for all those years so what was he worried about now.
1.25 p.m.

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown has asked me to point out that, in Barbados, a wife cannot go in Court and give evidence that a child is not her husband's child. She cannot give any evidence; she cannot even say that she did not see her husband for two years before the birth of the child, because that is evidence tending to illegitimacy and, therefore, at present inadmissible in Barbados. It is a rule which the Crown Law Officers should consider repealing, because it has been repealed in some of the most civilised countries. Although the hon. member makes a point, I am sure that the social good of being able to enter the names of putative fathers as well as acknowledged and declared fathers would make the work of the Courts, of the legal practitioners and of laymen much easier, when they have to determine who is the father of a child, if a certificate can be produced showing the father's name.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I feel that these proposed amendments to the Bill would be a great improvement. It is a fact that the Magistrate deals with normal cases involving the maintenance of children, affiliation orders, bastardy matters, etc., and he is the duly authorised legal authority who deals with such matters. It is true that the exceptional case referred to by the hon. junior member for St. Peter may arise from time to time, but it will be one in every ten thousand. I cannot agree that a Magistrate's adjudication in these cases should not be given much weight. The second amendment will meet the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. A man can go to the Court of competent jurisdiction, but if he cannot appeal against a decision, then justice has gone by the board. It is not possible to introduce an amendment to cover every case or contingency. This amendment will meet 99% of the people who now suffer. I feel that a Magistrate, who deals with these cases exclusively, will be able to deal with such matters.

It is only in divorce cases that the High Court has to deal with infants, their education, maintenance and so on. Normally it is the Magistrate who deals with these matters. I would support the amendments moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. We should move that further consideration of the matter be postponed, at this stage, in order to have all of the points incorporated. Let us postpone further consideration of the matter, and refer it to the Crown Law Officers who will be able to examine the proposals made by the hon. member and submit the necessary amendments.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item 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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Affiliation Proceedings Act, 1963.

AFFILIATION PROCEEDINGS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to provide a statutory defence for Mr. X if Mr. Y's name happens to be on a birth certificate. Mr. X can, therefore, deny paternity by saying that a name other than his, appears on the birth certificate as the father of the child.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
1.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the Leader of the House who said that this amendment follows from the amendment to the Registration of (Births, Baptisms and Burials) Act. However, Sir, I would have thought that now that the Government has seen fit to amend this legislation they would have amended the sections of this legislation which provided for the payment of \$5 per week in respect of each child. This legislation was passed in 1963, and I think the Government must be aware first of all of devaluation and the increased cost of living etc., and must realise at this stage that it is extremely difficult for any child to survive on \$5 a week. I would say that the time has come when the Government must seriously consider increasing this sum perhaps to a total of \$10, because what has happened in the interval is that there have been two salaries increases in the Civil Service, and Ministers and other members of the House have received more money. Government must seriously consider this, and I would like, rather than having two

sets of legislation, for the Government to consider postponing this and deciding whether or not the amount of maintenance should be increased, because this Bill cannot have any effect until the other Bill has been passed, and therefore no delay would be caused by postponing this. If you do accept that the money to be paid by a man who has been found by a magistrate to be the putative father of a child should be a sum not exceeding, let us say, \$10, it does not of necessity mean that the magistrate would automatically put \$10 on him; it only gives the Court the right, if the man is earning such a salary, to impose maintenance of \$10 a week on him. If this is done in respect of this, the Government may well consider that it must be done in respect of married women's maintenance. The time has also come when a review must be made of the amount of money paid by a husband who has deserted his wife or who has been proved guilty of wilful neglect in the support of his children.

Sir, when this was passed originally in 1963, one had to look at it in the context of the salaries and the cost of living in that year. When that is done and it is compared with the salaries now received and the cost of living of today, I am certain that the Government would agree with me that the time has come when we must increase the amount of money to be paid by a putative father, and also consequent upon that the amount of money to be paid by a husband who has deserted his children and who is guilty of wilful neglect of maintenance of his children or who has deserted his wife. I would seriously ask the Government to consider this.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. member who has just sat down is really serious. It is true we all know that \$5 cannot adequately support a child, but it is also true that if we were to accept the hon. member's proposal to raise the fee for a child to \$10, we would have more prisoners than we have normal people walking about.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member would appreciate the point I made. I did not say to increase it to \$10; I said to a sum not exceeding \$10. This would not necessarily mean that if a person is found to be the putative father of a child that he would be automatically ordered to pay \$10. There would have to be a means test and this would depend on his earnings. If he is a hotel worker or somebody like this working for \$50 a week, it may well be that he may have to pay it. If he is only working for \$15 per week, it may very well be that he can only pay \$2 a week. My suggestion is that it be increased to a sum not exceeding \$10.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know if the hon. member is trying to capture the votes of the young ladies, but I want him to understand that when he talks about the ladies' man, he is talking to me. However, we have to be realistic in this society in which we live. If the father of a child intends to support that child, whether you put \$1.00, \$5 or \$20 on him and he realises it is his child, he is not going to wait for

any Magistrate's court to tell him to find this child. The hon. member is forgetting that we have a lot of cassanovas living in our society, and I am a taxpayer. A sum of \$344.88 is taken out of my salary before I get it, and that is nothing to do with what I have to pay for my car. Is the hon. member asking me then to support an army of prisoners, because if a man cannot.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am not asking the hon. member to support any army of prisoners because what the hon. member does not seem to understand is that when these men refuse to support their children, the Government must support them out of the welfare grants and out of direct taxation. Whether they are being supported through the City Council or through welfare grants, they are still now receiving your money because of the failure of the fathers to support them adequately.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. I do not agree with the hon. member, because as I pointed out earlier in a debate, a woman sometimes finds herself in pregnancy, and in going to get sugar for this child she finds herself with another or a twin. A man may have a woman with a child, but the two of them cannot get along any longer. He may be a porter working for \$25 a week, he is a normal man and he goes and lives with another woman. She finds herself pregnant too; so those are two children he has to support. Let us assume he is paying \$5 for the first child. He is now supporting the home in which he is living with this other woman. She gets another child and this makes three children that he has to support on \$25. We know we have a welfare state and we cannot get out of it, and the last person to speak against this should be the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. *(Asides)* I would never have said that.

1.45 p.m.

How does the hon. member expect this man who is working for \$30 a week to keep a home with three children and a woman, along with himself, perhaps paying \$7 a week to a court for another child when the week comes? This hon. member is creating a situation here for us, not only for the Government but for the whole economy, because if when the time comes to pay this money the Writ Server goes to the man and the man tells him to come back the next week, and then one of his children takes ill so that by the next week he still cannot pay and he is taken to prison, you put that man out of a job and you also put that woman and those children out of bread. Do not try to get votes by bringing up these things, I would be happy if the amount is raised to a lot more than \$10 per child, but we are living in a society that is rather poor. Wages in Barbados are rather low, so how can the hon. member expect us as responsible people to create more hardships? You would then be encouraging women to make child bearing an investment, this is what the hon. member would be trying to do. As another hon. member has said, this would be a career because women would try to see how many children they can get in order to see how much money they can get.

The hon. member seems to forget that we would then have to be supporting not only the man in prison, but then we would have to support the children for whom he was put in prison and those for whom he was not sent to prison, and the woman as well because she would then come and tell you that she is not working and has to support the children, so when hon. members on the opposite side are making these points they must study carefully what they are saying. I am not saying for one moment that \$5.00 is enough to support a child, but what I am pointing out to the hon. member is that very few fathers stick to what the law states. Some people go to Court because they are scamps and they want to run around and create problems for people, or that they feel within themselves that they have been pushed into this situation. Any father, especially now that you have free Secondary education, is happy to support his child to the best of his ability because the child may get a scholarship and you will hear how proud the father is of the children when they do this.

We cannot accept what the hon. member says about jumping this from \$5 to \$10; we know it is too low, because it cannot support a child adequately, but the number of cases in which this can happen, as I pointed out to the hon. member, is if a man feels it is his child there is nothing to prevent him from supporting the child, so he supports the child, but if you go and impose this kind of jurisdiction to pay \$10, you are creating an army of prisoners and then we will have to come for more money because prisoners are eating very good nowadays. Then we will have to get more money to feed the children and the reputed wife; furthermore, we have put this man out of a job and nobody is going to hold a job for him until he comes back. This argument holds good anywhere in this society.

A man who is working for \$30 a week and has three children living in a house with a woman, and probably has more outside, cannot afford to pay this \$10. *(Asides)*. Nobody has told the man to get them, but do you think any ugly man wants to see a child looking like himself? They do not get the children deliberately, they go to have fun and children come along. Poor people do not deliberately go to get children, but they cannot go out to the theatre and the night clubs, so they stay at home and console each other, and the poorer the people are the more children they have. We must be realistic, and we are dealing with a society that has not reached the stage yet where we can afford this kind of thing. The hon. member might talk what he likes, but I am not going to accept that at all, because I live in this society, too.

I agree with the hon. member, but we cannot jump this from \$5 to \$10; the man might be renting a house at \$6 or \$8 a week. Do not ask me who told him to get the children, because there are very few of us who deliberately set out to get children, but these things happen. Sometimes you use contraceptives and you still get children, so these are the kind of problems you are faced with in this society. It is not that we are against women getting more money for children, but we also do not want to make this a lucrative trade for women.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. member who just sat down forgets this. What the hon. junior member for the City has suggested would be a means test, not exceeding \$10. This is all well and good; as it is now it is a means test before the Magistrate. I speak with some experience in this matter; I remember, Mr. Speaker, listening to an application from a woman who had three children and I suggested, after the Committee had gone through the application, that the man give the children \$2 each per week. The woman objected to this on the ground that the man was working with the people at the deep water harbour, and I did not think he should have given more than \$2 a week for each child. She took the man to Court and she got the Magistrate to call on the people at the deep water harbour to bring in what he was working for and he was getting \$210 per month; are you telling me that he should not be asked to pay \$10? If the hon. member would realise that this is a means test - it was on my instigation that the amount was increased to \$5. I say this, any decent man will support his children wherever they come from, and if you are worthless you will not want to support them. Years ago, and I have seen this, a policeman was getting \$90 a month; it is just a question of a means test, he was married and had children outside and could not afford to give them any \$5.00 a week. I agree with you there, but if a Minister or Member of this Parliament, one of these young virile members, got a child outside, are you suggesting he could not give it \$10.00 a week? Are you suggesting the Magistrate would have the authority to tell him he should give it \$10.00 a week because he is working for \$650 a month?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member is dealing with a case in isolation, I cannot deal with cases in isolation.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The Magistrate should be in a position to make a man pay \$10 a week to support a child, if he can afford to do so. When a Magistrate asks a man whether he is working for \$10 a week and he says no, then the woman will have to bring evidence to show what he is working for. If the man has a wife or children from another woman and he has to support them, then the Magistrate will take those things into consideration and arrive at how much he should give the child involved in the case before him. With the recent increase in salaries, are you saying that the amount should remain at \$5 a week? It must be remembered that we are not only legislating for porters and labourers and that promiscuity exists in other sections of the society. Let me say that if Mr. Pile was put before the Court for the maintenance of an illegitimate child, the Magistrate cannot charge him more than \$5.00 a week. If Your Honour was taken to the court to maintain an illegitimate child the Magistrate could not charge you more than \$5.00 a week.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now automatically suspended until 2.30 p.m.

On resumption--

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 141 stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas, and it is to be found on the right hand column of page 9.

REVISION OF THE LAWS OF BARBADOS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

When will the new edition of the Laws of Barbados be ready; and what steps are being taken to revise and re-publish subsidiary legislation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

1. No definite date can be given when the new edition of the Laws of Barbados will be ready but steps are being taken to have the new edition ready as soon as possible as explained in the Statement on the Progress of the Barbados Law Revision laid in Parliament.

2. Negotiations are at present taking place for the appointment of a Commissioner for the revision and re-publishing of subsidiary legislation.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member give an assurance that, where a member has asked a question, the effective answer be given first to that member rather than to the newspaper, or to the general public, as has happened with the statement relating to this matter last week?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will give that general assurance. I will add that I had hoped to give the answer to this question in Parliament last week, but I cannot remember if the hon. member was in his place on the last occasion.

Mr. ADAMS: I was in my place last week after the statement had been laid, but we did not reach my question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my recollection that we did not have time to deal with certain questions and the replies thereto.

Question No. 146 standing in the name of the same hon. and learned member. It will be found on page 11 left hand column.

DELAYS AT SEAWELL AIRPORT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that great delays are sometimes occasioned to passengers arriving at Sea-

well Airport by reason of the absence of a sufficient number of officers checking for Health purposes; and will the Minister see to it that at least two Health Officers are present whenever 50 or more passengers are expected to arrive?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

"Observations made on several occasions since recent changes at the Airport have shown that delay for Health Checks is minimal for passengers who have completed their E/D forms and hold valid vaccination certificates. More than two officers are assigned to duty when heavy traffic is expected."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, will the Minister say what he means by minimal? Is the Minister aware that the Health Officer has to take a passport or travel folder of some sort from a person heavily encumbered with hand baggage; he has to open it, because very often these persons have their hands occupied, and if this is done as thoroughly as it is at present done at Seawell, people will find themselves queueing in the hot sun while one Health Officer opens each one, turns over the pages, and so on. 2.40 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, probably the hon. member is referring to conditions which have been remedied fairly recently, but these conditions do not obtain today in that owing to the alterations and improvements to the Airport, the objections and difficulties which the hon. member did bring to the attention of the House have now been remedied. His question was good at the time when asked, but in the interim certain improvements and renovations have been made and the system has been improved; so the hon. member can share some measure of credit in the improvements which have taken place.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his kind confession and avoidance but will the Minister take steps to see that just occasionally members of the Government travel through the ordinary reception channels at Seawell Airport so that they can see for themselves what occasionally goes on. I do not think it is a matter where they deliberately avoid it, but if just once or twice they would pass, it would put everybody on his toes.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, do the replies of the Minister refer to immigration and health at the same time?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did not quite hear what was said.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, do the replies of the Minister refer to immigration and health at the same time?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: For the benefit of hon. members, I will read my reply again.

"Observations made on several occasions since recent changes at the Airport have shown that delay

for Health Checks is minimal for passengers who have completed their E/D forms and hold valid vaccination certificates. More than two officers are assigned to duty when heavy traffic is expected."

Immigration is a different matter. This is in connection with Public Health Officers. We in the Ministry after investigating this matter, felt that delays occasioned to passengers arriving at the Airport with valid vaccination certificates are not due to an insufficient number of Health Officers. It appears there is some confusion existing in the public's mind between health checks and immigration checks which are quite distinct procedures, but generally delays at the Airport are minimal. Proper health checks protect the country and its visitors and the Government thinks that the total time taken by a visitor to pass through the incoming area at Seawell compares very favourably with any other Airport with similar traffic loads, and is faster than many. When a large number of visitors is expected, two and usually three Health Officers are assigned to duty; but observations have shown that health and immigration checks are more often than not completed before the luggage has arrived in the building. The recent changes at the Airport have resulted in better organisation of the space and traffic flow so as to permit more space for incoming passengers before they reach the Health Officers, but the health desks are still too close to the entrance of the arrivals building. Very often delays are caused by the passengers themselves who fail to complete their landing cards.

Mr. ADAMS. As a further supplementary, will the Minister review the whole question of landing cards? Why is it you can go to every European country or the U.S.A. without a landing card and it is only us poor suffering Colonials that find it necessary?

Is the Minister aware that an official from the British High Commission has informally advised the immigration control persons here that landing cards are not necessary to obtain proper immigration statistics, and has offered to assist the Immigration Department in establishing a form of immigration control without the use of landing cards?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the landing cards required at Seawell Airport are chiefly the result in these days of hijacking?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I certainly did not know this, but it would be difficult for me to understand why this should be so in view of the fact that landing cards were in use long before hijacking became prevalent.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that passengers, even Barbadians leaving Seawell Airport have their landing cards examined by a special immigration officer? This was introduced less than a week ago, and the reason given is because of the number of hijackings.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If this would help to abolish hijacking, I am certainly for it. I do not see how it could help if this is what it is designed to do.

Mr. ADAMS: Could any of the Ministers say exactly what would happen if I presented myself at Seawell Airport and refused to fill out a landing card? I would like to know what warrant of law there is for a policeman to tell me I cannot come back to Barbados. I will do it one of these days too, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not convinced that is a proper supplementary.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I know of no law that could prevent a national of this country from returning to Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: The reply to Parliamentary Question No. 154 will be laid on the Table of this House. Question Time has not expired.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the Replies to two questions asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter have been given, but that on Your Honour's direction they were held over for supplementaries. I have not been told which two they are because I was not present in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member. I am informed by the Clerk that they are Nos. 120 and 123.
2.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The reason why I rose, Mr. Speaker, was that I was only reminded of this on my way in from lunch, and therefore I do not have the files with me, and if the hon. member would like to put them off until next week I will bring in the information.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nos. 120 and 123 will remain on the Order Paper for next week. That completes questions and we now revert to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS: The principal item with which we would like to proceed is No. 16, but I would draw the attention of hon. members to Item No. 1 which seems perhaps to be a little bit superseded, and now that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is in his seat I would like to ask if he wishes to continue his speech which would be on last year's budget, or whether perhaps the Question could now be put and get it off the Order Paper. I would like to close it, Sir, it is too old. I move that Order No. 1 be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: When this matter was being last debated the hon. senior member for St. Thomas resumed debate on this Resolution *re* the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance for the year 1970-71. In June 1970 the hon. junior member for St. Peter concluded his speech

and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking when Private Members' Business came to an end. Would the hon. senior member for St. Joseph intimate whether he proposes to continue his address?

Mr. SMITH: The only way I would finish that is if I had the apparatus, but I am not prepared to continue without the apparatus because I will not be heard.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think any other hon. member has risen to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas may exercise his right of final reply.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have forgotten the circumstances in which I rose to move this motion in the first place, but now I am reminded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and I think that hon. members will record the circumstances of this Budget Speech as an unfortunate chapter in the history of the House of Assembly, and one which at least will certainly be closed next year for ever since I think we can safely say that the electors of St. Joseph showed their opinion of it in the event of a few months previously. I would urge on all hon. members to support the Resolution which reads:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House notes the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance for the Fiscal year 1970-71 laid before this Honourable House on the 12th May, 1970, but deplores the taxation proposals mentioned therein: and especially

(a) the increased cost arising therefrom to the building industry;

(b) the increase in the cost of motoring;

(c) the fact that a more considered approach to the taxation of the tourist industry has not been adopted.

I would ask hon. members to support this Resolution.

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

NOES: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA; Messrs. W. R. LOWE, R. St. C. WEEKES, J. W. CORBIN, C. A. E. HOPPIN and L. E. SMITH - 7.

AYES: Messrs. W. C. B. HINDS, ELLIOTT MOTTLEY and J. M. G. M. ADAMS - 3

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution is now lost.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Clerk-at-the-Table to supply me with a copy of my speech in this Honourable House on Tuesday last, and the Clerk has intimated to me that

the Chief Reporter has informed him that permission will have to be sought from Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: That permission can only be granted in the light of the ruling of the Debates Committee to which I will instruct the Clerk to refer and act thereon.

Mr. HINDS: A member can always see his speech, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, why cannot a member see his own speech? I think he should not see the speeches of other members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I entirely agree that there is no reason why he cannot see his speech. I am now advised that the Reporter is seeking the speech. That is what I am advised by the Clerk-at-the Table.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if a speech is made in this House last Tuesday, the original copy is sent to the Printers and the Reporter has the duplicate copy and he takes more than half an hour to find it, then he should be sent from this place.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, that the hon. member either ask the Clerk to go, or to go with the Clerk, and see what is the delay. He would then be in a better position to enlighten the House in five minutes as to what is causing the delay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am reminded that, while the House is sitting, the Reporters are working continuously either here or in their office. Is there any objection to a short suspension?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of private Resolutions which we would like to get through. I beg to move that Item No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: During which time I will instruct the Clerk to expedite the matter. I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Peter would care to join him?

Mr. HINDS: No, Sir. I do not think it becomes me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3, under Private Members' Business, is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it is to resume debate on a Resolution *re* payment to Inspectors of Motor Vehicles (Grade One) of the Ministry of Communications and Works for extra duties.

RESOLUTION *re* PAYMENT OF OVERTIME TO INSPECTORS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that, in rising, I will be regarded as having spoken already on this Resolution. My purpose is not to speak on the merits of the Resolution, but to ask the Government exactly what has happened since the 14th May last

year when the hon. junior member for St. George seconded the Motion of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who, of course, has already spoken and will not be able to speak again until he winds up the debate.

As I understand it, the Resolution was postponed to enable the Government to go into the matter, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was speaking when consideration was postponed. I should like the Government to let us know whether there is any further step to be taken in the matter. It is a matter of overtime for the Motor Vehicle Inspectors. The Resolution merely calls on the Government to consider the inconveniences and embarrassment that these said Inspectors have to undergo when engaged in such extra duties working all round the clock (Bank Holidays, Sundays included) and are not permitted to receive overtime.

Mr. Speaker, one would imagine that the fact that the Minister of Communications and Works took part in the debate indicated that the Government was considering the matter. Although I did not take part in the moving or seconding of this Resolution, I would urge that the Resolution be now passed and let the whole process of consideration and consultation with the appropriate Civil Service authorities continue.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I know what the Resolution is about, but I cannot remember what was the attitude of the then Minister of Communications and Works who was speaking when the Resolution was postponed. The Minister will be coming back here in a few minutes, and I think we can deal with another item in the meantime. I would not like to anticipate what the Minister would say. Since the Resolution was put on the Agenda another Minister is now dealing with the matter. I would suggest that we leave the matter until the Minister returns, and we can then resume consideration of it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I had given way. I move that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION *re* REQUESTING GOVERNMENT TO SET UP A COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY *re* INCREASE IN COST OF SOFT AERATED BEVERAGES

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and it is

to resume debate on a Resolution requesting Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry *re* the increase in the cost of soft aerated beverages. When this matter was previously discussed on the 10th February, 1970, the hon. junior member for the City moved that the Resolution do now pass. The senior member for St. James seconded the motion and spoke. On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. K. N. R. Husbands, further consideration was postponed. Then on the 17th February, 1970, Hon. G. G. Fergusson spoke, the senior member for Christ Church spoke and moved that further consideration be now postponed. Hon. A. DaC. Edwards seconded the motion and was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when Private Members' Business came to an end. 3.10 p.m.

Does any other hon. member desire to speak before the hon. junior member for Bridgetown makes his reply?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, seeing that no other hon. member is desirous of speaking, I rise to say that I recall that when this Resolution came before the House, the manufacturers of soft drinks in this country had arbitrarily and without any sort of consideration for the consumer increased the retail and wholesale prices of soft drinks. I recall that at one stage the Government had given the Opposition an assurance that this matter would be taken up by the Price Control Board which they were in the process of setting up. I do not know whether this matter has yet received the attention of that Board, and due to the undertaking given by the Government that this matter would come before the Price Control Commission, I do not propose to press this Resolution. I am therefore asking leave to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is asking for leave to withdraw this Resolution standing in his name. If there be no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to withdraw this Resolution.

RESOLUTION *re* SUITABLE BUILDING NEAR
QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL FOR
HOUSING FORMER INMATES OF
ALMSHOUSES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution relating to the spending of money on a suitable building near the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the purpose of housing all the persons who were formerly inmates in the Almshouses in the parishes of St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. James, St. John and St. George.

When this Resolution came before the House, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph moved and spoke and it was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. James, then the hon. senior member for Christ

Church spoke and the hon. junior member for Christ Church was speaking at 3.45 p.m. when Private Members' Time expired. On 20th January, 1970, the hon. junior member for Christ Church concluded his speech and the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking when Private Members' Business expired. He then concluded his speech on the 27th January, 1970, and on motion of the hon. junior member for Christ Church seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, further consideration was postponed.

Does any other hon. member, who has not yet spoken, care to resume? The Hon. Leader of the House had merely seconded the motion that further consideration be postponed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak with leave.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection. Let the junior member for Christ Church speak.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the terms of this Resolution have done a very useful service in that it has helped in highlighting the congestion which is at present experienced at certain District Hospitals, and appropriate measures are being taken, though not necessarily along the lines suggested here, to remedy this situation. As hon. members will remember, the District Hospitals, formerly known as Infirmarys were reduced from eleven to five, and hon. members will also fully realise that many of these old infirmarys were very dilapidated buildings; so the suggestion of retaining more than five was not a feasible proposal. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that, we have inspected these old infirmarys and a decision was taken to reduce the number to five, and I am making it clear that the other six were worm-eaten buildings like the ones in St. George, St. James, St. Peter and so on, which would need rebuilding.

The policy of the Government in view of the congestion which does arise mainly in the St. Michael's District Hospital and in a few other places is to add wings to the existing buildings, and we have included money in the Estimates for that purpose. Over and above that, we have started building old peoples' homes and one has been built at the Pine so far, and the policy will be to build more in various housing areas. A little relief will take place by removing paying patients, couples or people who are common law man and wife, or the most suitable ones to ease the congestion from these District Hospitals. We have just been conducting a survey and it is the intention of the Government to see that the well patients are separated from the ones who are ill. General speaking, the terms of this Resolution can properly be said to have borne some fruit in that it has caused the Government to look into this matter more thoroughly and we are taking the necessary steps to remedy the situation, but the Government is not in favour of the suggestion that a building should be put outside the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for this specific purpose. It will be done as I have

just intimated by establishing old peoples' homes in various housing areas island-wide in order to house primarily the ones paying maybe \$5 or \$10 to the institution and any of the other patients for that matter, and we are thinking more in terms of couples who unfortunately find themselves as common law husband and wife. The matter is therefore being attended to, and very soon the old peoples' home at the Pine will be open, and the Welfare Department is at present working on the selection of the most suitable patients from the St. Michael's District Hospital for this home.

Mr. Speaker, the terms of the Resolution are well taken, and the hon. member's intentions and proposals will be met, though in a different method of approach in that we will not be constructing old peoples' homes outside the Hospital, but in various housing areas on an island-wide basis where we already have housing areas and schemes.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member desiring to contribute to this debate.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in the light of what the Minister has just explained to the House, if the mover would consider accepting an amendment to the Resolution. The Hon. Minister explained that it is not practicable to have a building near the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but would be prepared to examine the same proposal in relation to Old People's Homes in the Housing Authority's estates. One of course, as the hon. member knows, is soon to be opened in a matter of two or three weeks, and it is this policy we would like to continue. If the hon. member therefore would accept an amendment which takes out "near the Queen Elizabeth Hospital" and puts in the words "in suitable housing estates where possible", we would accept this. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I do not have my own copy of the Resolution and I would be glad if the Clerk could provide me with one or if the hon. mover has his own copy at his disposal I could borrow it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS terror has struck the residents of the Parishes of St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. James, St. John and St. George, by reason of the horrible action of the Government by the abandonment of the Almshouses in the said Parishes:

AND WHEREAS the abandonment of these Almshouses is causing the inmates of the said Almshouses to panic because they are taken away from their home Parishes and relatives, long distances away to other Almshouses all over the Island where it is financially impossible for their relatives to visit them.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government not to demolish or dismantle the building which formerly housed the Bridgetown City Council, but to spend the money so saved on a suitable building near the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the purpose of housing all the inmates referred to in

this Resolution, thus effecting a big saving to the Government and families of the inmates.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We would say "WHEREAS there appears to be congestion at the five existing District Hospitals", and the second recital would read as follows: "AND WHEREAS the remaining six District Hospitals have been abandoned as being unsuitable for use as District Hospitals;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to establish homes for senior citizens at suitable housing areas in the Island".

The amended Resolution would read, Mr. Speaker,

"WHEREAS there appears to be congestion at five District Hospitals in the Island;

AND WHEREAS the remaining six District Hospitals have been abandoned as being unsuitable for use as District Hospitals;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to establish Homes for senior citizens at suitable housing estates wherever possible."

That is the amendment.
3.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has proposed an amendment which he seeks to know whether the hon. proposer of this Resolution will accept before exercising his right of reply. Will the hon. member intimate by saying "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. SMITH: I would like a copy of the amendment to study it. I think the amendment should be circulated to hon. members.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. CORBIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my direction that copies of this amendment be circulated for the consideration of hon. members.

RESOLUTION *re* PAYMENT OF OVERTIME TO INSPECTORS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is in his seat, I will move that we revert to Item No. 3. For the information of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas this is a Resolution which calls on the Government to consider the possibility of paying overtime to Inspectors of Motor Vehicles for work done on Bank

Holidays and Sundays. I note that the then Minister of Communications and Works was speaking on the 14th May, 1970, when consideration of this Resolution, which I am now seeking to restore, was postponed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and it is to resume debate on a Resolution *re* payment to Inspectors of Motor Vehicles (Grade One) of the Ministry of Communications and Works for extra duties. When the Resolution was last discussed on the 14th May, 1970, the hon. junior member for St. George seconded the motion, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas then Minister of Communications and Works was speaking when discussion of the Resolution was postponed. The hon. member may now resume his address.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I honestly, cannot remember what this Resolution is all about. If it is the same old story about the people at Highways and Transport being paid overtime, I have already stated categorically on the Floor of this House that the Inspectors accepted the job knowing full well that working on Sundays and Bank Holidays was a condition of the service. I think I had promised to look into the matter. If I am not mistaken, somebody came here to revise the conditions of the workers, or to change the nomenclature of some of the workers and the positions which they held, since this Resolution came before this Chamber. I cannot remember the gentleman's name. *(Asides)*

Mr. Speaker, his name was Mr. Puisinelli. It was not a salary revision as such; it was an up-grading of certain posts. In the Puisinelli Report, although I drew it to his attention, he did not recommend that the Officers should be paid extra for this type of work, because he thought that it was a condition of service.

Now, we have an analogous situation with the Nurses. I am not denying that it is hard on these people to do extra work without getting overtime, but it was not harder on the people than it was on me when I was a seaman and something went wrong in the engine room of the boat. They would call me out and I would have to work, because it was a condition of service. The Nurses and Doctors of the Hospital have to work fairly long hours, especially when they are working in the operating room. *(Asides)* I have been told that when they do that they get back the time proportionately. The argument here is not giving back the Inspectors the proportionate time or paying them overtime. I think they work according to a duty roster.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am asking the hon. member to give way, Mr. Speaker. This has been a bone of contention, and this is probably an opportunity

for me to make the matter clear. I have received letters regarding overtime. I admit that Nurses work very long hours on certain nights, because it is not convenient for them to go off at eleven or twelve o'clock at night and get transportation to their homes. Some nights they work longer hours than the average person, but the following week they work proportionately fewer hours; they work on a shift system. I hope I have explained myself carefully. I merely mentioned that because I know it is a bone of contention. The Minister is saying that the Nurses work longer than 40 hours, and that is not a fact.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a slight error. I never said that the Nurses work longer hours. I was saying that it was a condition of their service to work at night, if they were on night duty. These Inspectors have to examine vehicles, and Mr. Puisinelli thought that the work they had to do during the day time was light enough that, if one of them had to attend a bus accident at night, it could be taken as a condition of service.
3.40 p.m.

This was a condition of service for these people. I remember that I had promised the Chamber to look into this matter and see what could have been done to facilitate these officers, but it came back to the same point that this was a condition of service which exists in a number of offices. That is why I mentioned just now the question of doctors and nurses. It is part of their service; so they cannot expect to get overtime for their work. For instance, we as Ministers have to work long hours, but this is a condition of service. The men who took these jobs knew fully well that this.....

I am addressing the Speaker and he is carrying on a meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to the hon. member with great care.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You cannot be listening to me with great care when you are talking to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Lawyers are capable of doing that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I know a lot of them who are not.

Mr. SPEAKER: None of them have ever occupied this Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I think I have made myself quite clear. I do not think there is anything we can do with this kind of worker, because the men who took these jobs did so, knowing that they would have to go out and examine vehicles in cases of accidents. I myself feel it is a bit hard, but there are a lot of things that are hard with which you have to comply. There was a law on the Statute Book that if a person in Barbados was seen with a wood dove or turtle dove he could have been prosecuted; so you get some of these antiquated situations arising. I am not saying

that I agree with them, but I draw this as an analogy that we have to put up with things with which we do not agree. It is not that I would not try to get this situation rectified for the Inspectors at the Highways and Transport Department, but it was specifically pointed out that this was a condition of service. Furthermore, if the Whitley Council who are members of the Civil Service and who always look into these anomalous situations and bring them to the attention of Government or the Public Service Commission has seen fit not to ask that this condition of service be changed, we are therefore up against a stone wall, and it would have to remain until they can get the Whitley Council to have it changed as a condition of service. If that was done, I would be the first person to try to facilitate them.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member desirous of speaking on this, the Hon. Mover of the Resolution, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, may exercise his right of final reply.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the hon. member who has just sat down. Before going further, I want him to know that the Prime Minister is not in favour of making people work and not paying them, and if this Resolution is thrown out, I am going to lead a delegation to the Prime Minister's office on this matter. This Government must learn to set an example and not go by advisers to rob people out of their earnings. Now it could be Puisinelli or any other kind of "Nelli", I am saying that he has advised wrong, and the Minister should be told that he was wrongly advised and not encouraged to come in here and mislead us by giving the Government advice to rob people. Now the Minister said that these people took the job with this understanding, but I am saying that they did not. They were not told that they would have to work night and day for the same money.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member is misleading the House. When these jobs are advertised, these conditions are advertised in the paper. The hon. member should know that you do not merely advertise that an Inspector is wanted. He has been in here long enough to know how Government is run.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have been in here long enough to know when people are being robbed, and these are the ones that are being robbed. The Minister may talk about conditions of work and try to get out of it by mentioning doctors and nurses. Nurses get a day or two days off, but these people do not get any time off at all. They have to go out at all hours. I can tell you that one particular officer had to attend three accidents in one night. *(Asides)* Police get a day off also. Imagine a person working, say, yesterday, and then the whole of last night, and today he has to be at the office at the same time. Are these the conditions of work the Minister is saying a man must work under? You are compelling private enterprise not to employ people for more than forty hours a week, and they cannot do it because the Labour Officer or the Union will be on their necks, but the Government is

encouraging people to work night and day because there are accidents. You, Sir, go out on a different basis, and even then you do not feel too happy having to get out of your bed at night. I am a poor struggling undertaker, and I do not understand getting out of bed at night after I lie down; but these poor men have to be out at all times and the next day they have to work without a day off, and yet the Minister is telling me about doctors and nurses and police. Police get a day off after every four days. I do not know about doctors, but nurses get days off and week-ends according to how they work. Are you going to tell me that because this is a condition of work you are not prepared to be reasonable and sympathetic?

3.50 p.m.

Suppose there was even a law binding these people to do it, the Act should be amended so that these people should be compensated for working all hours at night. It is very clear, if you want to help these people and not take advantage of them, if they go out tonight tell them not to come out to work tomorrow. There is nothing binding that you cannot make that a condition of service, and as long as you are going to tell me that it is a condition of service, and that people took this job with that understanding, and only because you know these people must eat that they have to do it. It is not fair, there is nothing to prevent the Minister from putting up something to the Cabinet drawing this to their attention, and I am sure that there are some sympathetic people in this particular Cabinet who would try to do something to help these people. There are other people in the same Government Service, at the Post Office, the Port and other departments who get paid for overtime and this should be a condition of service for these Inspectors as well. It is not fair to call on these men because you know they cannot do any better; if I were a Minister and my Permanent Secretary could show me the Act which tells me that these people should work like that, I would try my best to get the Act amended. It is my contention that if Mr. Puisinelli says it should not be done, we in this Chamber ought to do something about it by amending it to suit.

I am not asking the Government to do this for me, I am asking them to be sympathetic, and if they cannot see my point and if they do not care to pay overtime or give the necessary time off next day, then they do not want to do anything about it. These Inspectors sometimes have to face men who are intoxicated at night and who get into accidents and sometimes ill-treat and abuse the Inspectors. That happens to them at night, and you do not know what might happen because when these boys get their booze in them they go along in such a manner that they sometimes kill themselves. Just a few nights ago, a motor car cut a tractor in two; you do not think he was driving at five miles an hour when he can cut a tractor in two and kill himself also. I am trying to convince the Government to look into it because I do not want to see people trodden upon and their rights taken away only because they cannot say anything. I am asking the Government to consider it one way or the other, postpone it again and carry it back to Cabinet and raise my point.

If you cannot pay them overtime let them work at night and stay home the next day, or give them a day off like anybody else; it is sheer courtesy and decency that if they go out at night on Government business they should be paid for it. You are encouraging these men to take their telephones off at night when they are going to bed and not put them back on until the next morning, and you can never tell who might require these Inspectors during the night it could be the Minister or myself and the Inspectors might feel that if they are not being considered they will take the telephones off and go to bed like anybody else.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way at this stage, reserving his right to continue, I think if the hon. member were to move that further consideration be postponed, this much appears fairly feasible but as far as I am aware there are only two such Inspectors, but anyhow the suggestion that some work by day and some by night I do not think can be brought into operation unless we increase the number. The question of overtime to supplement their salary could well be examined in the light of present day conditions, and if the hon. member would move that this Resolution be postponed so that the question can be examined further, although it is a condition of service as explained by the Minister, yet what might be a condition of service can further be examined because everything is subject to examination and revision, and it may well be that the fact that these Inspectors are called out all hours of the night may be examined and they may be given overtime pay for overtime work, so if the hon. member would consider that he may move that further consideration be postponed and the precise point will be considered. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of the matter be now postponed.

Mr. LOWE: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be back within a minute approximately, and the House is not in recess.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 16 be the next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 16 stands in the name of the senior member for Christ Church and it is to resume debate on the Resolution deploring the incompetence in the management of the Barbados

Marketing Corporation, the grave loss of employment that has occurred, the grave loss of revenue to Barbados, and calling upon the Government to take steps forthwith to restore the shrimp industry.

On the 26th January, 1971, the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke and moved that the Resolution do now pass.

The senior member for St. James spoke and seconded the Motion.

The hon. Leader of the House moved, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, that further consideration of the Resolution be now postponed.

The Motion was put and carried *nem. con.*

On 2nd February, 1971, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew resumed his speech and was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business expired. That hon. member is now entitled to resume his speech, if he so desires.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, negotiations between Barbados Seafoods Limited and the Barbados Marketing Corporation have been plagued by a series of very unfortunate circumstances. Some of these occurred long before the end of the contract between these two organisations was due for consideration. For instance, Sir, there was an occasion when a Mr. Livy Greaves, who presided over the operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation but with, perhaps, a keener interest in the Airline at which he was employed at the time, he saw to it that the Barbados Seafoods Limited had an uneasy and unhappy time, because in his view the interest of the Airline should have precedence over the smooth functioning of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. 4.10 p.m.

It was found, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Schofield who had been shipping the shrimps that were for export via Pan American Airlines, was called upon to transfer the business from Pan Am to B.W.I.A., the airline which then employed Mr. Livy Greaves. One can well imagine that after all, the Barbados Seafoods Ltd. had been in operation prior to Mr. Greaves being associated with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. It would mean that Barbados Seafoods Ltd. would have had its plans well laid in advance, because it is well known that Barbados Seafoods Ltd. operated principally as an export organisation, and only a small portion of its catch was earmarked for Barbados, and Sir, it was when Mr. Livy Greaves in his position discovered that he could not bend, twist and turn Mr. Schofield that the troubles of Barbados Seafoods Ltd. began to multiply and increase. These are things which ought to have been put before the public. What is more, it was the Government which had the responsibility of the 500 odd workers employed by Barbados Seafoods Ltd., but we have seen until this present moment nothing whatsoever to convince us that apart from an occasional shout, nothing has been done or attempted to be done by the Government to provide employment for these 500 workers.

We ought to examine in some detail, Mr. Speaker, the case for these workers as was put by me to this House, I think, on 10th March, 1970. On that occasion this House was warned that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was being ill-advised in many of the steps that the Corporation was taking. This House was further advised to assist the Corporation wherever possible, to protect the Corporation from the operation or the manoeuvres of what I found it necessary to call big time operators, but I went on further and invited the House to have before it at the time some detail of the considerable sums to which this Island stood to benefit by way of payments in the form of wages to crews and captains, fees to the Barbados Marketing Corporation and various other sums in respect of warehousing, maintenance and particularly that \$168,000 had been paid to workers in the processing of shrimps.

It is for us at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to examine ourselves as deeply within as possible and convince ourselves how members on the Government side must feel that they sat idly by and allowed the wrecking of a shrimp industry that has been known to be worth something like \$7 1/2 million to Barbados. There are 500 workers out of a job, Sir, and when one takes a broader look at it to find that the dollar which goes into one house is expected at least to provide bread for a minimum of four persons, if we were to multiply 500 by four, we certainly get a reasonable average of the number of mouths that might not have tasted, and if they have tasted, to what extent since then; but we must convince ourselves that we have an average of 2,000 odd hungry mouths. That is the stock which we must take and which we must examine in the light of the present circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember the then Minister of Agriculture after certain advice - and I believe that the Minister got his advice from some of the same people who advised the Barbados Marketing Corporation and undermined it at the same time - came back to tell the House that not one worker would lose a single day's pay.
4.20 p.m.

It might be, Sir, that the Minister who said so then is not alive now to see, to hear and to know all of this or for that matter to care, but he particularly warned that he was speaking on the matter quite dispassionately, to use his own words. He said that he did not have to work himself up in a frenzy, he had to deal with the facts and figures. Mr. Speaker, the facts are these; the Government has shown a preference for dealing with crooks, rogues, and vagabonds, has shown a marked liking for dealing with questionable characters, even if it means putting 500 odd people employed by Barbados Seafoods Limited out of a job.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to say that the Government has shown preference for dealing with crooks and questionable people unless he is implying that they might be doing it without

realising it, but he said they have shown a preference and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. HINDS: Even if I say that the Government has shown a liking for it or a desire for it?

Mr. SPEAKER: All of those are in the same category.

Mr. HINDS: The Government has acted in a manner which convinces me that the Government prefers to deal with crooks, rogues and vagabonds.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is the same thing.

Mr. HINDS: I am expressing an opinion of what I am convinced about.

Mr. SPEAKER: One cannot cover it up by saying that one is expressing an opinion; one may say that the Government has happened to be dealing with so and so.

Mr. HINDS: We find that the Government has found itself dealing with crooks, rogues and vagabonds in the matter of Barbados Seafoods and the B.M.C.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I rise to object to that statement by the hon. member that the Government has found itself dealing with crooks, rogues and vagabonds in the matter of the shrimp industry. It was clearly and indisputably pointed out here that the only crooks, rogues and vagabonds who would have been involved would have been those who were responsible for having the ships that were employing Barbadians confiscated, and therefore we did not even go so far as to refer to them as crooks, rogues or vagabonds.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is merely drawing a red herring across the trail, and we are dealing with shrimps. As I said last Tuesday, red herrings and shrimps do not school together.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member finish his point.

Mr. HINDS: He is making a speech, not a point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member finish his point.

Mr. HINDS: The Minister is not making a point, Mr. Speaker, he is making a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would both hon. members resume their seats? Let me get this straight; the hon. member spoke of the Government having a preference and a desire and so on for dealing with a certain type of person. I pointed out to the hon. member that I regarded that as unparliamentary.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, but you cannot call on me to withdraw it after you have permitted a speech from the hon. member; you have permitted a speech from the hon. member, not a mere objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I understood, to have withdrawn the reference to the desire for having a preference when he mentioned then that the Government had been dealing with a certain type of people which I do not regard as unparliamentary, because the Government presumably was not aware that it was dealing, if it was dealing with, a certain type of person. I understood that hon. member to have withdrawn, certainly by implication, any reference of the Government being desirous or having a preference for dealing with crooks or anything of that sort. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew rose to a point of order, and I would ask all hon. members when they rise to points of order to do it as succinctly and as precisely as that same hon. member did only last week when I, with respect, congratulated him on the succinctness of the point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the compliment, but my point of order is.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, has he now risen on a point of order again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HINDS: I was speaking, the Minister rose on a point of order, he sat down and he has now risen on a point of order without anybody else having said anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, both hon. members sat down when I called on both to sit down. Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew make the point of order to which he rose, and as succinctly as possible.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out that this Government has not been, in its opinion, dealing in respect of the shrimp industry with crooks, rogues and vagabonds, and that the only crooks, rogues and vagabonds involved in this issue were those who confiscated the boats.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is only repeating himself.

Mr. Speaker; The point has been made; let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: The time has gone, but I do not blame that side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business has now come to an end, but I can appreciate the fact that the hon. member has not finished his speech.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Leader of the House intimate that which he seeks now to proceed with under Government Business?

A BILL TO AMEND THE AFFILIATION ACT, 1963.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, 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.

4.30 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that, in their wisdom, the Crown Law Officers have come up with the best formula. I, however, would have preferred to see in the Affiliation Proceedings Act itself some specific clause making a certificate signed by the father evidence against him as well as ruling out proceedings against any other person. There is a general provision of law stating that anything contained in a certificate of birth, baptism, marriage or burial, shall be evidence in a Court of Law of the facts noted, and no doubt it is going to be argued that this is only prima facie evidence as indeed it is. I, personally, would like to see a situation where a man who has acknowledged a child is in the same position as a husband and cannot get away from supporting it, and that nobody would be able to come and say; "The woman begged me to put down my name and I did so, or that my mother told me she would put me out if I did not put down my name, or that the child was under fifteen years of age, and I was told that if I signed my name the Police would not prosecute me." If a man is foolish enough to do that, then he should also take on the consequences. He should not sign for a child unless he knows that it could be his, and I do not think he should be allowed to escape at all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the second reading of the Bill took me by surprise. I did not appreciate that the hon. senior member for the City was not in his seat at the second reading of the Bill, because I know there are one or two points that he wanted to make on the principle of the Bill. Without in any way arguing on the principle of the Bill, at this stage, there are one or two remarks which I would like to make, associated with some of the speeches which have been made on certain points relating to the principle of this Bill. Sir, I have to ask for the good humour of hon. members to permit me just two or three minutes to make a point. (ASIDES)

Mr. Speaker, is Order No 29 (6) still one of the Standing Orders of this House? Behaviour of hon. members not speaking. I can hear a noise as of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew but coming from our side of the House. I know that he has said that he will be on this side next session, and that a lot of them over there will not be in here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If I am on this side it means that the Democratic Labour Party will be getting 23 seats at the next election, in accordance with the projections of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us insert the "2" before the "3" in the third reading of the Bill before the House. Let us deal with the third reading of the Bill (Asides)

Mr. ADAMS: It means that the Democratic Labour Party will get only 3 seats, Sir. I know that on the third reading it is definitely a breach to suggest that anything should be in a Bill which is not in it. I am not being critical of this particular Bill which is here, but I know that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown wished to make certain points which, I am sure, the Minister of Community Development and Health would not mind my making. All of us in this House should look forward to the day when the Affiliation Proceedings Act is not necessary. You cannot have an ideal situation but instead, I would suggest, adopting the arguments of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and thinking that the only alternative to the proper support of children is by putting people in prison, we ought to look forward to an attack on the problems which this Bill as it stands represents by family planning first of all. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas spoke as if the only concomitant to sexual pleasure is the procurement of children. We have gone a long way from the Bible's alleged remarks upon this issue.

In Barbados we are fortunate in having the birth rate down to a point where I believe that the amount of affiliation proceedings work has fallen off in the Court. It is not by any means as prominent as it was before. If the suggestion to raise the limit from

\$5 to \$10 is adopted, it does not mean that a man with \$25 a week who is supporting a child at \$10 a week when he gets married will still have to go on paying the child \$10 a week.
4.40 p.m.

My experience has been overwhelming that one of the things best done by the Magistrates of this Island are domestic proceedings, and they do domestic proceedings relating to the support of children even better than those relating to questions between husbands and wives. That has been a part of my experience, therefore I think we are doing the Bench a disservice when we suggest that they are only waiting for a chance of an increased penalty - and I use the word "penalty" quite advisedly because that is the sense in which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas seems to interpret maintenance - to put more money on fathers. That is not the way it goes now. The great overwhelming majority of orders now are made for less than \$5. If you raise it to \$10, it does not mean that every \$4 order would become \$8; it would stay at \$4 because if a man can only afford to pay \$4, the fact that he could be made to pay \$10 does not make him any more able to pay more than \$4. (Asides)

Now the hon. member for St. Andrew in one of those facetious expressions, has managed to find a germ of truth; he cannot always evade it. He says, and I dare say he was pointing at me, that when you go and drop about yours all over the country - I do not know if he means you or me.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew did not get up to address you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Exactly; I heard the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on an alleged point of order on another side of the House.

Mr. ADAMS: He said that when you drop them all over the country, you should pay \$10.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have ruled on a previous occasion, sometimes "you" means "one".

Mr. ADAMS: That is the whole point. In our party we are not in a position to press this matter of party issue, since it seems that the arguments which find favour with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas also found favour with a substantial majority of our delegates at our recent Annual Conference, and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown was as unsuccessful then as evidently he would be, did he press this matter of amendment now; but it does not mean that there is no merit in the argument. There are a few cases where a father is well able to pay more money and is cited before the Courts, and the Magistrate is limited in his award by the amount of the jurisdiction. Things should go up. There should be a continuous revising process of everything relating to the cost of living. The price of butter is being put up now, the price of maintaining children goes up with all these things. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure we are going beyond the third reading now.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am a little beyond the third reading, but I am suggesting not to let us have these old authoritarian, right-wing, conservative views as put forward by the hon. juniormember for St. Thomas. They are remarks that belong to an outdated situation in Barbados. You would expect to hear those remarks from the hon. juniormember for St. Thomas in the year 1930 not in 1971. You would expect to hear from the old conservatives that you cannot make it more than three shillings a week because they would have to pay taxes to keep these people in prison. It is an obscurantist's attitude and one which ought to be deplored. Let the Ministry of Health go on with the good work it is doing in family planning; let the Welfare Department add a little education, a little talk to the young ladies whom it has to support, try to get them out of this Act not by handing out taxpayers' money to them, but by persuading them to avoid the consequence of concupisence if possible. I welcome the falling of the birth rate, and I very much hope that with the falling of the birth rate with a new enlightenment coming over the public life of this Island, we will not hear all the old arguments that you will fill up the prisons and that these poor men have to pay too much money for their babies and so on. Why should the poor mothers have to carry all the burden? A man is often as responsible for forcing himself into a situation aware of 'baby results as the woman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not even sure this is good for a second reading.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would have had no intention of addressing the House on a third reading of a Bill had not the interesting example been set by the Hon. and Learned member who has just sat down. Really what has caused me to rise was not so much the merits of the question because it is not a contentious Bill - it is a Bill which we all support - but the astonishing intelligence which has been communicated to us that the other side are divided on an aspect of the matter which has been presented to the House. Indeed we have just been told that a proposal put to the House earlier today by an hon. member on that side had as much chance of being accepted by us as it had in his own party, although I suspect myself that it was more indulgently treated by this House and by this side than it would have been in the rarified atmosphere of a B.L.P. conference.

However, Mr. Speaker, the point at issue is that perhaps neither a proposal to increase the amount payable under an Affiliation Order or an opposite point of view as was expressed by the Hon. Minister on my side fully meets this situation. I think that the ideal situation in this Island would be for so much to be done for children whether they are born in wedlock or not as to make unnecessary the enactment of any law which would require putative or accused or actual fathers to support them. I think the Affiliation Act is one of those bits of legislation which get

on a Statute Book because the society has not quite risen up to the level of its opportunities, and not having done so, a society falls back on the easiest way out. If you have what you regard as unwanted children, you try and nail the fathers or the people said to be fathers for them, so that they would not be a burden on society. This is outdated thinking, and I think the hon. member who has just sat down has common cause with a lot of us inside and outside the House when he suggests that we should update our thinking, that the benefits of family planning should be more widely spread, but even to go further than that to see that the community itself should have a greater regard for children, so that whether they are in fact born in wedlock or not, they should partake, all of them, whatever the circumstances of their birth, in the prosperity of the country itself.

I am a great one - I do not commit the Government of Barbados by saying this; I am speaking my own personal view - for the payment of children's allowances, and I hope the day will soon come when a Government of Barbados will consider this, because perhaps when we reach the stage when this can be done, it may not be necessary to continue to retain a really disgraceful system of people having to be hounded through the Courts to support children. There is nothing wrong with the law taking its course if it is broken, but I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the disadvantages to the children of being brought up against a background of the fathers having to support them by law are not completely got over or surmounted no matter what more pleasant circumstances the children meet in after life. The stigma to have one's father support one by law somehow remains even if the person against whom it is said has made good, and I think we ought to aim at a society in which this can no longer be said of a child, and to do this the whole community must be prepared to do much more for children than up to now is being done, although I think that my own Government, given the resources at its disposal, is doing as much as the circumstances will permit. We are not complacent about this; we are, very much on the contrary, much more anxious that more should be done for them, and I am convinced that when we feel this way about a situation generally and what the community can do for them, we will not be faced with the necessity of enacting this kind of legislation or even of amending it to make it more workable.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was passed and its title read and agreed to.

4.50 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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 it be an

instruction of the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with a Resolution for \$40,000, notice of which was given earlier in today's sitting.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1970-71, NO. 19

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is the second supplementary for which we have come under this Head. This one seeks the sum of \$40,000 under Head 42 - Welfare Department, Item 30 - Welfare Grants. As hon. members will recall, when the 1970-71 Estimates were being prepared, the sum of \$500,000 was the amount which we had in mind should have been provided to meet the expenditure of Welfare Grants, but the amount actually included in the Estimates was \$350,000. A supplementary of \$199,250 was approved by Resolution No 80/1970 on 16th December, 1970, but this amount proved to be inadequate to pay grants to the end of the financial year. An additional sum of \$40,000 is therefore required.

The original proposal for \$500,000 was based on the payment of grants of \$1.25 per week to 8,000 persons, and when the supplementary was sought, the figure had increased to 8,600. Since then it has increased to 8,700 persons, so that since the passing of the Supplementary Resolution in December last year the number has increased by 100 from 8,600 to 8,700. I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that in 1968, prior to the transfer of services from the interim Commissioner, the amount of grants paid for the year was \$401,550. The amount of money required to pay the 8,700 for the remaining four weeks of this financial year is \$43,500. There is a balance of \$5,600, and of this amount approximately \$3,600 is already committed as arrears of payment and the uncommitted balance therefore is \$2,000.

The position simply is that the original amount we asked for we did not get, and although we had a supplementary of \$199,250 in December last year, the numbers have again increased so that if we are to continue to pay grants this \$40,000 is absolutely essential. We want to make sure that all these cases are attended to, and we have been giving these Welfare grants and have been very liberal in the administration of such grants. I will quote one single example to demonstrate what I am saying. We issue grants, for example, to people who have worked for 40 years at the sugar factories, many of whom receive a very small pension - \$9.00 or \$10.00 a month - and we give assistance to those people because the pension is so small that although we regard \$7.00 a week as the means test, yet we do not stick to \$7.00 in each case because we consider a man and his wife and we divide the money between

both of them, and I always give instructions in cases of small pensions to divide the amount in half between a husband and wife to see that we give full assistance to all needy cases. It may well be that it is just the facilities or the assistance or the implementation of these measures; in other words, the attitude and policy of the Ministry in trying to see that these needy cases are met, so that is probably how the money will run out.

My point is that in the first place we were not given the amount we asked for. I may mention that there are a few cases in which many of these payments are still in various Post Offices, there is money lying down there for some of these people, and this is in the Report of the Postmaster General and is being examined, so that in the various Post Offices balances are there because people have not gone for their money and this is being examined. In order for the welfare grants to continue up to the end of the financial year, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$40,000 do now pass, and if there are any questions I will try to answer them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would first like to hear from the Minister exactly what are the needs of these people as seen by the Welfare Officers. In other words, the Welfare Officers must see that these people are in need of something before a decision is reached to give them \$1.25 a week. To my mind \$1.25 a week is nothing; it has no purchasing power, and it has no value when taking today's cost of living into consideration. (Hon. C. E. TALMA: "It is not always \$1.25; it varies.") The Minister is now saying that it varies.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is the basis on which it is calculated, but it is not always \$1.25. In some cases they get \$10 a week. For instance, a woman with four or five children whose husband has left her will get \$10 a week or, perhaps, more. Do not for one moment think it is only \$1.25; I think the average payment is about \$5.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, that gives me more grist for my mills. Is the Minister going to tell me that throughout the whole of Barbados the Welfare Officers can only find 8,000 people who are in aid of this relief? Let the Minister tell me how many people from St. Peter are getting this relief. How many people in Christ Church are getting this relief? How many people in St. Peter are getting \$1.25 as against those who are getting \$10? What is the maximum amount given to any person in any one parish? I am sure that in the City of Bridgetown alone you can find almost 2,000 out of this 8,000 people in need of this type of relief. You will find women with the number of children to which the Minister has just referred. I would like to hear how many cases from St. Peter the Welfare Officer has recommended for

this type of relief. How many were given \$1.25 and how many were given \$10? In the parish of St. Peter you will find people in dire need for this type of relief. There can be no two ways about it; the Minister has not come before us with any estimates. These are guestimates." Who is running the Welfare Department?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wants further information. I have already told the hon. member that some people get \$1.25 a week, others get \$2 or \$3 a week, and in cases where people are disabled they get \$5 a week. He wanted to know how many people in St. Peter are getting this relief, but I am unable to tell him the exact number at the moment. I can tell him that there is money lying down in the St. Peter's Post Office for certain people who have not gone to draw it. There is money lying down in the following Post Offices:

	\$	¢
Christ Church Post Office Branch	695.50	
St. Andrew	94.00	
St. George	182.00	
St. James	131.80	
St. John	427.00	
St. Joseph	183.00	
St. Lucy	162.50	
St. Peter	91.00	
St. Philip	383.50	
St. Thomas	146.50	
St. Michael	3,189.50.	

In all of the Branch Post Offices there is money waiting for people who are entitled to welfare grants. As far as the number for the various parishes is concerned, I am afraid I do not have the figures here. I can get them and give them to the hon. member when we are considering the Estimates. I am sure he will be asking the same questions then.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the Minister to use the Radio, Mobile Cinema and T.V., and appeal to the Press to tell these people that there is money at a branch Post Offices for people who are entitled to welfare grants. How many welfare officers do you have in the Parish of St. Peter? How many people in St. Peter are being assisted by these grants. (*Asides*) The Minister says that there is \$91 in the Post Office in St. Peter. \$91 for how many people? Several of these people who are entitled to this money are going to bed at night with their children starving, while the money is lying in the Post Office. What is being done to let the people know that these few pennies are in the Post Office waiting for them?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This matter was only drawn to our attention by the Postmaster General on the 5th March. Today is the 9th March, so we have not been sleeping on the matter.

Mr. HINDS: The matter was drawn to the attention of the Government on the 5th March, but how long has the money been lying in the Post

Office before the 5th March? This is not a case where the Postmaster General saw it on the 5th March for the first time and drew it to the attention of the Government. People are going to bed hungry at night, and the Minister can stand here and proudly announce that the Government is doing so well for these people in St. Peter that it has money in the Post Office lying down waiting for them. You have \$91 in the Post Office at St. Peter waiting for the people in St. Peter. How many people will this \$91 be divided among?

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the entire Welfare Department are just making a mockery of this situation. They are just political nuisances for the Government. They are going about campaigning, and you will find that in most cases some of these same.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. As far as I am aware, the Public Service Commission is divorced from politics. The permanent Welfare Officers are appointed by the Public Service Commission, and it is not fair for the hon. member to say that they are only political nuisances going around for the Government. They are appointed by the Public Service Commission like any other civil servant.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Home Affairs in this country is being accompanied by a Welfare Officer to every house in Grazettes canvassing, and the Welfare Officer is introducing the Minister as being their candidate in the coming general elections; and Mr. Foffie Williams as well is accompanying the officer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see nothing in this Resolution that has Mr. Foffie Williams in it. I will ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the Resolution under discussion.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if you are referring..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention that the Constitution of this country gives every man a certain amount of privilege, and there is absolutely nothing wrong with a Welfare Officer who is a citizen of this country going around and expressing his views after working hours; as long as he is not doing it as a public officer during his working hours, he can express his own views. The Constitution of this country in the formulation of which hon. members on the other side had a hand gives every citizen of this country that right. What I am saying is that if a man in his spare time goes around and does that, there are people who would go around on behalf of hon. members on the other side; so what is wrong with Civil

Servants going around and speaking on behalf of Mr. Greaves or anybody else? (*Asides*) You cannot criticise a Civil Servant if he goes around in his own time and does this, because there are Civil Servants who do it for members on the other side. I would like to congratulate the man.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see there is something called a Constitution. There is also something called the Constitution River. What I want to say is that the consciences of some people who address this House on the question of the Constitution is like the Constitution River.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would really like to hear a debate on the \$40,000 for Welfare grants.

Mr. HINDS: We are addressing the Chair on that. What I am saying is that a Welfare Officer is on duty twenty-fours a day. That is what the Hon. Minister of Health has represented in this House....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, there is labour legislation on the Statute Book of this country and regulations which prohibit a man working over a number of hours per day. (A VOICE: Policemen too?) I think they are exempt from it. Regulations were implemented within the last two years, the Shops Act and that sort of thing, which prohibit the employment of a worker for more than eight hours a day. He is given an hour for overtime, but eight hours would be the normal time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are looking at the fact that in December, 1970, this House voted a supplementary sum of \$199,250 for the Welfare Department. Now we find that to carry us through to the end of this month we need another \$40,000. The Minister has quite rightly drawn to our attention that we have already voted \$549,250 for the Welfare Department, but are we seeing the benefit accruing to the poor people? What we are establishing is that instead of attending to the needs of the poor, the Welfare Officers are engaging in exercises which are completely outside their scope of employment. This is not right. We are to wonder as in the case of those people who are supposed not to have collected their few pennies from the Post Offices how many of them are amongst the disabled that the Minister has told us will get this benefit. Is it too much to ask the Welfare Officer to make a special provision to see that a disabled person gets his allowance sent to him rather than having it remain at the Post Offices? What we are saying is that the relationship between a Welfare Officer and the people with whom he has got to deal ought to be such that there is nothing pertaining to the welfare of the sufferer or the sick or poor that the officer could not or would not look to do to create an atmosphere even half-way of happiness for the person concerned; but what we see is that these Welfare Officers have no interest whatsoever in the poor people in this country. As far as they are concerned, the money can remain in the Post Offices until this same time next year. It

is not fair, Sir, and we are asking the Minister to tell us, because he ought to realise that this Resolution for \$40,000 has been circulated to us during the course of today's sitting.
5.20 p.m.

The note, five lines of explanation, and all the note tells you is:

This resolution seeks to authorise a supplementary provision in the sum of \$40,000 to continue the payment of Welfare grants to the end of the financial year. The original vote was based on the payment of grants to 8,000 persons and was supplemented in December 1970 because of an additional 600 persons. The number has now increased to 8,700.

What I am saying is, Mr. Chairman, the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us when the Central Government took over the welfare services in the parish of St. Peter, how many had been getting this type of relief, how many have been taken off the list as was done in the parish of St. Michael, and how many of those people who have been struck off the list since the Central Government took over the administration of this fund.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member will realise that this is an emergency supplementary in order to continue the payments, and I have already given the Committee that information. In 1967, for the Council pensioners in the north, south and St. Michael, the expenditure was \$407,160 and in 1968 the expenditure was \$401,550.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: On a point of order, before you give those figures, I see you are comparing those figures with \$350,000; does this supplementary include assistance in kind? If not, somebody would be misleading you with the comparison of the figures, but this is only monetary assistance. If you bring figures to show that in 1967 it was actually more than this, this is some sort of snag and somebody is wilfully and maliciously misleading you.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, we asked for \$500,000 in the first instance.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Does this include assistance in kind? (Hon. C. E. TALMA: No.) Does it include the medicines which were given to poor people and which has been stopped? (Hon. C. E. TALMA: No.)

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister had started to give us some figures from 1967. I want to tell the Minister that these figures can have no meaning whatsoever to this Resolution unless you can relate them to the number of persons that those figures were serving; in other words, that these sums were being distributed among so many people, that is what we are concerned with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am giving some backlog information. When the current Esti-

mates were being prepared it was estimated that 8,000 registered persons each receiving \$1.25 per week would have required \$520,000 for the year. During the first three months of this year, the number of persons had risen to 8,600 on the register, and provision for an additional 600 at \$1.25 per week for approximately 39 weeks amounted to \$29,250. It will be seen therefore that the total provision for the year should not be less than \$520,000 plus \$29,250, making a total of \$549,250; that was why we came for the supplementary for \$199,000 in December last year, because the amount provided was \$350,000.

The position is that we asked for more money but we do not always get what we ask for and we had to come back for more. The amount provided in the 1970-71 Estimates was only \$350,000, of which \$93,000 remained unexpended at the 15th September, 1970 and in order for these payments to continue till the end of the financial year 1971 the amount of \$199,250 had to be supplemented. I tried to explain that there is money tied up at the Post Office which has contributed to some extent to the fact that we need another \$40,000 to continue these payments. If the hon. member wants to know how many in each parish, he might have to ask a substantive question because that calls for a certain amount of research. When you ask a question the officers have to get down to it and get that kind of information.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister could have said that monetary assistance was given out, but I have a few questions to ask. The Hon. Minister says \$1.25 per week, and I think they went wrong here because there are hon. members on the other side who had to do with national and public assistance, but you had a standard thing and then you took separate cases of some big families.
5.30 p.m.

I would like you to answer this question for the benefit of the public. Has the Minister given instructions that poor people, who apply for medical aid, should not be given medicine. Is it true that old age pensioners are not given medicine? (Hon. C. E. TALMA: "They are entitled to it.") My information is, and my experience has been, that more than 50% of the people who attend the District Medical Officers suffer from high blood pressure. Before these people could have got one prescription from a Doctor and they could have it renewed. Everybody knows that people suffering from high blood pressure must continue taking medicine for a long period in order to keep their pressure at a certain level. Today people must find \$9, \$10, or \$12, to pay for medicine, whereas originally they were given medicine free in St. Michael.

Sir, the people are now told that they cannot get free medicine. I know the hon. junior member for St. Peter will bear me out, because people go to him every day. There are people whose sons, daughters and cousins may find a private Doctor for them. People, who are suffering from an illness, like to change a Doctor and some do not like to go to the Doctor provided by the Institution. Because a son or a daugh-

ter may give somebody \$5 to go to a Doctor, that person will then have to look for \$10 or \$12 to pay for medicine. I do not believe that the Minister would give such instructions, but I am telling him that it is what is happening nowadays. I saw a case of this sort up to last Sunday morning.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member will give way, Mr. Chairman, I will explain the matter. Old age pensioners and those people who are in need of relief are entitled to free drugs and free medicine. We are also working to extend it so that all people whose income does not exceed \$25 a week will be entitled to free medical assistance, free drugs and free medicine. There will be more District clinics held by the District Medical Officers, and those people who have an income in excess of \$25 a week will attend the clinic - not the Doctor's residence - and pay a fee of \$2 instead of \$5. If a man attends the Doctor's residence, he may have to pay \$5 or more. I am surprised to hear the hon. member say that old age pensioners cannot get free medicine and drugs. That will have to be investigated, because whoever is doing that, is working contrary to the policy of this Government. If that is the case, such people will have to be dealt with.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that the Government has taken up where I left off. That is exactly where I left off. This idea of trying to belittle some people who had a hand in Local Government is going to boomerang. The Minister can ask some of his colleagues if it is not going to boomerang. The Minister mentioned something about not going to the Doctor's residence. Who is a Doctor? When I was in charge of things, any person could go to a Doctor's home for medical attention, because he was employed as a whole-time officer with the right to have private practice. Why cannot people go to a Doctor's home for medical attention? What is wrong with that?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong with going to his home. At present if you attend a Doctor's home he will charge you a fee of \$5. We are extending the scope of things not only for old age pensioners, and so on, to get free drugs and medicine, but to include people with an income not exceeding \$25 a week. If their income exceeds \$25 a week, they can attend a clinic and pay a fee of \$2 for medical attention and get drugs free, as distinct from going to the Doctor's home where they may have to pay \$5.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I quite understand that the Elections are in the air at the moment, but I am not unduly worried. It is not only old age pensioners and National Assistance pensioners, but there are several people who can merely find a fee to pay the Doctor and would be glad to get medicine. Will the Minister give the Welfare Officers instructions that, if they are satisfied that the person is not able to pay for the medicine, they should initial the prescription and let the person get the medicine? Medicine from a Drug Store will cost about \$8 or \$9. Today medicine will cost twice as much as the fee

paid to the Doctor. I hope that the Minister will make a note of this, because it is very important.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the debate seems to have taken a slight turn from where I had been trying to channel it; however, the contribution made by the hon. member has been very good indeed. According to the Minister's calculations the sum of \$40,000 is based on \$1.25 per person, but he tells us that some of these poor people will get additional sums amounting to \$10. We are glad to hear that. What is of some interest to us is the point made by the senior member for Bridgetown about some people having a desire to change their Doctors. There are cases where some people go to a private Doctor and not to the Doctor provided by the clinic, and when they get the prescriptions they are unable to purchase the medicine prescribed for them. Those are some of the people that the Welfare Officers are denying an opportunity, or the right, to get free medicine. What does the Minister have to say about that?

5.40 p.m.

There are people whom the Welfare Officers are denying the opportunity and right to get medicine. What does the Minister have to say about this? Because a poor person as we say in Bajan parlance may have scratched enough to pay a private doctor, must he not get medicine from the clinic or dispensary to which he is entitled?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, I would like the hon. members who are making these allegations to give me confidentially the names of some persons who have suffered in this respect, because I am not aware that this state of affairs is going on, and I would have it investigated.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I am surprised at the hon. member wanting to get the names of people. Do you want this because they are poor? I can call names in here now of respectable families, but you do not want me to do this sort of thing. This is a general thing, and you either believe me or you do not. You know I would not mislead you.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has any information of the number of poor people, this will increase by to the end of the present financial year, who are to benefit from this \$40,000, or are we to understand that these officers have closed off their books and there are no more poor people outside the palling of grace that are to benefit from this sum of money we are voting here today? Nobody in this House should be satisfied with what the Minister would like to call the progress of the work of these Welfare Officers. I wonder if the Minister will tell us how many Welfare Officers he has at work in the field at the present moment, because that would then give us some indication as to the number of cases of wretchedly poor that these officers come into contact with perhaps in the course of a month.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I gave this information be-

fore. This is not the first time it is being asked for. Anyhow, I think there are twenty-nine. Seven have been transferred to the Ministry of Health and Community Development leaving twenty-two.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to authorise a supplementary provision in the sum of \$40,000 to continue the payment of Welfare grants to the end of the financial year. The original vote was based on the payment of grants to 8,000 persons and was supplemented in December 1970 because of an additional 600 persons. The number has now increased to 8,700.

Now, Sir, hearing the various arguments concerning the Welfare Department and the poor people of the Island, I can assure you that some of the old people who are getting the \$5 per week are still drawing \$1.20 per week because I see them doing so at the Post Office in St. Andrew. What I want to see is that Government give the Welfare Officer in charge of the parish a telephone at his home so that if any poor person takes ill or needs assistance, he can telephone that officer to come to his assistance. There is not one living in my parish, and the people come to me even if they need a doctor or want to go to the infirmary, and I have to telephone night and day to get a van to come for them. That is one of the things I am stressing.

We have heard a lot about the poor people today, but a lot of young and able-bodied men and women who can work depend on the old people getting this \$6.20 to get something out of that. They are robbing the old people because they refuse to work (*Asides*). When you were speaking, I did not disturb you; I want you to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, there is a Welfare grant called "relief in kind". When I was Chairman of the Board, we had to give a person who was unable to work something to keep him. If he is not working and has a family, we had to give him something to help him until he got a job, because we could not allow himself and his family to suffer. Therefore there are many ways in which we have to give grants for relief in kind. Some people get their houses repaired out of the same Welfare Department, and some get food and other items; so I cannot sit and hear advantage being taken of the Welfare Officers by members. Some of them do their duty the whole time just as doctors, and if rain falls or sun shines they have to work when called upon. When you see an Officer going from parish to parish or district to district it is for a purpose. I would not say it is for political reasons. Very often they come to my district and ask where such and such a person lives and I have to direct them; so you should not take advantage of them because they cannot answer for themselves. The grant of \$40,000 which we are asking for until the end of the financial year is for many purposes, and I do not think there is any need for further argument on this, because it is to help people to get relief from time to time.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to respectively.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT)
ORDER, 1971.**

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be now taken, and I am asking leave to take charge of it.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 5 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of it, and hearing no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, this Resolution calls for an increase in staff in a number of Ministries whom we have seen repeatedly coming to the House to ask for more and more people. To deal with the first Item, Ministry of Finance, Insurance Department, *(Asides)* I must ask the hon. senior member for St. Andrew not to heckle me, Sir, he has occupied the position as Acting Leader on his side just as I am occupying the position of Acting Leader on my side. I am sure I am going to tell so many people what a good Acting Leader I was as he has told them what a good Acting Leader he was.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, the senior member for St. Andrew was specifically asked by the junior member for St. Lucy to lead the House on that occasion, but we have no record here in this House that the senior member for St. Thomas has been asked to lead the Opposition, so let him get his facts straight.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to be in a position at the end of the day to congratulate the hon. senior member for St. Thomas as he did congratulate me when I led the House.

Mr. ADAMS: He is assisting me greatly in my instant task, Sir, and I may assure the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that the customary process of consultation applies in this Party as it applies in his. The Ministry of Finance and the administration of the Insurance Act, I would like to ask very

briefly what exactly is the relationship of this part of the staff to the present staff of the Standing Insurance Committee. This is a matter on which we really do require some elucidation on this side; more and more Civil Service posts proliferate and we are by no means assured that the proliferation is always in the interest of good Government rather than in the interest of extending the number of jobs.

The particular point on which I wish to speak deals with the Ministry of Home Affairs, Item 1, the creation of a post of Chief Electoral Officer. This question of Electoral Officers has been a sensitive one for many years; I believe that on the Government side those members who went to the Independence Conference in London are now as convinced as we were then that an Electoral Commission charged with the responsibility of supervising elections in Barbados, free from political day-to-day control and freeing politicians from the odium which can fall on persons who supervise elections would have been a better idea than the present setup which we have. I for one am more than ever firmly wedded to the idea of having a separate Electoral Commission on the same status as Public Service Commissions to run elections in Barbados.

We had a situation in the last St. Joseph bye-election where political appointments to positions of supervision at electoral level had reached such a flagrant state that four persons whose names were put forward by the acknowledged supporter of the Democratic Labour Party who was the Returning Officer for St. Joseph, refused to serve, not on the grounds that they did not feel themselves able honestly to discharge their duties impartially since they were active members of the Democratic Labour Party, and intended to canvass in the elections. They were people who were put forward to take part in the election as Electoral Officers.

I myself had the experience in the St. Joseph bye-election of talking with, I think his name is Mr. Marshall - I think he taught the hon. senior member for St. Andrew - (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He said he was proud of it.) He did not say he was proud of it. Mr. Marshall, as the election went on, I was watching him count and he and I were talking in terms of the votes for the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party; he and I were talking in terms of the votes for us and you.
6.00 p.m.

He and his little helper were - after I made it clear to them that I regarded them as yard fowls - putting themselves forward as yard fowls, too. Mr. Marshall and I did have a little clash at the end. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas will remember the little fuss which I made at the end of the table away from him. When he was around things went well, but where he left things to the Returning Officer they did not go quite so well. At our end, I had to say to Mr. Marshall....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member need not go into such minute details on the St. Joseph Bye-election.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this has something to do with the post of Chief Electoral Officer. Mr. Marshall having served as an electoral official, for all I know, may be in line for appointment to this post. He may be the next Returning Officer in St. Joseph. I told him: When you make 6 mistakes, please do not let them all be in favour of Mr. Smith; try and make one in favour of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He told me that I was unfair and so on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: How did the hon. member know that he did not acquiesce?

Mr. ADAMS: Acquiesce in what?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In favour of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. ADAMS: I was looking very closely at him. When the votes were marked outside the box at the bottom, Mr. Smith got them, when they were marked outside the box at the top they were put as doubtful. I commented on this. I do not think there has ever been an election in Barbados at which there has been a complaint and in which the Returning Officer has been the subject of attack on platforms. I am saying this although the attacks came from the platform on our side. I am saying this for the reason that, in my experience and in the experience of other hon. members, in and out of this House whom I have consulted, they have never had to complain before of the conduct of a Returning Officer.

Mr. Speaker, I say this to illustrate an example that things are getting slightly worse. Whoever is appointed to this post when created - I refer to the post of Chief Electoral Officer - at a salary of \$9,840 a year will have to be left sufficiently free of political influence to avoid a situation where again, the electoral officials themselves are going to be called in question. I have had a single situation with an electoral official in St. Thomas, where he asked us to move our loudspeakers because they were too close to his house or something like that. It is to his credit that when it was pointed out to him that his action could be misinterpreted - I think the hon. junior member for St. Thomas knows to whom I refer - he has ever since that day gone out of his way to be impartial as between the side which he undoubtedly favours, which is the hon. junior member for St. Thomas' side, and the side which he will sooner or later have to swallow as the winning side. This is the kind of thing that I am suggesting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, a lot of us count our chickens before they are hatched.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not counting my particular egg; I am just talking about the winning side. I do not put my mouth on myself, Sir, nor do I say how many votes I am going to get in Orange Hill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I understand that the Labour Party is not running you.

Mr. SPEAKER: It certainly is not running me. What is the hon. member saying?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was referring to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, Sir. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am quite capable of taking care of myself.

Mr. ADAMS: There are some people who say that the public scandal is that the Democratic Labour Party is running the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. Anyhow, Sir, I think that, as far as you are concerned, it is a sensitive subject that ought to be avoided and I will not press this on you at such a difficult time in the affairs of the parish of St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The situation has never been more assured than it is now.

Mr. ADAMS: Pilate took water and washed his hands, but it seems that, in other quarters, arms are folded in sublime disregard of any assurance which Your Honour feels at the present time. I appeal to hon. members. We are coming up to a General Elections, so please do not create a situation in which public confidence in the electoral process is in any way undermined. This is a serious matter. Hon. members must believe and they must know, if they look at the Home Affairs records, that more and more electoral officials, registration officials, right down to the enumerators, are being appointed from the ranks of the ruling Party, and many of them with only an imperfect understanding of that impartiality which the discharge of the duties of an electoral officer requires.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Matthews, who is no longer the Electoral Officer; I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Smith and Mr. Byer, and for all the people at the top with whom I have had to deal. Mr. Crichtlow Matthews is a member of the Democratic Labour Party. (*Asides*) Go and look it up. I have never had the slightest complaint about his partiality in discharging his duties. I have no idea what Mr. Smith politics are, although I have been told that his politics are on that side. I have no idea - the question does not arise, because he discharges his duties in a proper and efficient manner. I have a fair idea of what Mr. Byer's politics are. (*Asides*) I am happy to think that I am wrong; I think he is with the Hon. Leader of the House, and the Hon. Leader of the House, thinks he is with us.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to think that these people who are charged with the conduct of the elections in Barbados can so conduct themselves as to make it impossible for politicians to say: "He is a 'Dem' and is doing things the 'Dem's' way, or he is in the Opposition and is not helping us and so on." I want that to extend right down to ground level, if possible. Let us get rid of a situation where a

Returning Officer has to be attacked during a campaign. It is not a task lightly undertaken by any political speaker to attack the Returning Officer at an election in which he is interested, and it is not something done merely for the sake of doing it.

Sir, when the members of the Cabinet are considering the position of Mr. Banfield, they should ask themselves why, all of the Returning Officers, he is the only one who has ever been the subject of political comment. We have had many opportunities in the past, and we have not taken the opportunity to do this. I appeal most earnestly to members on the other side. Experience has shown that you gain nothing through having your supporters in positions in the electoral set up in Bye-elections and in General Elections.

6.10 p.m.

The penalties of which Mr. Banfield was eventually reminded after all for being a Returning Officer and canvassing are that you go to prison without the option of a fine. There is no fine, Mr. Speaker, for being a Returning Officer who takes part in a campaign on behalf of one of the candidates; there is a mandatory prison sentence. Do not put people in the situation which at least four of the nominated electoral officials in St. Joseph refused to accept as being canvassers in the seats of impartiality. Let the permanent staff itself choose from among the members of the Civil Service an appropriate person resident in the districts. Let the permanent staff choose the officials for elections and bye-elections.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, who chose during the Barbados Labour Party's regime?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member is a political fledgling compared even with me although he may have been in this House longer. If he knew anything about the Barbados Labour Party's regime, he would know that the Barbados Labour Party used to lean over backwards. Ask him about how Mr. Cox and Mr. Bryan had to drive about complaining during the 1956 election that all the electoral officers they had let the sheriff, the officials and Mr. Chase choose, were conservatives and people who were against them, and I am reminded by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that he objected to one electoral officer during that election and he was removed right away. We objected to the electoral officers in St. Joseph all through, and all that happened is that it was treated as a joke on the night of the count that they should be actually active members of the Democratic Labour Party. I hear the voice of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph behind me, but he suffered in Babylon in the general election in 1966 from the same people whose hands he had to hold. He suffered by the waters of Edom...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is somewhat wide of this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: And he, if anybody, can confirm the part played by certain electoral officers in the most recent example of the work, which this officer we are now discussing was called on to discharge, and perform. We welcome the permanent post of Chief Electoral Officer because we believe that the present Local Government Commissioner is much overworked. When I am told that if I cannot get a car number I must ring up Mr. Smith, I really have to say what it is they think they are asking a colonial, not Mr. Dudley Smith, a different Mr. D. Smith, although many people, I gather, thought that the Identification Cards issued during the St. Joseph bye-election had a certain point to them, because they were all signed "D. Smith." I do not blame the Government for that. I do not believe they would choose an electoral officer because his initials and name happened to be the same as that of a candidate.

Sir, I am glad to think that there will be a Chief Electoral Officer, but I ask the Government please to think again whether two things are not desirable a permanent Boundaries Commission and a permanent Elections Commission; a permanent Boundaries Commission which however much it treads on politicians' toes, it at least takes away the wish to have gerrymandering and counter-gerrymandering, because Governments do change and electoral boundaries can change with them. A Boundaries Commission can stop that. It is not a good thing to make electoral boundaries a political plaything, and that is the next thing I see is going to happen. I can see you there, Sir, right at the centre of your minority report, and its possible implementation, but in the form preferred by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy rather than by the senior member in the fullness of time. If the Government would look at these things, they would take a lot of trouble off their shoulders, a lot of confusion and a lot of responsibility which no politician really wants to discharge.

Sir, I can understand that if we had a political party that wanted to maintain itself in power by electoral fraud, then you would have all the power in your hands of the Minister of Home Affairs to choose all his yardfowls to manipulate the elections. You have in Guyana a situation where when they opened some of the ballot boxes from up in the Pomeroon where Jagan did not have a supervisor, the ballots were still tied together with rubber bands, and it was made by Order an offence for a pamphlet which Dr. Jagan published setting out this and setting out how they had in one part of the Corentyne an increase of 19,000 voters.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I am sorry I have to stop the hon. member. Some time ago some statements were made in here and the hon. member asked the person who was making the statements if he was prepared to go in public or before the Court and make these statements. I am challenging the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to know if he is prepared to make these statements outside of Barbados or in Guyana or on a political

platform where he knows he can be prosecuted about Burnham having ballot boxes opened and things like that. I would like to know if he is willing to do what I have asked.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I will deal with that. The answer to one is that I have two or three times made that identical statement on political platforms here. Secondly I would not say it in Guyana because I do not want to go to goal, because in Guyana you go to goal sometimes for telling the truth. There are two occasions where to tell the truth makes you liable to a criminal offence in that happy land ruled over by the dear blood brother of the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, maybe you will say this is no point of order. The hon. member is saying that he knows that in Guyana somebody went to prison for telling the truth. Here in Barbados people go to goal for telling the truth, because if you kill a man and you say "yes" you would go to prison; so there is no point there.

Mr. ADAMS: The earthy wit of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas never fails to astonish. Sir, we have been led a little astray, but for the education of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas I will remind him that at the time of the troubles in Guyana the English Commissioner of Police published a pamphlet entitled "The activities of the murder gang of the People's National Congress" at a time when Jagan was Prime Minister, and the Governor of Guyana was instructed that possession of that document was to be an offence against the Official Secrets Act, and Dr. Jagan the Prime Minister himself was threatened with prosecution for reading out extracts from a police document on the murder activities of the then Opposition on a platform. If the hon. member wants justification for what I am saying, I am going to be very careful because I am not sure the document is still in my office, but if he is serious and is not merely making a silly rhetorical challenge in the belief that he will get public support for the view that the Opposition says things that they cannot prove, I will come back next week having checked in my office and see if the document relating to the ballot papers being tied with rubber bands in the Pomeroun is still there, and if it is, I will make it a document of the House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I accept that challenge.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot tell you if it is still in my office. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, the hon. member is straying too far from the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, let them make a joke of it. I know I have seen it and I know I have possessed it, and I know that I put the document away, and I know that in the same way I had it, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy can get it too, even

if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas may not be able to digest it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will advise the hon. member now to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I would be a lunatic to say that there is something which, for all I know, some mischievous person will go and take out before I can get there. Bananas have vanished in St. Thomas; pamphlets may vanish in Pinfold Street.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow let us come back to the Resolution under discussion.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Again in the same Guyana, in the Corentyne which is a growing district, one district in the Corentyne had 19,000 new electors for the last election, 16,000 of them voted for Burnham.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to deal with this Resolution as it concerns Barbados; conditions in other parts of the world are very interesting, but let us deal with this.

Mr. ADAMS: Why do not hon. members who are concerned with elections argue with me? Why does an hon. member who is finished with elections not keep quiet? He is standing up behind me heckling; there are no more elections for him, the people of St. Joseph have finished with him. Go home, man, and keep quiet; you are not concerned with the next election, you do not have anything to do with the Supervisor of Elections, I may lose or I may win, but the senior member for St. Joseph cannot lose or win, he is finished with it. I expect blows from over there, not in my back; this is my back here, I do not expect to feel a "jucksie" in my back when I am in the House of Assembly, if the hon. member wants to attack anybody in this Chamber, let him go over there, he is welcomed in the Democratic Labour Party, let him go over there.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I would not waste time to "juck" him in his back, he had better not talk too quickly because he thinks by getting up in here and blowing off gas is service.

Mr. ADAMS: If anything I have said has in any way reflected on the many years of honourable service which the member has given the Barbados Labour Party in this House, I must unreservedly withdraw it and assure him that that was not my intention. When you are in Parliament you do not as a rule expect to hear the blows coming from next to or behind you; that is all.

Sir, I ask the Hon. Leader of the House, in the same spirit in which he has dealt with matters coming before the House earlier today, the same approach to see if we cannot work out a joint attitude towards problems that affect us all as politicians and not as Party members, to consider seriously whether any advantage is gained from tight political control over the election process. I am suggesting, by the examples

which you no longer wish me to draw, Sir, and by an appeal to our own reason and understanding, that the dangers of anything tending towards political manipulation of the electoral process far and fantastically outweigh the gains you can conceivably obtain therefrom. Governments change in Barbados; they have changed already, and they will change again. (*Asides*) No hon. member at present in this House, as far as I know, has said there will not be any more elections, I thought the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was suggesting that if we got the Government there would be no more elections.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Cheltenham will tell you.

Mr. ADAMS: If, like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I was to rise and challenge the hon. member to repeat that on the political platform he would think that I was being a copycat.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, his Leader will tell us.

Mr. ADAMS: Nobody has got any advantage in Barbados, in my view, either from the weeding out of the enumerators or from the appointment of yard-fowls - an unpleasant word, Sir, and not the best word but an appropriate one in the circumstances - to positions inside the electoral arena. I do not believe in the long run that Mr. Banfield's activities did anything at all but bring him disrepute in Sugar Hill, I do not believe that without him we would have had a majority of 1,000 or that if he had been more active we would have had a majority of 5. People do not want to see electoral officers take a side and therefore they will discount anything the electoral officers say or do, except either as a rebound effect, that if they see an electoral officer who appears to be on one side it tends to hearten people on the other because they fight all that much harder. When you go on a cricket field and you are playing not only eleven, you find you are playing thirteen, you take that much more care in the approach to the game. This is how we had to approach the game in St. Joseph, and I very much hope, whether I am getting boring in the debate or not - I am not worrying with the senior member for St. Andrew, in here is an amusing place for him and he can always give an exchange of blows in here at certain times, but I am appealing to him as much as to anybody else, do not waste time thinking you can get votes by manipulating the electoral process. The manipulations necessary are much greater than anybody is willing to carry out, even on your side.

So far we are not Guyana yet, so do not get into that, because no American is going to come here to support a regime that exists contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people, do not believe that. We do not have cold water conditions here, we just have a little homogeneous island where the people have an idea for the last twenty years that has been drilled into them that Governments are here to govern for a time and to be in Opposition for a time, so do not waste time in trying to stack the deck on your side. When you have packs of cards with eight aces in them

somebody shoots you underneath the table; do not let it happen here in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, subject to that, we are not on this side opposing this Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I will start by saying that the hon. member who just spoke, in an aside referred to the senior member for St. Andrew as a political fledgling, but I would say that the senior member for St. Thomas is a political embryo. I say that to say this, he was here just now, I would not say fulminating, but he was trying to expound the theories of fairness in nominating people at the polls to look after people casting their ballots.

6.30 p.m.

The hon. member is either a political embryo, or he has an extremely short memory. I can remind the hon. member that some time in 1950 - I was not in the country then, but I kept in touch with things - when the senior member for the City won the majority of seats in a bye-election, the senior member for St. Thomas' father, who was then the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, came back from Trinidad and said that he would fight what I considered to be a legally operated election that was won fairly. He said he was going to fight it tooth and nail, and would give up his seat as Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation to come back here and see that the senior member for the City would not be the Mayor of Bridgetown. That is why I say he is a political embryo. He has not yet got out of the foetus stage.

Sir, in an election in Barbados, when the junior member for Christ Church ran, a lot of ballot papers were found floating in the sea. The father of the senior member for St. Thomas said that Barbadians have a short memory. He did not give an example of this, so I suppose he meant the senior member for St. Thomas, too. The senior member for St. Thomas does not seem to know about a man called Napoleon Layne and another gentleman called Dorian Farrell, who were hounded down in this community by none other than the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, the father of the senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not aware that Mr. Frank Walcott was ever the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, so how can he say that the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party hounded down Farrell and Layne?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said your father, and I mean Grantley Adams. Is Grantley Adams your father?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hounding down of Farrell and Layne was not only done by the President of the Barbados Labour Party. I always thought that the issue in the City Aldermen was that the Government had the power to appoint a certain number of Aldermen - Aldermen and Councilors make a Council - and that a threat of force made a weak Government and a weak Government give way. I say that with all due respect to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. It is obvious that, if the Aldermen had been appointed before the election, there would have been no complaint. If the Aldermen

had been appointed before the 1959 Local Government Elections, while it may have prevented a much deserved honour from accruing to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the fact is that it could have been done legally, and it would have been politically feasible because nobody would have made a murmur. Mr. Morris would have been elected in St. Michael West, and it would have given the Barbados Labour Party one more seat in the Election.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is aware of how long I allowed him to speak, on what he terms to be a point of elucidation, without interrupting him. I am one of those people who do not believe that two wrongs make a right, but I also believe that such a situation can serve a useful purpose at times. I like to read the comics in the Advocate, because that is all I can find to read in it. I follow Matty Square, Pouch and the Chameleon. The people, who are always shouting about their constitutional rights, are generally people like Matty Square, Pouch and the Chameleon.

Here it is the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who is talking about a Returning Officer at a Polling District. He claims that this officer was canvassing, and that it not true. I would remind the hon. member that at the same bye-election I was the agent for a candidate, Mr. W. Smith. The senior member for St. Thomas was not an agent for anybody including himself, but he was inside the Polling area canvassing.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would just advise him that he made that remark in St. Andrew School, and the matter is still in the hands of my solicitors. He is not a lawyer, and I would advise him, first of all, to find out the law. There is no law against what he calls a non-agent going into the Polling area, but there is a law against saying that anybody goes into a Polling area and canvasses. Let him go outside and say that again. I can tell him that Messrs. Hutchinson and Banfield have a case of slander against him in respect of me, but I am asked not to pursue the case. He must withdraw that, Sir. He must withdraw the remark that I was canvassing in a Polling Station. It is a criminal offence, and I could lose my seat in the House if it is proved that I was canvassing in a Polling Station. 6.40 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, he said I was canvassing in a polling area.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do not waste your time with that. Go and tell your solicitors to put me in Court.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a criminal offence. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that and proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Withdraw what?

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that and proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you want me to withdraw that he was canvassing. All right, I withdraw that he was canvassing. He was soliciting votes in a polling area.

Mr. ADAMS: I object to that. That is exactly what I have objected to. What is wrong with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas? If I had solicited votes in a polling area, I could lose my seat tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: "Solicited" has the same effect.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You will eventually do, anyhow; so you do not have to worry about that. (Asides) Mr. Speaker, do you mean you are allowing the hon. member to continue to interrupt me?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw the word "solicited" and proceed with the debate.

Mr. ADAMS: Soliciting votes in a polling area is an offence.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I withdraw that he was soliciting votes in a polling area, but I know it is not beyond the hon. member to be in a polling area for the purpose of so doing.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I object to that in that it imputes improper motives to an hon. member and it is unparliamentary because it imputes a criminal intention to an hon. member, and I ask that he withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: No member shall impute improper motives to another member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have not imputed any improper motive towards the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw that and proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what do you want me to do? I do not want the House to be broken up and then for somebody to say that I broke up the House. If you want me to withdraw what I said, I categorically withdraw what I have said about the hon. member, but I saw the hon. member taking people to the polls within the polling area. Let him deny that now.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, we were there together. He was driving his car with people and I was being driven in a car by the candidate with the hon. senior member for Christ Church. We were there together, except I did not have any voters in my car; he had in his.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order and there is nothing to be withdrawn.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Now he will come in for some lashes. The law states that the car should deposit the voter and unless the voter cannot read and write or is blind, the voter should not be accompanied inside the polling district. The hon. member was inside the polling station. Let him deny that because this is where he was challenging me and said he would put me in Court. It is no wonder that solicitors can live so big.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member has asked me to deny that. The hon. member is going into deeper waters than he understands. He states he was an agent. Just let me tell him that the only agent was the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and a purported appointment of agency was made under which the hon. member travelled all about on election day in St. Joseph. All the electoral officials now know it to be a mistake. I had more right to be there than the hon. member, but I am not worrying with him; he is raising the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we had better get back and stick to the subject matter of the Resolution and forget the details of what happened and what may be in Court.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I agree we should stick to the Resolution, but do not forget that I am a Minister and therefore something critical about the Government has been said, and I have the right to reply. (A VOICE: What about that?) I also have the right to close the debate if I want to; so do not ask me what about that. You take your foot down and have some respect. (Asides) Now he has taken all the steam out of my debate. I would not say he is a coward, but the hon. member makes statements and then he never waits to hear the reply. Anyhow this is for the record. The hon. member seems to have no memory at all or a convenient memory, because I know, but the hon. member would not know because he was never on the opposite side of the fence; but I have always been on the opposition side of the fence and I know that when the Barbados Labour Party was in power, not only did they make sure that their yardfowls were Returning Officers, but some of the cellar ducks used to be by the demarcation line with a placard holding up, and in the last bye-election in St. Joseph I had to draw it to the attention of the Returning Officer on more than one occasion that the Barbados Labour Party had people from St. Joseph standing by the demarcation line drawing to people's attention how to vote. My view is that no car should be allowed to pass the demarcation line to carry the voters to the poll. The voters should be made to get out there and there should be facilities for those who are blind and incapacitated, those who cannot walk and so on. There are people who can vote who cannot walk and they can be taken inside the polling district to cast their votes. No car should be allowed to pass the demarcation line, and I am sure the hon. senior member agrees with me.

In the former bye-election in the City, I saw the father of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown in a

polling station sitting down, but there is no law saying that the agent is to be in a polling station sitting down. (Asides) The moment you are there, you are soliciting votes in a surreptitious manner, and these are things that have to be stopped. (Asides) I know that if you had risked this when the Barbados Labour Party was in power, all like now the complaints against you before the Chief Justice would not have stopped yet; your name would have been changed for a number, and people would be running about trying to whisper. When the boot is on the other foot, you can always hear.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On a point of order, if the hon. member gets back to the bye-election in the City, I would ask him if he is aware that the Prime Minister walked into the polling station at St. Mary's with a camera and I do not know if it contained infra-red film to see how people were voting. What could be more improper than to walk into a polling station with a camera to take pictures of people voting?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. N.W. BOXILL: The hon. member asked me a question. The answer is that I was not aware. I am not saying it is not true; but there is no machine no matter how great or small that can make a man remember. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Members not addressing the Chair, please.....

Hon. N.W. BOXILL: Let them dissipate themselves. There are some points which the hon. member made with which I agree, but I was only replying to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to remind him that his memory is either short or convenient, because when his Party which he has the honour to represent - I do not even know if he calls it an honour because he has no honour in it; he is down at the bottom of the rung - was in power, they did not stop short of intimidating the people, and he ought to be the last person to come in here to use this kind of remark about a Returning Officer at a polling district who was canvassing, because that is not true. 6.50 p.m.

Returning Officers, like any other person in the community, have a right to have a feeling one way or the other. I am not saying they have a right to demonstrate this feeling openly, but they have a right like anybody else, but to make the statement he has made because the gentleman cannot come in here and defend himself, I consider this to be unfair and unparliamentary, because this is not the first time the hon. member has said this, and the hon. member knows I was there as well as the senior member for St. James when they were counting the votes and nothing untoward took place.

I am only referring to the senior member for St. Thomas who got up and tried to castigate the Returning Officer, and not only that, but I have been

watching the trend of the members on the opposite side, that the moment anybody shows the slightest inkling that they are in favour of anybody on this side they are the biggest yardfowl, the biggest thief, they are dishonest and everything that is wrong. There is no bigger thief than one who takes money to do a job and refuses to do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No arrangements have been made for us during the period between 7.00 and 7.45 when automatically the sitting has to be suspended. It is quite close to 7 o'clock now, and it would seem that if we continue till 7 o'clock, we will have to suspend further till a quarter to eight, and we might have to go further afield than these premises.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I believe I am right in saying that this is the last piece of business of the House for today, and I do very sincerely recognise the wish of the Leader of the House to finish it, and I think that we on this side would like to finish it too. I think that what has been said so far is something that has to be said, because there are a lot of misconceptions by politicians about the nature of elections, and I do not think that members should be hard on the Opposition for talking, but I think they must give us a chance to talk it out. Certainly I know the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and I would not be surprised if the hon. junior member for the City also wishes to speak, but what I do not quite see is the argument that between 7.00 and 7.45 that hon. members will have to go great distances for dinner that we should now make extraordinary arrangements if the House has to rise at 7.00 and has to return at 7.45; my view is that the period from 7.45 to 9 o'clock, which is closing time, will be sufficient to discharge the remaining speeches, and I would not suggest any extraordinary procedure at the present time. Let us go through.

Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to think that you extend the hour from 9.00 rather than extending it now to 8.00 because it is not my opinion that we will be able to get through the business at 8.00. The Hon. Leader of the House is asking us to work through till 8.00, but I do not believe that we will necessarily finish by 8.00; I myself am somewhat surprised to find that the debate has taken so lengthy a turn, but I would not have missed the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas for anything. I do not believe to suspend the Standing Orders now to work through till 8.00 will necessarily finish this Resolution, and I think it is better to let members have their break, come back, and if there has to be a suspension of Standing Orders have it towards 8.30 if it appears that time will run out, but let hon. members have a break now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If at a quarter past or half past eight hon. members deem what we are now considering to be controversial, I would prefer to move the motion for the suspension of certain Standing Orders now. I beg to move that suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed by the Clerks -at-the Table that it is 7 o'clock.

Mr. Adams; the point is that hon. members on this side are not prepared to say that the debate will be finished by 8.00; apart from those hon. members who do not want to work through till 8 o'clock, I could not give any assurance that the speeches from this side will be finished by 8 o'clock.
7.00 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I have no alternative but to declare this sitting suspended until 7.45 p.m.

The sitting was suspended accordingly at 7.05 p.m.

On resumption - -

Mr. SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended hon. members were discussing a Resolution on the Civil Establishment.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we do not have a quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1971.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to provide adjustments to the establishment structure in 12 Ministries and Departments, and the cost envisaged is approximately \$347,970. As for the Ministry of Finance, there is one very sad feature reflected in the Note provided here, and it is that until now there is no proper basis, as admitted in the Notes for accounting performance in the Public Service of this country. What sadder reflection could there be when we have, year in and year out, to pass vast sums of the taxpayers' money for large sums unaccounted for? We have, in addition to this, the Report, from time to time, of the Auditor General. While these Reports in themselves do not say that there is no satisfactory performance, or no proper basis, to quote the Note, for accounting performance in the Public Service, there is enough for us to understand that there is something underlying much more than has been able to meet the eye at the present moment.

Now, we have gone pretty far in recent months. We have reached the point of computerising part of our accounts, but there is one thing, perhaps, that has not really caught the eye in this respect: it is that nothing more can come out of a computer than what has been fed into it.
7.50 p.m.

If this state of affairs is reflected here in this note, one can readily see what is going to be our position in the not too distant future. We must ask ourselves if employing two Chief Accountants who will be professionally qualified is going to be the answer. We do not see where these two accountants will be attached to in the Training Unit because accountancy in it-

self is a field of study which cannot be hurried through. It is a field which covers a period of years, and one must understand that persons engaged in such an exercise have got to be dedicated people and not merely people who are, as we have seen in the past, making the Civil Service a stepping stone for getting a fare to Canada or some other part of the world where opportunities are undoubtedly better.

We are not, Mr. Speaker, attempting to deny Government an opportunity to provide the services that are envisaged in the appointment of a Supervisor of insurance, because undoubtedly launching out on a scheme such as has been proposed must of necessity demand that an officer of the highest quality possible be appointed to fill such a post, and the post of supervisor of insurance is one for which we feel, if we are not to have leakages at any stage of our commitments in this particular field, we ought to find the very best qualified person to fill such an office.

In the same way, we are to hope that the salary of \$10,800 per annum for the two Chief Accountants would be sufficient inducement for a highly qualified set of people to take up these duties, and particularly as the note says, their duties will be related to the training of others in accountancy.

Now the Valuation Division does not to my mind present much of a problem because I myself have been following quite closely on the heels of all this and I feel that we are a little behind in the upgrading of this post of Technical Assistant to that of Assistant Valuer, because we very well know that the Department is presently administered by an officer who has retired and has been re-engaged on a temporary basis; so it is in keeping with the best policy possible to upgrade the post of Technical Assistant to that of Assistant Valuer if we find that it will make for efficiency, so that when the time comes for the retired officer to finally resign, the Assistant Valuer would be able to carry on these duties.

Now I will not say anything as regards the Statistical Service or the Regiment, but I will make a simple observation on this matter of the Chief Electoral Officer. The Leader of the House some time last year informed us that a piece of equipment was being awaited so that the photographers would be able to visit the homes of the incapacitated and like persons who were not able to get out to the camera centres and that those persons would be photographed in their homes. Now we have it, Mr. Speaker, that the 15th March is expected to be the closing date for the registration and photographing of persons who want to be registered to vote. If that is the case, I wonder exactly what the Leader of the House has got to say as regards this piece of equipment, whether or not it has arrived and if so, if it has been put into use. We would be told undoubtedly how many persons have been photographed as a result of the arrival of this particular piece of equipment, because it is a matter of considerable concern to each and every hon. member at least on this side of the House and I must say on that side as well, because no one would want to find that when election time comes there is any

person in any constituency who through some handicap has not been able to exercise his civic right, and this in the face of having been promised by the Leader of the House to expect to be photographed in one's home on the arrival of this special piece of equipment.

Much has been said, Sir, on the question of the appointment of a permanent post of Chief Electoral Officer, but the only thing that is worrying me is to find that we are appointing a permanent officer to this post, and in the same note we see that the supporting staff will be provided on a temporary basis as may be required. Surely if we are setting up such an important office and the officer is going to be paid \$9,800 per annum, if you are appointing that quality officer, surely you must have a well established department. We do not and cannot expect to hear that you have installed an officer and to see that the supporting staff will be provided on a temporary basis. There must be some staff whose performance in office will be equally as important and as accommodating as one could expect of an officer who has been appointed on a permanent basis, and it is for this reason we would certainly like to hear what the Hon. Minister would have to say on this score.

Now I turn to the Police. The note says that it was decided in 1969 that there should be an increase in the establishment of the Royal Barbados Police Force phased over a three-year period. The staff provided by this Order is the third phase of that general Police Staff expansion made necessary by the widened range and variety of Police duties.

Mr. Speaker, I must pose a query here. I must ask the Minister responsible who I believe is the Leader of the House on this occasion, what are those duties of so widened a range and variety that the Police are now called upon to perform.

8.00 p.m.

What we can see and what we know - and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you are as familiar with this as I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you are as familiar with this as I am myself - we are certain that the deployment of the Police leaves much to be desired, because the absence of the policeman on the beat is a matter of public concern; very much so. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when there was less crime being committed; there were fewer people living, there were fewer policemen, but do you know, Sir, that we had more Police Stations and we had greater police supervision? There were less murders, less cases of rape and indecent assault upon females; what one must concern oneself with today is that the places where indecent assault upon a female is committed, and we are saying that motorising the Police Force has not proven to be the answer for the reduction of the crime limit in this country. It has not proven to be any deterrent, it has not shown itself in any respect as a means of reducing the foul, filthy and indecent language that has taken hold of the

entire country, that people cannot express themselves today in an ordinary conversation without employing some adjectival phrases that would cause decent people in this country to vomit.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves at this stage having to call upon the Minister of Home Affairs to insist on the Commissioner of Police to place more policemen on the beat; we must stamp out this dirty language, we must mount a campaign against it, we must employ Special Constables, if necessary, we must put policemen in plain clothes, if necessary. I am saying that the country, judging by the frequent use of the type of language to which I have referred, has gone past Hell, and we have got to do something to bring it back. We are here today, Mr. Speaker, concerned with the creation of posts for three Inspectors, two Sergeants, twelve Corporals and thirty six Constables; I want to say here and now that the principal need for the Royal Barbados Police Force is the creation of the posts for 53 Constables, that each member of the Force recruited thereto must carry out a period of patrol duty on the beat.

I must say this, Mr. Speaker, that a policeman who knows the law is a happy man, and one thing that has been taking place in our midst for some time now is this, that our Training School has been turning out policemen here who are not at all familiar with the various Acts on the Statute Book. I remember in years past that a policeman passing out from the Training School had at his fingertips, could be called upon at a moment's notice, some 32 Acts on the Statute Book, but today this is not the case. We have seen no evidence whatsoever that the young policeman who comes out from the Training School has been familiarising himself with any research; what he can tell you is this, he has been taught as much ju-jitsu as there is to be taught, and other forms of manly art for the protection perhaps of his body, but, Sir, that in itself is not enough, and one should call into question what is it that has caused those other territories that have withdrawn the sending of their recruits to the Police Training School at Barbados; what was responsible for it? We do not for a moment think that those territories were minded or in any way concerned with any attempt at bringing about disintegration in the training of police for the service of their country, it is more a question where these countries were concerned that the type of recruit returned home to their countries were not exhibiting a sufficient sense of duty and responsibility as to warrant the financial contribution that those countries had been making to the upkeep of the Police Training School in this country.

These are things, Mr. Speaker, with which we have got to concern ourselves. We have it before us - and there are no two ways about this - that discipline in our own Police Force has been going a-begging, it has completely broken down.
8.10 p.m.

Sir, you have a situation at the present moment where the Commissioner of Police is asking Corporals and Sergeants that, when constables commit

offences, rather than have them reported, to endeavour to reason with them, in preference to bringing them before him where he is in duty bound to adjudicate and take some sort of disciplinary action. When one finds a state such as this existing, it is for one to become wary. One cannot feel happy about this state of affairs.

Sir, I do not know if hon. members are aware of the fact that each day we sit in this Honourable House members of the Royal Barbados Police Force are spying upon us, and they return to Police Headquarters and write reports as to the conduct or performance of each hon. member in this House. That is exactly what is happening. It encroaches on my privilege in this Honourable House, and I am challenging the Commissioner of Police and the Minister of Home Affairs to deny what I have said. I say that the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force are coming into this House, and their specific duty is to report back to the Commissioner of Police as to the conduct of hon. members in this House. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "Of course not.") Who says "of course not"? Do not deny it for denying it sake; investigate the matter first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have to deny it; I do not believe it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Security Branch of the Royal Barbados Police Force. The Leader of the House has got up to say he does not believe it, because he would like to hear me say where my source of information comes from.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I do not have to say I disbelieve it to hear where his source of information comes from. It is just incredible to me that a thing like this could happen. I do not see any reason for it, and I therefore do not accept it. I would have to see it in black and white.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am very serious about what I have just said. There is no member of the Royal Barbados Police Force who comes here in plain clothes for the protection of any hon. member of this House. Any member of the Royal Barbados Police Force, who is attached to the Security Branch and is sent here on duty, must return to Headquarters and have a report ready for the office of the Commissioner at 8 a.m. the following day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: What is there to report on?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Report on what!

Mr. HINDS: Ask the police. I am not concerned with what he has to report on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have heard that, but I find it difficult to accept it because it could not be any part of the competence of any branch of the Royal Barbados Police Force to inquire into the conduct of members of Parliament conducting business in Parliament. That would be entirely outside of their competence.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have never said that any member of the Royal Barbados Police Force comes here and inquires into the conduct of hon. members, but he observes and reports thereon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Observes for what purpose? Hon. members of Parliament, when they meet in Parliament, are conducting legitimate business, and they are not breaking the law. For what purpose would any observation have to be made? I just do not accept it, Mr. Speaker. It is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have given this Honourable House the benefit of my knowledge; I know with what authority I speak, and I know what I am talking about. The Hon. Leader of the House as well as other Ministers are at liberty to make diligent inquiries to determine whether what I have said is true or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member does not understand the basis of my disbelief. Let me explain it to him. No person can address this House unless he is a member of it. All the business transacted in this Chamber is transacted by people who are duly elected under the provisions of the Constitution of this country and the Representation of the People Act. What are there in the deliberations and transactions of Government Business for anybody to observe? (*Asides*) I take the hon. member's point. We employ them; we appropriate money here to pay their salaries; they are not above us in status. What are they observing? I just do not accept it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I want the Hon. Leader of the House to understand that a member of the Security Branch would hardly come into this House and report the speeches made by hon. members. I am saying that they have made extracts from speeches made by hon. members and incorporated them into their own reports to be submitted to the Commissioner of Police by 8 a.m. the following day.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to point out to the hon. member that the only persons who are allowed to read or write within the precincts of the House during the time the House is in session are the Official Reporters who take down Hansard and the Reporters for the Press. Nobody else is allowed to read, write, sleep or do anything of the sort in this House. If anybody does any of those things, maybe the Marshal does not see them, or he does not want to worry himself about them. It is illegal to read, write, sleep, laugh and so on in this House. People are only allowed to come in here, sit down and listen to the debates. No policeman can come in here and write a report on us.

Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to understand that the office he now holds is the highest office in the land. We make the law. What nonsense is he talking about policemen coming to this House to make reports on hon. members? What we say in here goes. Even if we made a wrong law, it will have to be law because we made it.
8.20 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I must say that our conduct in this House of Assembly is not private or secret; it is known to the public as a whole, so if somebody takes it in writing or not, the public will know our character and ability when we come in here by what comes from our mouths. If they take notes, it is no offence to us.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I quite understand what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has tried to say. When Your Honour was facing the opposite direction, I have seen security men sitting in that corner taking notes. (HON. J. C. TUDOR: And you did not call our attention to it?) I have seen Inspector Lunn in uniform next to the very security men who were taking the notes. I am not accusing the policemen of only taking notes, but they go out and present garbled versions of what did go on in this House to the Commissioner of Police. What the Commissioner of Police does with these reports is a matter entirely for him; it does not concern me at all. But I am saying, and it cannot be denied by the Commissioner of Police or by the Minister of Home Affairs that what I have said here is a statement of fact, and that members of this House are reported on by the security men in this Island. Mr. Speaker, it only means that hon. members on that side are not familiar with what is going on within their own Police Force. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members not addressing the Chair, please observe the relevant Standing Orders.

Mr. HINDS: My point is that when we had less people in this Island and a smaller Force, we had more Police Stations. What I want to say now is that with the building up of areas such as the Pine Housing area, Grazettes Housing area and other housing areas scattered about the place, we should see re-established either the Belmont Station or the Brittons Hill Police Station in that area. In other words, when a person is arrested by the police, too much time elapses before the person making the arrest can get relief or assistance because it is coming from too far away. Further, we have a terrific increase in the number of house breakings of the vilest type in this country, with many other accompanying crimes. Many people are very unhappy and uncomfortable, and this brings into consideration the type of house that is now being constructed in this community. There are some people who have fallen for town and country planning and permit the building of these low types of houses, and then the people have to provide wrought iron barriers at their windows and doors. The modern type of house today carries much more glass than in years past; thieves have now a greater invitation to invade the privacy or what was once considered the privacy of certain homes. All this is in what we call the modern build-up. We are saying, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we have got to decide to police the streets and villages. We are having many policemen placed in offices; too many policemen are joy-riding in motor cars and the like. Mr. Speaker, we want an increase, not necessarily in the numbers in the Force; we want an increase in efficiency. For instance, if one-fifth

of the crime that is reported at Scotland yard is traced, it is considered excellent. We have here our C.I.D. we are hearing of this widened range and variety of police duties. The Police need to keep statistics of the number of crimes reported and the number traced. It is a bit shocking, Mr. Speaker, that we still have a number of unsolved murders in little Barbados, not to mention house breakings, rapes and other serious crimes against the person.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is now 8.30 p.m. o'clock, the Moment of Interruption, and in the absence of an assurance that the matter is not controversial.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I give the assurance that the matter is not controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Peter assure me whether or not the matter is controversial? If it is, we cannot proceed any later now.

Mr. HINDS: I will not make it controversial. We can go on.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter, will he assure me whether or not the matter is controversial? If it is, we will not be able to proceed with it at this stage.

Mr. Hinds: Mr. Speaker, I am not giving a guarantee that I am going to finish by 9 o'clock. I am being forced to finish by 9.00 so I will try to complete by 9.00.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minutes before nine.

Mr. HINDS: I will stop in time for the Minister to reply. Mr. Speaker, we have situations in this island which demand that there should be increased police vigilance; for instance, at Combermere School on weekends vandals take over the place, they litter, and leave faeces all over the place. There is a pavilion there now being destroyed. At the Pine playing field, there is a Community Centre there that has been destroyed; we are witnessing gambling on the increase at every street corner, and at every dance hall. There is now a section of every dance hall that is set aside each Saturday and Sunday night for the gamblers, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say that what I am now saying is not unknown to certain members of the Royal Barbados Police Force.

I feel that we have got to act and act quickly; for instance, along the streets of this island, I think I had better describe it as how some people undress themselves and parade on the streets, you see some women with half of their breasts out and half of the buttocks out, parading on the streets of this island. These are open invitations to rape, indecent assault and other crimes that are committed by some of our youths who cannot control themselves. This, Mr. Speaker, I feel should be stopped; there is a method of getting round it, we feel that our Police Force

should be lectured to and those lectures should be acted upon without infringing or encroaching upon the rights of any individual who walk the streets of this country, but still we should bring about a measure of decency. We should teach people to discipline themselves and see if we cannot get things back on a decent level in our country.

I have, Mr. Speaker, to try and hasten to another point, but believe me, I would have liked to say much more on this score to see if we can encourage the Government, although we know they will not have the opportunity to do it, to establish more police posts that they could exercise control and bring back some sort of sanity to some of our people. The Ministry of Education is asking for an Assistant Secretary in the salary scale \$7,500 - \$10,800; I want to ask the Minister here and now, is this an Assistant Secretary to function as an Information Officer for the Ministry of Education or a Public Relations Officer in the Ministry of Education? The note says that:

In keeping with the Constitution of UNESCO, member states are required to make arrangements for associating the principal bodies in the country interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters with the work of the Organisation and to this end a National Commission for UNESCO broadly representative of the Government and such bodies has been set up.
8.40 p.m.

Now, it is common knowledge that both the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union must be considered as two of the bodies principally concerned with educational and cultural matters in this country. If we find that these two organisations have had to issue protests at Government's action in excluding them, or having representatives from at least one of them on this National Commission, I think that we are well within our rights to suggest that the Government should endeavour to see that this Commission will not be wrangling with these bodies. We should see a Commission truly representative of bodies interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters.

Mr. Speaker, we have other institutions like the Headmasters and Headmistresses Conference; we have the Rawlitz Guild. (*Asides*) It suits the Leader of the House to acknowledge five of them, but there are others from which representatives ought to have been drawn. As a matter of fact, if it were thought that a representative from each organisation might make the Commission too cumbersome then a compromise could have been reached during the negotiations entered into and the Unions could have decided to send two delegates to become members of the Commission in order to make headway in a matter of this sort.

We find in this Resolution that the Government is completely ignoring these organisations and is about to set up a secretariat. They want an Assistant Secretary, a Library Assistant, and a Stenographer. I have asked the Minister to state whether this Assistant Secretary will function as a Public Relations

Officer to the Ministry of Education or an Information Officer to the Ministry of Education, and I would like to get an answer from the Minister. *(Asides)* I am told that I will have to wait until we are discussing the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at ease, seeing that I have to race against time. With regard to the Health Centres, we find that the Minister has now come around to appreciating some of the questions tabled in this Honourable House from time to time, because this Note admits that qualified staff have been recruited overseas from time to time, but on arriving in Barbados it was found that the conditions of work were not at all acceptable to them. As a consequence, the Minister very well knows that many of them turned up their noses and quitted the jobs. The Note here refers to the loss to the Service of this expertise. I wonder if the Minister would have at his fingertips how many staff Nurses recruited overseas have quitted the job.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose going on at length because of the time. Anyway, I see that they are now creating several posts and amalgamating the posts of Staff Nurse and Health Sister. Now, I want to warn the Minister that sometime ago this Honourable House was encouraged into creating, as at the Mental Hospital, a post of Principal Nursing Officer. That is a nonsensical title, and the post of that officer is really vacant. No post of Principal Nursing Officer obtains in the West Indies. This House was misled into agreeing to the title for such an office, and that is something that should be remedied as quickly as the Minister finds it possible to do so.

With reference to the posts of Health Sister and Staff Nurse, I would advise the Minister to think very carefully about this matter. I appreciate the fact that the Staff Nurse finds herself performing the same duties as the Health Sister, as the Note tells us here, but there might be the necessity for a distinction at some point. We feel that the guidance of people who are interested in health matters and who have experience in these Institutions which we are setting up here, even if it comes from outside the chief technical area surrounding the Ministry, should be sought. I think the Minister will be well advised to explore the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the gamut in some haste, and I leave it to the Minister to let us hear what he has to say on these matters.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on Item (6) Police. The remarks made by the junior member for St. Peter as to the opening or re-siting of some of the Police Stations are valid. I do not go as far as saying which Police Stations should be re-opened, but I may suggest that because of the shift of the population in recent years, the Government may very well find it necessary to have a look at certain places based on population and decide whether certain areas need more policemen. For example, the housing areas and other areas need more policing. The District "A" area, for example,

covers a very wide area; I believe it goes to St. George, Cave Hill, and the Bank Hall area. If some sort of investigation is done in this matter you may find that other parts of St. Michael as well as other country areas may require Sub-stations or other Police Stations.
8.50 p.m.

One other point is that I think the time has come when the Police Force in this country must establish a public relations section, because if one thing is true, whether we like it or not, it is that the police of this country have a very bad public relations. It is unfortunate but it is true. If one looks at the attitude adopted to the police whether in the housing areas or generally, one would see that it is an attitude that leaves much to be desired. It is an attitude which can be changed if an attempt were made at giving the police a better public image. Sir, I am not saying that there are not one or two bad policemen, but that is beside the point. The fact remains that we in Barbados rely entirely for the maintenance of law on our police force, and therefore it is necessary to have a police force which has a very good public image, and this cannot be left to some Police Inspector or Assistant Police Commissioner who knows absolutely nothing about public relations. I think that it is in the interest of the country as a whole and the interest of the police and the Government if Government were to look into setting up a public relations department for the purpose of enhancing the image of the police of this country.

Another point, Sir, is the question of accommodation at the Central Police Station. I know that there will be new buildings, but I think the Government should seriously look at the present offices used for the Criminal Investigation Department. This is really outdated; it lacks proper facilities, and I think again in the interest of the police the Government should seriously consider as part of the capital works project the building of a new Criminal Investigation Department, because I believe that a lot of the finger print records, convictions etc. are kept in this Department, and if the Minister of Home Affairs would visit it, I think he will agree with me that it is very insecure.

There is another point on which I do not want an answer at this stage, but I want to mention it to the Leader of the House because in the Estimates I would like him to tell me something about it, and that is the question of uniforms. I say no more. I just want a statement during the Estimates about the uniform of the police.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members would realise I could not fully do justice at this stage to the questions, but I have noted all of them, and I do say that next week when we are doing the Estimates under the appropriate Head or Heads I am responsible for and the Hon. Minister will do his on health, we will answer all the points raised in this discussion. In any case, even if we forget, I cannot guarantee that hon. members opposite will forget.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell hon. members that next week we are proceeding with the Appropriation Bill and we will be on it certainly more than one day if I know my House; so that I am asking hon. members to clear their decks for that, because we are not going to do anything else but the Appropriation Bill when we start on it. After that I will announce to the House when we will rise for the customary recess at Easter.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 16th March, 1971, at 10 a.m. o'clock.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion for the Adjournment, I promised the hon. senior member for St. James that he would be allowed to put certain questions which the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has in hand for him now.

QUESTIONS

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. James, I beg to give notice of the following questions:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of the bad condition of the roads and the inadequacy of the water services in Paradise Land, Applewhaites Lower Tenantry, Applewhaites Upper Tenantry and Locust Hall Tenantry in the Parish of St. George?

2 Will the Minister take immediate steps to make adequate provision for road and water services in these above - mentioned areas?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that the residents of Rock Hall, near St. Helens, in the Parish of St. George, suffer great inconvenience because of the lack of a road leading into their district and consequently the said residents must of necessity use a dirt track which becomes almost impassable after heavy rains?

2 Is the Minister aware that residents in the above - mentioned area are willing to make available portions of land to facilitate the building of a road-way leading to the above-mentioned district?

3 Will the Minister take appropriate steps to have this situation remedied at the earliest possible opportunity?

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 16th March, 1971, at 10.00 a.m. o'clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.00 p.m.