THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th November, 1971.

Pursuant to the Adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.40 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., *(Speaker);* Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Leader of the House);* Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Health and Welfare);* Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., *(Chairman of Committees);* His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., B.A., *(Minister of Communications and Works);* Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., *(Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations);* Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., *(Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance);* Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Honourable R. B. CADLE, *(Minister of Home Affairs);* Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.) *(Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport)* and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are just two short announcements I would like to make. The Clerk of the House, Mr. Chezley Boyce, has asked me to convey to the Honourable the House of Assembly his thanks for its making it possible for him to attend the three-month attachment course at the House of Commons in London, and he has promised hon. members faithfully that he will take maximum advantage of the course.

The second is in the form of an invitation from the Barbados Youth Council which I will just mention at this point because it is the subject of a Resolution which I daresay will come before the House later. It is an invitation from the Barbados Youth Council to invite members of the Honourable the House of Assembly and of the other Chamber to participate in a cricket match at the Garrison Savanah as part and parcel of this year's Independence Celebrations. No doubt we shall hear more about that in due course.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE LAYING OF PAPERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay the papers later in today's sitting.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to hear from the Leader of the House his reason for asking for the suspension of those Standing Orders.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the reason is simply that there is only one item standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition under Private Members' Business; so unless the hon. member would like to deal with it, I make the motion subject to this Order being done.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has struck a very precise chord today, but with respect I would suggest that there is more than one thing to be dealt with before we enter Government Business, since there are certain questions and there are two Resolutions which I would like to give notice of, and it may well be that other hon. members on this side have Resolutions. In respect of the one item of Private Members' Business, it is as I understand it, a short and uncontroversial item, and in view of its nature, I would ask that members set aside 15 or 20 minutes to deal with it so that a Committee, if it is thought desirable, can be appointed to start its work at an early stage. And so I would

ask that perhaps the Minister defer taking a vote on the motion he has just moved until 3.15 p.m. when the relevant Notices and this item of Private Members' Business can be dealt with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member's request is quite reasonable. If the hon. member would like to have this matter dealt with, by all means it will be dealt with because the entire Parliament is in agreement with the setting up of a Committee to establish proper Standing Orders. For that reason the work is almost completed, because it was dealt with for quite a long time in the last session and there is very little left to be done. Of course a new Committee will revise what has already been done, but the greater portion of this work has actually already been done, so if the hon. member cares to proceed with this motion which stands in his name, we will dispose of it at this stage and then go on to Government Business. It is much the same thing eventually.

Mr. ADAMS: The only point I would make is that notice of Questions and Resolutions has to come first.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the normal practice is never to stifle questions and Private Members' Business being done. It is a question of discussing what is on the Order Paper so that the question of asking questions and laying Resolutions and making motions has always been done. Nobody is trying to prevent that from taking place.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the Leader of the House to defer taking a vote on the motion until the ordinary business of the House and Private Members' Business are transacted.

Mr. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees to the several Standing Orders being suspended for the remainder of today's sitting subject to what we agreed on, that is the procedure. You can have this motion voted on, but in any case Private Members' Questions will be asked and motions moved and this item will be dealt with. It is not a question of not taking the vote now. We will take the vote subject to what we agreed on.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th September, 1971.

Dr. The Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Barbados Citizenship (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land situate at Kendal, St. John, for the purpose of providing a site for the construction of a Communal Bath and Latrine.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to grant the sum of $89,291 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72 Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
2.50 p.m.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution to grant the sum of $10,400 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 11, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

The Rt. Hon. E.W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution to grant the sum of $75,151 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of $174,976 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to Supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 11 - Capital, as shown in the Suphlementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 13, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Ammunition Act, 1919.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

1. WHEREAS Modern Youth in Barbados, as in the outside World, is better educated, better informed, and more able to take decisions affecting International and Personal affairs at an earlier age.

AND WHEREAS the voting age in Barbados is 18 years.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House call upon the Government to introduce legislation reducing the age of legal majority from 21 years to 18 years,

2. WHEREAS the ancient Common Law rules relating to the age of marriage - namely, 12 years for a girl and 14 years for a boy - are still in force in Barbados;

AND WHEREAS this is no longer in keeping with the status of women in a modern age or with International Convention.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on the Government to introduce legislation to raise the age of marriage to 16 years.

Mr. HINDS Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS there is situate in the Parish of St. Peter for most part (and to a lesser extent in the Parish of St. Andrew) in this Island, the estate known as St. Nicholas Plantation - a landmark of many years of absentee proprietorship;

AND WHEREAS the said estate comprises of some 220 acres or thereabouts and located thereon is the historic St. Nicholas Abbey as well as the chattel houses of several agricultural workers and others, in addition to the relics of formerly located labourers' "law houses";

AND WHEREAS there are indications that the National interest would best be served if the absentee proprietorship could be negotiated out;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges upon Government the necessity to initiate such negotiations with the local Attorneys or persons having such authority with a view to acquiring on the most advantageous terms and under the most feasible conditions the said St. Nicholas Plantation to provide for this Nation - its first safari Park, to establish a Zoo, Botanical Gardens; to offer to the Youth a real Civic Theatre and Cultural Centre and, amongst other things, to preserve and enhance the scenery of Cherry Tree Hill which overlooks the Scotland Valley; and, to afford protection to generations of rent-payers and afford them an opportunity to acquire on the most favourable terms the plots which their forefathers settled upon in years past.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS a total of five factories, sugar and syrup have ceased operations within the last year:

AND WHEREAS many workers have been displaced as a result of such cessation of activities thereby depriving them of their only means of livelihood:

AND WHEREAS provision is made by way of Severance pay to compensate such workers for loss of earnings:

AND WHEREAS such payment has not been made:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on the appropriate Minister to institute such measures as would bring about a speedier settlement of outstanding claims so as to alleviate the hardships now suffered by such displaced workers.

QUESTIONS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Prime Minister:

On how many occasions, on which occasion and for whom since January 1, 1967 to date has the Government of Barbados defrayed the costs of travel and/or subsistence of the wife or husband of a person travelling out of Barbados at Government expense or on Government business, in the cases where that person was

1. The Prime Minister,
2. A Minister,
3. A Parliamentary Secretary,
4. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker or Mr. Chairman of Committees of this House,
5. Any member of Parliament not mentioned above,
6. A Civil Servant,
7. Any other person attending a conference or a meeting of an International Organisation as part of or an adviser to a delegation from Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Finance:

Will the Minister state in respect of each of the years 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970 and for each person who has held Ministerial Office (including the Prime Minister) or has been a Parliamentary Secretary during that time, what sums have been paid out of Public Funds in each year by way of -

1. Moneys paid to each of these persons from the Government Hospitality fund stating whether those moneys were paid on a regular monthly or other basis or whether occasional.

2. Moneys paid to each of these persons in respect of subsistence allowances for attendance at Conferences or any other travelling whatsoever.

3. Moneys paid from the Government Hospitality fund in respect of individual entertainment by each of these persons.

4. Moneys paid to hotels or other residential establishments outside Barbados in respect of each of these persons.

5. Moneys paid as airline or other fares in respect of each of these persons.

6. Moneys paid as airlines or other fares in respect of the wives or husbands of each of these persons.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Housing:

1. Will the Minister state the total sum paid since January 1st, 1969 to date by Barbados Housing Authority to contractors or other non-employees responsible for the painting and repairing of the Authority's houses; the names of the contractors or other persons and how much each was paid?

2. Was there any advertisement or were any tenders invited for the aforesaid contracts before they were awarded?

3.00 p.m.

BILLS - FIRST READING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Ammunition Act, 1919, be now read a first time.

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

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

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, 1967, be now read a first time.

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

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

RE APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. MILLIKEN AS AUDITOR OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House is commenced, I should like to move a Motion for the reappointment of the Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. With your leave, Sir, I beg to move that Mr. J. Milliken of FitzPatrick Graham &Company be reappointed Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1971, at the remuneration of £125 for the year.

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House is entered upon.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Hold on, please.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Ministers are allowed to make statements. A member is not entitled just to get up and say: "Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House commences". If he wants to move a vote of sympathy to some departed constituent, or a former member of the House, it is the custom that he should give notice to the Speaker and the Speaker calls on him. I just want to know on what particular point the hon. member has risen.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what point have you risen?

Mr. HINDS: That is correct, Sir. As soon as you have heard, you will be in a position to tell the hon. member. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what have you risen?

Mr. HINDS: To draw a matter to the Speaker's attention and that is all, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is no provision in the Standing Orders for the hon. member for St. Peter to rise at this stage. Will the hon. member for St. Peter take his seat, please.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. It has been customary in this House from time immemorial for any member to rise when an adjournment is being taken in order to speak on a matter of public interest, and it must be of immediate public interest in order for the Speaker to grant him a hearing. An hon. member should intimate to the Speaker, even beforehand, that it is his intention to rise even on a matter of public interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The leave of the House should have been sought, too.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with arrangements and in accordance with the man-

ner in which the Standing Orders were suspended just now, subject to this Private Motion being taken, I am asking that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition be permitted to deal with this Motion, at this stage, because it is of great interest to all of us.

RESOLUTION *re* APPOINTMENT OF STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: The item under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Thomas, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution that this House reappoint a Standing Orders Committee to be charged with the duty of recommending such alterations as may be thought necessary in the present Rules and Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, during the last Session of Parliament it was recognised that the Rules which had served quite well for 13 years for at that stage, Mr. Speaker, 9 years, perhaps, had various hiatuses and, perhaps, also had Rules more appropriate to a larger Assembly than ours, and it was thought proper that a Standing Orders Committee should be appointed to effect yet another revision of the Rules in order to streamline the procedure of this House. A Committee was appointed; it went through the main parts of the Standing Orders; there were reservations on certain points, but the matter never came to finality. A great deal of work was done - in particular the groundwork in the form of obtaining Standing Orders from the Legislative Assemblies of other members of the Commonwealth which were laid. I trust, indeed, that the Clerk who obtained them also left them in such a way that they are still available to the present Clerks, but no doubt they can be obtained again.

Further to this, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the last Assembly in the course of the last 5 years a Bill was introduced into this House to amend the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act. The Standing Orders Committee took some exception to this, and the Bill was never proceeded with. It is, undoubtedly, a problem which we have to face, namely, that there is a licence given in Legislative Assemblies everywhere, for I have the authority of *The Parliamentarian,* the magazine of the Commonwealth, for saying that nowhere in the Commonwealth is a member liable to an action for defamation for any thing he says in the House. Nonetheless, this very great privilege, undoubtedly, gives rise to certain duties.

Many Parliaments in the Commonwealth have sought to find a path between the privilege and the duty. I very sincerely hope that the Committee, which I am now recommending to hon. members, will adopt one of the solutions which has been adopted in other parts of the Commonwealth. In India, for example, if someone wishes to make reference to an individual not a member of the Indian National Assembly, he must so inform the Speaker and, unless he is prepared to justify his statements, Mr. Speaker can call upon him to withdraw them and have the matter struck from the record. I merely indicate a path along which the deliberations of such a Committee may go.

I deeply and sincerely urge on hon. members that this will be a superior way of dealing with the particular problem than the introduction of legislation to make Barbados the first place, so far as is known in the world, where the right of free speech in Parliament is to be infringed. I mention this as one of the problems which I know the last Standing Orders Committee had dealt with only on the outskirts. Perhaps it is one that this Committee, if appointed, can deal with in some depth. There are others, Mr. Speaker, and it is to be hoped that the fresh minds which I anticipated will be brought to bear on this problem, if this Resolution receives the approbation of hon. members, will be able to explore, perhaps, one or two aspects of the Standing Orders which we did not explore in the last Standing Orders Committee.
3.10 p.m.

The numbers, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, which I envisage would be seven, and in a matter such as this I would hope that you, Sir, would take the chair. In fact, I would expect you to take the chair and I would respectfully suggest to hon. members that a combination of experience plus a fresh mind might very well make for the best composition of this Committee. On this side I intend to nominate the hon. members for St. Peter, Christ Church West and St. Thomas for membership of the Committee.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding this motion. Much of the time of the House is spent by way of repetition, and it may be a very good thing if these Standing Orders are amended so as to effect savings in time and having Government Business more expeditiously dealt with. We all know that the revision of the Standing Orders is long over due, and it may be well for us to try to complete our labour in that respect. There is hardly anything more to say because we all fully realise the necessity of having these Standing Orders revised and streamlined and brought up to date with modern trends and in line with what goes on in other Parliaments.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say I have no desire to serve on the Committee because I am busy otherwise, but what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should have mentioned was the general tendency of Parliamentary institutions to regard Parliament as a place for unfettered freedom in so far as speech is concerned, but the origin of that, the hon. member must know, was rooted in the idea that a member of Parliament should not be worried about litigations brought against him for expressing views on a matter in Parliament otherwise he would quite often have to face charges, and that was to give parliamentarians that freedom; but I think it is a different matter if Parliament is reduced to a stage and more so if people outside of Parliament are reduced because Par-

liamentarians inside can represent themselves, but when you are outside of Parliament and parliamentarians are going to utilise their privilege and call a member outside a thief, a murderer or a criminal and all the things that he knows he would be unable to do other than in Parliament, I do not believe that Parliament was ever meant to protect such kind of persons and such kind of speeches, and we must get down to brass tacks. The hon. member said that we do not want to be the first and that Barbados would be unique. Barbados is already unique in the sense that you can search the annals of history of all parliamentary institutions and if you are going to copy the British Parliament, it is very nearly impossible to find in the British Parliament that a member of Parliament would hide behind parliamentary privileges to call a Civil Servant a thief when he knows that the Civil Servant has no means of representing himself or defending such a charge. What is the point of calling a man a thief and he cannot get any redress. If somebody outside of Parliament says something true about you, you want to sue him for speaking the truth and say it is slanderous or libellous. We do not want the reverse to take place. Outside you will find cases being brought against people for saying things that are true, and if the matter is true the more the libel. Here we want to hide behind it.

I feel, and I agree with the hon. member, that in this institution you should not prevent members from coming here and being able to express their views fearlessly of any member of the community. People in a small community will not be served if any fear surrounds the idea even in the Assembly that you cannot expose things that people outside are not willing to expose.

At the same time I hope that there will not only be fresh minds, but I hope there will be penetrating minds to find a way out of the situation which now exists. It is a heavy weight of responsibility upon Your Honour because I feel that speeches and behaviour of Parliamentarians have a lot to do with the role that Your Honour will play, and I feel that if the Speaker is firm and knowledgeable about the Rules of procedure of the House, he can bring members to order promptly without things getting out of hand. I do not feel that any member of Parliament has any right to be offensive, and if he is, the Speaker should be quick in making the member withdraw the offensive remarks, and that would prevent any suggestion of hon. members abusing the privileges of free speech. We cannot, moving into the 21st Century, begin to put any muzzles on the freedom of speech. I hope that when the Committee meets that it will so draw up Rules and procedures that it becomes very nearly impossible for any member of Parliament to say anything about any person outside of Parliament. It does not matter about those inside because any sitting Parliamentarian should be capable of defending himself, and even here he is going to call upon the Speaker anyhow to defend him; but the public outside cannot call upon the Speaker, and it is not fair or right for members of the House to abuse the privileges that we have of free speech by maligning the public and people who cannot defend themselves under the guise of free speech. We should do everything we can to give the public the right to the feeling that the debates of this Assembly are conducted without slander and bringing them into public ridicule for which they have no redress, because I do not think that a freedom that only a coward would like to have, and I feel that if that is encouraged it would not only reduce the position of Parliament but it would make people outside feel that they would have to get other means of redress. I hope the hon. member will be willing to come forward with his own ideas about how we should deal with that subject, because it is very distressing to many people outside to find that in Parliament they can be dragged down by the members with laughter and that is the end of the matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long, but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in what he considered a moment of sweet reasonableness suggested a Committee of seven. I do not think that could be considered reasonable in the present position of this House. It means that you will preside and they will have three and the Government will have three members. I do not think that could be considered reasonable at all, and therefore I could not support anything that suggests that the Opposition should have the same number of members as the Government even on a non-controversial Committee such as this.

3.20 p.m.

The second point is that I would like some time limit placed on the deliberations of this Committee. The last Committee was appointed on 1st July, 1969 and up to now new rules have not been brought before this Chamber. If the time spent, as was spent by the last Committee which extended over a period of two years, continues in this session, 1973 might find us again without new rules, and I would only like to exhort the new Committee, whatever its composition, to give some degree of urgency to their deliberations so that the new year at least will find this Chamber operating on up-to-date, proper and fair rules.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am in entire agreement, Mr. Speaker, with the remarks of my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member seconded the motion. I will make the nominations with the concurrence of the Leader of the Opposition, but before I do so I want to make my position clear. I do not want any distortion by the Press in anything I may say because the uneducated - and I should say this is not defamatory - but certainly the uninformed members of the Press have talked about the Government wanting to remove privileges from members of the House. I just want to remind the members that if this House had any privileges - and there are lots of places, the Privy Council, for instance, the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords, to demonstrate that a Colonial Parliament

has only the right to confer privileges upon itself - that is a different thing from saying that we have inherited privileges from the House of Commons. This is simply not true, and in pursuance of this a gentleman by the name of Mr. Erskine Ward who was formerly a Minister without portfolio in the Other Place, and who at that time was a member of our Party, on the eve of his departure did something of some disservice to the standards of the public life of this Island by introducing a Bill conferring privileges and immunities upon members of Parliament. Shortly after we had a general election with a new element, a new type of person was brought into this Chamber, and from then we got a spate of vile abuse, slander, defamation in every conceivable form - I have a complete list which I will go into when we have the debate, I will not go into it now - by all the members on the other side.

I have been in this Parliament in a few weeks' time for something like 20 years off and on in a sabbatical in 1956 for 15 months of which hon. members will be aware, but I returned and with that short hiatus in my service either as a member of the Government back benches, as a member of the Opposition front and back bench, or as a member of the Government, and I never found it necessary in the course of conducting any discussion in this place to indulge in the kind of abuse and defamatory statements that emanated from 1966 to 1971 from the other side. It is true that they do not have the reinforcements of vilification that they had at that time, but some of the Field Marshals unfortunately are still with us, and I want to make it clear to the Advocate and the rest of mankind that any privileges which these members enjoy in here were conferred by a Bill introduced by Mr. Erskine Ward. After 300 years of Parliament he opened the flood gates to the kind of unseemly behaviour that we on our side had to suffer from, and I want to make the position clear. I am an egalitarian, I do not believe that a member of Parliament should enjoy any privilege at all, even freedom from arrest on his way to the House which we do not do nowadays for civil debt and which is one of the privileges which I take it was claimed at the opening of the session, that an ordinary citizen in this Island does not enjoy. This is the trouble with politics in this Island, that we - and I am not speaking personally now, I mean members of the House - regard ourselves as some kind of race apart, that a dispensation has been granted to us from all the norms of human behaviour which are not vouchsafed to the rest of mankind. There is no such thing as freedom of speech in Barbados, there is no such thing as freedom of speech in any democratic country, because you are only allowed that kind of freedom which does not encroach upon the rights of an individual to protect his person and his character. You are only free to do those things which the law allows you to do, and therefore it was iniquitous for us to sit down here and acquiesce in the conferrence of privileges upon members of Parliament which people outside could not and would not enjoy.

I want to make it clear that with the appointment of this Committee it is not going to be any part of the terms of this Committee that they should in any way attempt to fetter the right of the Government to reintroduce the Bill for the repeal of the Immunities and Privileges Act which was introduced only a short five or six years ago. Then if they claim that we have always had these immunities and privileges they can refer to the common law position which safeguarded this Island for over 300 years. But their cohorts and minions in the editorial columns of the Press have been talking about the Government wanting to fetter discussions, and the arm of the C.I.A. has been informed by one member of the Press that we are repressing freedom in Barbados, and he gets $500 from an agency of the Central Intelligence Agency for successfully opposing the independence of Barbados, and that is why I had to serve notice on the United States Government that this is not 1966. The hon. member would know to what I am referring, and he can go and look at the plaque at one of the Advertising Agencies so far removed from this place, so I merely rose to read out the names of the members I will invite Your Honour to select for the Committee and to emphasise that it is no part of the terms of reference of this Committee on the Standing Orders to hinder the Government's intentions in any way. If they like to they can endorse what I feel and what the members of the Government feel about the breach of privilege and the excess immunity which has been conferred upon members in their Standing Orders as well. As far as I am concerned, both as a Parliamentarian and as a lawyer. It would be an act of supererogation on their side, because as far as I am concerned we must have it enshrined in a Bill that that iniquitous Act under which this country has suffered a lowering of its standards of public behaviour must be repealed. I make no bones about it and all the legal pundits who have not been exposed to legal education and who write to the Press to say it is unconstitutional, they can carry it to the proper courts in order to challenge its unconstitutionality.

I know the hon. member on the other side knows that he is as much likely to suffer as any of us on this side if we leave the Bill as it is, but I would just like to say something not so much as a warning now, but I hope that when the Committee on Standing Orders sits, one of its duties will be to examine not the question merely of what is privilege and what is not privilege - leave that to us, I have the Bill drafted - what they have to examine is the unnecessary waste of time in this House by people who filibuster and want to drag on debates and waste public time, and that we should introduce measures if we are going to appeal to Parliaments outside which have been employed and institutionalised in the Parliament at Westminister and other Parliaments in the Commonwealth, that we should introduce the kangaroo and the guillotine and the closure and other effective measures for putting an end to the unnecessary prolongation of a discussion of matters of public importance. We have sat here the live long day and the live long night listening to members of the Public Service, members of the general public and members of the Govern-

ment on this side being criticised for 7, 8 and 9 hours and making absolutely no contribution to the subject matter under discussion.
3.30 p.m.

This is the proper area within which the Standing Orders Committee could probably exercise itself. I am going to suggest that the Committee be: The Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, the hon. member for St. Michael North East; the hon. member for St. Michael South Central; the hon. Leader of the House, the member for Christ Church East, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, being the same person as the member for St. Michael South Central. Subject to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition he, obviously, should be a member, but I just want to know whether this is the kind of nomination that the member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition, would like. *(Asides)* Also the hon. member for St. Peter and the hon. member for St. Michael South-East. I have to get accustomed to these new divisions. I do not have any complication in the constituency which I represent. I will have to add Your Honour as Chairman of the Committee. Please read the names so that I can check them.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not interrupted, Sir, because we are trying to get on with the Business of the House. I believe it is more usual to have the Resolution passed to set up the Committee before you have nominations for the Committee!

Mr. SPEAKER: Absolutely no point of order. The names which were read out by the hon. member for St. John.....

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. If you do not mind my saying so, I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is right. We have overlooked that we have not put the Motion that a Committee be appointed. When the Motion is passed, as I figure it will be passed, without any further ado Your Honour is then entitled to read out the names. As I was on my feet, I probably prolonged the discussions so that Your Honour forgot that the Motion had not been put, but I took the opportunity of submitting the names to Your Honour. It would be right for the Motion to be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I stand corrected.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if there is no other hon. member who wishes to speak, I should like to reply very briefly to what has been said. As the Mover of the Motion, I think I still have a right of reply. I must confess that when I had looked through earlier Sessions, that is Sessions of Parliament, before I became a member, if there was one member who, it struck me, made full use of such privileges as may have existed at common law in respect of the right of free speech in Parliament, it was one of the members for St. Peter - not the present member or the recently retired member, and I was glad to see that the former member for St. Peter has joined, so to speak, the Parliamentary Salvation Army and renounced the stretching of the right of free speech at this stage. I should be very glad if I thought we could get through 5 years without the hon. member for St. Michael West, perhaps, losing his cool and referring to one or two persons in and out of Parliament but particularly out of Parliament, since that is what we are talking about, in terms in which a court might consider some defamation was contained.

I was also surprised to hear the Prime Minister discuss this matter. I have formed the impression that female members of my family might very well have maintained slander actions against the Prime Minister, if words that I have heard him speak in here had been spoken on a platform. But, nonetheless, all of that is only in passing. Today is a day of peace and love, Mr. Speaker, and peace and love should prevail, and we do not have to return to the past.

As far as the time limit is concerned, I must say I find it difficult to agree with that, especially since the suggestion comes from the Chairman of a Law Reform Committee that has sat for three years without producing one piece of law reform.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have never been Chairman of any Law Reform Committee. He knows that it is the hon. member for Christ Church West who was Chairman of a Committee and not me - the Company Laws Committee. He was Chairman for three years and not me. I was the Attorney-General.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of elucidation.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have never been Chairman of any Committee dealing with Law Reform. I am dealing and have dealt at the request of the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, and I hope to his satisfaction and the satisfaction of the House and the country, with a Committee of which the hon. member knows the full reason why it has not reported. I do not care to repeat those reasons here or now, and I do not really want to get into any personal vendetta in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am obviously mistaken. I saw a picture in the Press of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he was Attorney-General. He gave a Press Conference and said that there was a Law Reform Committee of which he was the Chairman and it was going to reform the laws of Barbados. Obviously, the Press is wrong. The Prime Minister's strictures against the *Advocate* are correct. The Minister's Press Conference was misreported and the picture was not of him at all!

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is possible that the hon. member is hoping to be Chairman, but he was not nominated.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As Attorney-General at the time I could have made myself Chairman, but I was not. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that as a member of the Bar Association.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must accept my assurance that I thought he was the Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member for St. Thomas reply to the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: I am replying to the debate, Sir. I honestly thought he was the Chairman, because, on one occasion when a Committee of this House was trying to get a little law reform done, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central objected, and said that since we had not told him or the Chief Justice we could not have it done. He has never done any, but we, at least, tried. That is only in passing, Sir. I said that to illustrate that I hope you will not be too strict with a time limit on such Committee as is envisaged in this Resolution.

I am saying that if the Prime Minister is going to restrict his view of the Parliamentary Immunities and Privileges Act, which he himself introduced in January, 1963; if he is going to restrict his view of the Act - it was he and not Mr. Erskine Ward who introduced it in its first Parliamentary hearing - if he is now going to repeal the whole Act, I would not object. What I did object to was his placing members of Parliament, in the last proposed Bill, in an inferior position to ordinary citizens in that he said that even if you said something in the House and honestly believed it to be true, then you might still be liable for penalities for slander. That is something to which no ordinary citizen is ever subject, because he took away the defence of qualified privilege even from members of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate on the privileges of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. ADAMS: It is coming, because I think it is an important part of the work of any Standing Orders Committee at this time to introduce such Rules of debate as will control in the same manner as reference to members of either House, the Governor-General, the Judicial Officers and so on - control references to members of the public and not just civil servants.
3.40 p.m.

I do not think that Civil Servants should have any greater protection than ordinary everyday citizens, and many ordinary everyday citizens, no matter what is said in here by the Prime Minister, have been abused by members on both sides, and ordinary people in the road have been called thieves. It has been said that they carried away the money of this and that member, or that so-and-so carried away so-and so's money, and I have heard the clients of barrister members of this House accused of being guilty of the crimes for which they were acquitted by hon. members on the other side. All that has gone on in here; so let it not be thought that there is any Field Marshal in here. As far as I am concerned we are all Privates when it comes to this matter. There are one or two hon. members - I see the hon. member for St. Philip South, the hon. member for St. George North, the hon. member for St. George South, and the hon. member for St. Michael South-East, although I have not heard him make any substantial speech in here, whom I have never heard slander anyone at any time. There is also the hon. member for St. Michael South-West. There are certain hon. members who undoubtedly do not require the protection of the Parliamentary Immunities and Privileges Bill; but I believe the Prime Minister is one who benefits from it, and we know there are hon. members on this side who if they produced Bills which subsequently imposed criminal liability on themselves, the Prime Minister would be the first one who would repeal the Bill which protects him from certain criminal liability. I wonder if for example/the Prime Minister would care to repeat in the House that I was dismissed from a post for incompetence or otherwise at any time. He said that in here more than once.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the authority of the Government and therefore I would hope that any Committee which I sponsored or of which I was a member would in no way seek to affect the right of Government passing legislation. In fact no Committee could affect the right of Government, but hon. members who were members of the last Standing Orders Committee would recall that the Committee did not fetter but it certainly restrained the Government of the day from introducing legislation into the House which would in fact place members of Parliament at a very low position indeed *vis-a-vis* their statements in the House. I am hoping that this Committee will be appointed and that we will have the Rules of debate settled. We do not need the closure as the Prime Minister said, we already have the closure. I do not think the Prime Minister is entirely familiar with the Standing Order, not if he can call for a closure, something which I have seen moved in here on numerous occasions since I have been a member, but I hope we will have Rules of debate which will satisfy the public that they are not to be lightly abused in the House of Assembly and at the same time preserve the right of free speech of members. I am sure that as other Parliaments have done, so we can do, and I would suggest to hon. members that the penalty which exists in many African Parliaments and in the Parliament of India of ultimately expulsion of a member who is disobedient to the order of a Speaker not to mention the names of persons except in so far as required for the purpose of debate and not to defame persons without justification is a more serious sanction than the penalty of paying damages for slander in the Law Courts.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The composition of the Committee to revise the Standing Orders of this House is as follows:-

The hon. member for St. Michael South West; the hon. member for St. Michael South Central; the hon. member for Christ Church East; the hon. member for St. Michael North East; the hon. member for St. Thomas; the hon. member for Christ Church West; the hon. member for St. Peter with the Speaker as Chairman.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is just one further addition which I omitted and that is the hon. member for St. Michael South. It should be St. Michael North West, St. Michael South Central, Christ Church East, St. Michael South East and not St. Michael North East.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said St. Michael North-West.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And the addition was St. Michael South. It is not the hon. member for St. Michael North East who is the hon. and distinguished lady member. she is not on the Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: If the Prime Minister is nominating five members plus Your Honour, plus the Chairman of Committees who will also attend - I would imagine that would follow in the course of business - at this stage I would like to add the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would those hon. members indicate whether they are willing to serve? There being no dissenting voices, I take it that those hon. members are now the members of the Committee to revise the Standing Orders of this House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (1971-72) ACT, 1971.

The Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, section 109, subsection 5 of the Barbados Constitution and Order in Council 1966 stipulates that the Minister of Finance may at any time before the end of the financial year introduce a Supplementary Appropriation Bill for such sums of money as may have been voted or may be required for the supply of the Government of this Island.
3.50 p.m.

What we used to do before until about three or four years ago was to come in here week after week with resolutions for supplementary sums for Departments either in the nature of votes which had been exhausted or for new items which were unforeseen at the time when the main Estimates were concluded before 31st March in each year. What I have introduced as Minister of Finance is to come down once every three months with a resolution comprising all the departmental requirements for supplementary votes instead of coming week after week for small sums of money.

In accordance with section 109 (5) it is necessary for us to get a Supplementary Appropriation Bill which will compound all the provisions which have been awarded during the course of the last financial year by this House. The main feature of the Bill is that the House has already voted these supplies and what we are doing here now is merely to comply with the requirements of the Constitution, because all money Resolutions in the last analysis have to be embodied in a Bill, and the purpose of this course - not that it was designed for this purpose - but one of the good results of this is that the Other Place will not now have the opportunity to discuss resolutions which may be brought down from time to time during the course of the financial year, but the Other Place then has an opportunity to go into the Appropriation Bill because all Bills have to go to the Other Place and be assented to by the Governor-General before they can be deemed to be Acts of Parliament. Although we have passed these already we still have to go through this exercise and in this regard I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 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.

A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC OFFICERS' LOAN AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES ACT, 1948

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill before us repeals the 1948 Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances Act and all the amendments thereto, and it makes reference to the Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances Regulations of 1966. The Principal Act which is being repealed is the Act of 1948, and most of the provisions of the former Act are being incorporated in the new Bill which we now have before us. The provisions are substantially the same, except that power is given to the Minister responsible for these matters to regulate from time to time the maximum amount of loan which may be awarded any Public Officer for the purpose of the acquisition of a motor vehicle.

4.00 p.m.

We found some difficulty in that the prices of motor cars are going up all the time relentlessly from year to year, and if there is too rigid a ceiling on the maximum amount of a loan which may be made available to a public officer, then we find that many public officers who are on the Schedule are unable to purchase cars. Let me give you an illustration. The maximum of the loan at one time was, say, $2,500 when the minimum amount for which a public officer could acquire a car with the kind of standard and capacity that would be necessary for the performance of his duty would be $3,800 or $3,900. I think that the present ceiling is something like $5,600 for a public officer and that, of course, is subject to review from time to time. There is nothing further of a new nature, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say on this Bill, because it has been the law since 1948 and no new principle is being invoked. What we are doing in this Bill is to give greater flexibility in the management of the Scheme, so to speak.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No.8

Head 2 – Service Commissions – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 2 - Service Commissions - Item 28 - Furniture and Equipment - stand part, I should like to mention that the Note is very explanatory. It is merely to provide furniture for certain Officers as set out in the Addendum:

1 Senior Personnel Officer
1 Personnel Officer
1 Assistant Personnel Officer
2 Clerical Officers
2 Stenographers

The items of furniture are made up as follows:

1 desk at $250
4 desks at $195 each
2 desks at $125 each
1 chair at $170
2 chairs at $120 each
2 chairs at $142 each
2 chairs at $ 35 each

making a total of $1,844.

I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

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

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

4.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 16, there are three items involved. Item 9 with duty allowance which has been caused through the increase in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries; Item 13 - Conference, is an item which I know will probably have to be more thoroughly explained, and then there is Item 19- National Insurance Contributions. I may at the outset deal with the Item - Conferences, unless hon. members would like more explanation on the other items. As far as conferences are concerned we have prepared a memorandum with a breakdown of the number of conferences which we have attended both by Government officials and Parliamentary Secretaries up to this time of the year and the various amounts which are yet committed under this vote. I will in passing say that up to the present time a total of 26 Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries have attended various conferences for the financial year whereas the number has been exceeded considerably in the case of the Government officials. For example if I gave a brief run down, on the first page we have what deals with conferences from 22nd March, 1970 until 8th April, 1971, there were four Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries who attended as compared with twenty public officers; on the second page there were six Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries who attended as compared with twenty-one Government officials. On the third page one Minister or Parliamentary Secretary attended as compared with forty public officers; on the fourth page four Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries attended as against nineteen Government officials; on the fifth page two as against sixteen; on the sixth page two as eighteen; on the 7th page one as against twenty-one on th 8th page three as against fourteen, and on the ninth page three as against ten. I am just giving this information.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it would be so much more convenient for hon. members on this side if the hon member had made copies and had them circulated to us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is a very good suggestion and if there were more copies available by all means I would let them have copies, but there is only one copy available, and the hon. member can look at it with the assistance of the Clerk.

Mr. Chairman, out of the grand total of 202 public officers and Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries attending for the entire period including of course the commitments, twenty-six have been Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries and the other 176 are public officers. Those are the final figures.

Another point which I should like to draw to the attention of the Committee is that the Government has set up a Conference Committee comprised of Government officials, Permanent Secretaries, members of the Economic Planning Unit, the Financial Secretary and the Establishments Officer which goes through the applications for attending conferences very carefully and assesses what Barbados would get out of these conferences before approving any submission to Cabinet. This matter has been receiving very strict scrutiny by this Committee. There are numerous conferences that this Government is usually invited to attend which are not even submitted to the Conference Committee. I can tell you that from my own personal experience. There are dozens of other conferences which the Ministry of Health have been invited to attend and on which we did not make submissions to the Committee, and the same thing applies to the various Ministries and Departments of Government.

In coming for this supplementary it is not that the money has been frittered away in any way; it is just that we have to attend many more conferences owing to our advancement in world matters and having to attend conferences, because Barbados being a small country, unless we have members attending those conferences where we receive a considerable amount of aid like FAO, ILO, UNESCO UNICEF, IDB that the Inter-American Bank, Barbados does not stand to benefit in any way.

I beg to move that Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. GRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the Hon. Minister that a country such as Barbados, small, now in its developing stage must attend conferences. We make subscriptions towards several of these organisations and therefore we expect to go to seek whatever aid there is for us and to carry the necessary delegations, but what bothers me is these high-powered delegations that are sent. When the Minister said that it is not throwing money away, that is all right provided you can cut the size of your delegation down. I hope the Minister will be in a position to give the information which I seek in this connection, because there was a high-powered delegation which went to the United Nations soon after elections, and I think it comprised of a Mr. Ward and a Mr. Morrison - I cannot remember the names very well - but I think a Mr. McClean was also included.

I would like to know from the Minister who is introducing this Resolution if any of the Gentlemen had their air fares and other expenses paid out of the taxpayers' pockets. I think it was a Mr. Wendell McClean, and I knew from what I had read in the Press that these people went to the U.N. as part of the Barbados delegation, so I would like to know from the Minister if he is in a position to tell us if any of these gentlemen - Mr. Ward and Mr. McClean - if any of their passages and expenses were paid by the Barbados Government. I agree with the Minister..... *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, not too long ago I listened to an address by the Prime Minister, but the Union Pope is now misbehaving himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have no Union Pope in here.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if you listen to me carefully you would have remembered that I said a certain member to whom I always refer as a Union Pope, and I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, to ask the members on the other side to allow me to address the Chair. What I am concerned with is if the Minister is in a position to tell us if any of these names of which I have just referred had their expenses paid out of the taxpayers of Barbados. It is unfortunate that we have a Minister of National Guidance, if you put it that way, but it bothers me when you see a very junior member of this Assembly leading what I consider another high-powered delegation to Rome. As the Pope's favourite remark is that you do not understand the fundamentals of this. I am asking the Minister to give me any information on this which he has at his disposal, but I have something else to say on this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, purely for the fun of it.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to realise that when we are in this Chamber, there is no fun, we are always serious.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not serious on this matter because what the hon. member for St. James has said does not merit seriousness. By now he should know as a Parliamentarian that a Government is there to send whomsoever it cares to any conference it so desires. That is its function, that is its prerogative. When you win an election you have the right to do all this, it is no point asking the Prime Minister whom he chooses as Ministers, that is his right which was given to him when the people chose the Government so do not say because the hon. member for Christ Church South Central is a junior member and won the election against the leader who would have been the Prime Minister normally, that he has no right to lead a delegation. What is the point of saying that he is a junior Minister and is made the leader of a delegation? That is the prerogative of the Government. I think the Minister can answer the hon. member, I think he will be able to deal with the hon. member's question and I am sure the Minister will be able to give him the names. The hon. member must understand however that Ministers will have a sense of understanding about these matters, and if the hon. member for St. James and his Party had won the elections they would have sent whom they felt like to the U.N. I understand that they had people padded up in New York to come out of the pavilion to play, but these are things that will happen in any election so it is no point the hon. member asking these things now. His parliamentary experiences should teach him that you must be able to reward people who have served you, and there is nothing wrong with that.

I am sure that if his side had won the elections their good friend, Mr. Egbert Brancker, would have had a play. I heard of a man in St. Thomas who went and bought six suits in preparation to help his Party, but I do not think the hon. member for St. James should worry about that, I think he should not ask those questions, If he considers that something is improper let him say so.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. Heath won the election, and there is no point in Mr. Wilson asking Mr. Heath why he sent Lord Goodman to Rhodesia about ten times when Lord Goodman was a member of the Labour Party. He sent Lord Goodman because he felt that Lord Goodman was able to deal with the negotiations. That is the prerogative of the Government. I do not think the hon. member understands the Parliamentary processes. Do not deal with those things that are not within your area.

The function of the Prime Minister, the function of any Leader of a Government, the function of the Leader of the Opposition, if it is led in the same way a Government should be led, is to pick the team. You cannot have every man leading! If the hon. member for Christ Church South Central has gone to Rome that is a matter for the Government to decide. Who leads the Government's delegation is a matter for the Government; it is not a matter of giving anybody a ride. He is a Parliamentary Secretary. If the Government decides that a Parliamentary Secretary of any Ministry is going to be the leader of a delegation

when the Minister is not there - you may say that if the Minister is there it will be a silly thing to have a Minister going along when the Leader of the delegation is a Parliamentary Secretary. If he or she is a Minister of any quality and the Parliamentary Secretary is leading the delegation, then it would be time for the Minister to hand in his or her resignation. If I were a Minister that would be my role. *(Asides)* I said that if I were a Minister that would be my role, but I have no ambitions. You have heard the vulgar remark about a trade union Pope in here. Well, I have complete satisfaction where I am, so I do not have any worries.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I thought we were not talking about Popes in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am just simply waiting for him to make his point, and then I will deal with it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I thought you were going to ask the hon. member to make his point of order. I should like to know on what he rose. I should like to know if it were a point of interruption you were entertaining. If it were a burlesque and you entertained that sort of thing and said that you were waiting until a point is made, then I will have to be very open in saying that it is not for you to allow a member to interrupt me and then say that you are interested in the point to be made. You must tell him that he cannot rise on those points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like the hon. member to realise that I have been in here long enough and know absolutely what I am about. I want both sides to realise that when it comes to a point of order - I am well aware that in many instances we may have a fraudulent point of order. I know that, but let me decide that matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr Chairman, I do not care whether it is a fraudulent or a fair point of order. All I am saying is that when a member rises when another member is speaking, then he must say on what he rises to speak. If it is a point of order he must say so to you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what he said when he rose. If you did not hear him, then I heard him.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr Chairman, as I was saying, I do not think the hon. member for St. James should worry about who the Government sends on a delegation. It is not the business of the Opposition to worry about whom the Government sends on a delegation. It ceased to be the business of the Opposition after the party lost the election. If you were going to question the fact that people went on the delegation and they had nothing to do with Parliament, then you must say so and you will get an answer. You cannot question a Parliamentary Secretary going on a delegation. It is out of place; it is improper, and it is stupid. A Government can send any member of its team anywhere, at any time, on any delegation that it considers he should be sent. That is the Government's prerogative. The Leader of the Opposition should teach his members these things. Do not let the hon. mebmer get up in Parliament and make himself look silly. The Prime Minister has the right to send any member of Parliament on a delegation. The hon. member should have known that by now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for St. Michael West started to address this Chamber he said that he was not taking me seriously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already dealt with that, so do not let us go over that again. I outlawed it completely.

Mr. CRAIG: He said that he took a good 12 minutes to say what he had to say. The first day that he takes me seriously he will talk for a whole day. I am sure about that, and he is going to take me seriously very soon. I remember during the Independence debate when I came through this door the member said to me "Craigie", do you think in here is a Sunday School?"

Now, the hon. member said that I questioned the leading of a delegation by the member for Christ Church South Central. It is not fair to say that. I said that I was surprised. Now, I am entitled to that. I was surprised to see that member leading what I considered to be a high-powered delegation to Rome. I am human, and I am entitled to have that little surprise. But what the hon. member, who spoke for almost 12 minutes, did not mention is that McClean and Ward went to the United Nations and they are not members of the Chambers. All that I am asking the Minister is if he can tell this side of the House whether a Ward and a McClean went to the United Nations and if their expenses were paid by the Barbados Government. I am entitled to ask that. If the members of the Opposition are supposed to be watchdogs of the public purse, then I, as part of the opposition, happen to be one of the watchdogs. It is my bounden duty to question anything on the other side that I am not satisfied with in the interest of the taxpayers of this country.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael West said that I spoke about the hon. member for Christ Church South Central going to Rome. It is not fair to say that. He can go to Mars or Venice. *(Asides)* Why should we not pad up, Boxill was padded up, too, and the Skipper told him not to play, Odessa Gittens was padded up, and the skipper told her not to play. That is the skipper's duty, and I do not have to rub that in. What I am dealing with is if the member for St. Philip South were to lead a delegation anywhere and he was on this side and the hon. member for St. Michael West was on the other side, he would have wanted to cut his head off. He would have questioned that.
4.40 p.m.

Knowing the temperament of the individual, he would have questioned that, but it is improper for me on this side to question two persons whom I read in the press went to the United Nations as part of the Barbados Delegation. Since they are not mem-

bers of this Chamber or the other Place. all I am asking is whether these names are included in the amount of money that we are asked to vote this evening. The Minister said in his opening remarks that this is the amount up to date and I am entitled to ask this As soon as I cannot do this, I must go out. When the hon. member gets up with his fancy bandying of words I think he should know me from years ago and that I have a lot of steel. *(Asides)* There is only one sort of steel; I am good steel; as getting there and bandying words about who padded up and who won the election, that is history; so let us get on with the people's business, and that is what I am doing. I was simply asking the Minister who introduced the Resolution whether McClean or a Ward who attended United Nations as part of a Barbados delegation had his expenses paid by the Government of Barbados. The Minister can give me this information since he says it is up to date and I would be very grateful.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, just in parenthesis, I heard my name mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael West with a suggestion that I might not agree that a member of my side is entitled to criticise whom the Government sends on a delegation. The hon. member knows that that is foolishness. Any member of the public still more a member of the House of Assembly is entitled to say that the Government sent an idiot on a delegation and that we do not want to pay for it, and the hon. member knows that. If you pick up somebody who is nothing and send him away for some reason - I am not suggesting this has been done because I do not know what went before - but if you sent away somebody whom we think is not fit to represent Barbados, you must expect the Opposition to criticise, and if this is the motion, because I am not familiar with what went before, I would hope that whoever did the criticism will also vote against the item, and I will join with him in voting against it under the circumstances.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member for St. Thomas knows he could not be sincere in that statement he has just made. Do you think it would be proper for me over this side to question anybody you as Leader of the Opposition put on any Committee? It is your prerogative to chose whomsoever you feel is a fit person to go on a Committee. You are the Leader of that side. If they do not accept, that is a different thing, but do not say that because the right resides in me to speak that I should get up and say that the right you possess in choosing your side I am going to criticise, otherwise I would be getting up here all the time in that I do not have very much to choose from. That is what the electorate has done.

The hon. member for St. Thomas spoke about the Standing Orders earlier today and he knows it is a fact that it is the prerogative of a Government to choose its membership for any delegation. You do not have to get the approval of Parliament. You can criticise the spending of the money in sending a person on a delegation, but you know very well that the sending of a delegation is the prerogative of a Government. You say you can question it if the Government sent an idiot.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, as I understand it, no person on this side is critical of any member which the Government may have on a delegation. All I have asked is whether the Minister has these two names on the delegation. We are not saying who should or should not go. You were a selector once at Everton Football Club and you know that sometimes when they picked a team you were angry with the same team that you sat down and saw them pick. Nobody is critical of whom you send; what we are critical of is how many you send, and we are entitled to do this.

Mr. WALCOTT: The point I am making is that the hon. member must separate his arguments. Are you arguing on the basis of the right the Government has of sending a delegation? There are two things the hon. member is arguing. He is arguing the send ing of a delegation, and then he was talking about the composition of the persons the Government sent. As soon as the hon. member asked whether Government paid for Mr. McClean or Mr. Ward, he is questioning whom they sent.

Mr. CRAIG: If the hon. member would give way, I never asked if the Government had paid the expenses for the member for Christ Church South-Central. I only asked about two names.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. All I am saying is that the Government has the prerogative, and I am going to this, extreme. What the Hon. Leader of the House has said is that the Government has the prerogative to send an idiot. As soon as you elect a Government you have put the reins of doing these things in the Government's hands, and they can send an idiot, an imbecile or a convulsed fool; then you may question it. You said you were not questioning the persons, but you were questioning if in sending these persons the Government paid. So the whole idea about it is that if they paid you would be questioning the persons. If you are saying that these persons are not fit persons to send, by all means say so; but you cannot come along and say the persons are not fit persons to send and ask whether they should be paid. Now you are making a distinction between the hon. member for Christ Church South-Central but let me put it clearly to you. Whether a man is a member of Parliament or not, Government is not bound by Parliament in sending him on a delegation. The hon. member for St. Lucy went on a U.N. delegation and he was not a member of Parliament; but you would not question that because you would feel in a general way that he has sufficient academic qualifications that would make him eligible to go. Now United Nations delegations are not confined to Parliamentarians. Let me remind you that Marion Anderson was a delegate, not an ordinary member. I do not have all the names in my head, but they were not like in our case where we were sending members to a general United Nations conference. These were delegates to the United Nations sitting down with the right to vote on behalf of the United States, and they were not members of Parliament or Congress.

With respect to the United Kingdom delegation, you do not know all the names of the people that go. Similarly with Canada. Because it is a Federal Parliament, what they do to give the respective Parliamentary groups a play is to send a lot of Parliamentarians from time to time on delegations over the three months' period to the United Nations because it is just across the border; but the Government has the prerogative to do that. I do not believe that the hon. member for St. James could be seriously querying sending Mr. McClean because I do not see how he can seriously say that any person who reaches that stage at a University would not be a fit person for any Government to include in its delegation to the United Nations.
4.50 p.m.

Suppose we were dealing with international law or some other aspect, and they asked the hon. member for Christ Church West to go, was not the hon. member, who did not sit in the last session, asked by the very Government to be the Chairman of a committee dealing with company law? I felt the Union should have been a member but we were not asked to become a member, but the hon. member was Chairman. We did not make a big constitutional issue of it because we were not asked and the other side was asked, because he was a legal member and he had a contribution to make, but I do not think the hon. member should make an issue of it. I believe what you really want to know is if Mr. Ward had his expenses paid by the Government.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why we should waste so much time about who was on a delegation and who was not. A lot of people feel that the hon. member for St. James is not a person who is a fit and proper representative, but the people put him here, so after he got in here he could not talk, but what I want to say is this, to remove any fears from the hon. member's mind and the member who has just given way to me, that the gentleman I believe to whom the member for St. James refers has been a Clerk of our Party for something like 12 years, and he was given leave at private expense to take his three weeks' vacation to which he was entitled by law, in the United States, and the Government of Barbados was never asked to contribute a single penny to any of his expenses, so why have all this confusion and talk about whether we have the right to do it? We have sent a lady from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who is not a member of the Government to the U.N., we have sent the present member for St. Lucy when he was not a member of the Government,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to know he has the option to speak at length on this and not on various points of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is something you do not understand. The hon. member for St. Michael West has given way to me, and until he interrupts me I am entitled to speak, and that is a different thing altogether. I have not interrupted him, he has given way and I will not be speaking eight and nine times on one Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the hon. member rose on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you wish me to stop speaking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CRAIG: Now, Sir, the member for St. John has made it very clear. He gave the answer. I asked one question about the names McClean and Ward, but the member for St. Michael West has been trying to pin it down to qualifications for going to the U.N. and all sorts of nonsense. The member for St. John said that a Mr. Ward has been a card carrying member of his Party for 12 years.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member must have been asleep when I was speaking on a point of order, but he is now misquoting me and I am entitled to get up and correct the record. I said that he had been Clerk of the Government Party for a period of approximately 12 years and by law he is entitled to three weeks vacation after he has served three years every year with pay and he was given that pay and certain other fringe benefits to which he is entitled, having worked for the Party for so long, and he did not go to the United States of America with one penny of any Treasury money or Government money in Barbados. I never said anything about any card carrying member, we do not recruit people to run in an election, everybody associated with us has to be qualified because the secret formula cannot be entrusted to subordinates.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. CRAIG: I think the only thing the Minister has to add if he cares to answer is about Mr. McClean. That is all. The Prime Minister said that Mr. Ward paid his expenses and all these things, but I think we are entitled to ask these questions if we hear of a Mr. Ward or a Mr. Jones on the delegation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On another point of order, the member could not have heard that Mr. Ward was a member of a delegation, he appeared in a picture with some members of the Barbados delegation and the caption of the picture said that Mr. Ward was not a member of the delegation. That was the only public notice that Mr. Ward was in New York at all, so the hon. member is being now completely and utterly perverse, because the only public mention was in the paper and it was mentioned that he was not a member of the delegation. That is suggesting that we pay passages out of the Government funds for employees of our Party.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman; the Minister said that I am completely and utterly perverse, Ask him to withdraw that, the duty of the Chair is to protect the rights of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In my estimation I do not think that the word "perverse" is unparliamentary.

Mr. CRAIG: All right, Sir, if the Prime Minister is an authority on perversion that is all right with me.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this Head at all, but I think there are various points of principle that one should make. It is an undoubted right, as the member for St. Michael West has said, for any Government to choose the people to comprise any delegation that represents its country. It is equally an undoubted right for any member of the Opposition or indeed any member of this country who is taxed to question the qualifications, to question the performance and to question the composition of that delegation. I think one of the things, Mr. Chairman, that we should try to get away from is the act of decrying people of our country from representing one another overseas, and it is in this light that I would draw to the attention, of the Government and in particular to the Hon. Prime Minister, that there are people in this country who might hold contrary political opinions but who are equally well qualified and who have the sincerity at times to make a contribution to some of these conferences in the interest of the country as a whole, and I would like further to see - and I think last time this point was got over and I hope it is not repeated - that the expenses of both the workers and the employers delegations to important international conferences are always paid by the people of this country.

I noticed the member for St. Michael West did not refer to an impasse some years ago over this very point. I think that with that in mind we could get on. The Resolution in its explanatory note has said that details of expenditure and known commitments are available. The member for St. James is entitled to ask whether certain persons were on the delegation, and if that information is quickly given I think we can pass on and get the business of the House conducted quickly. I know there must be a little bit of by-play, there must be a little bit of fun and there must be a little bit of give and take in the debate. There are some issues that are fundamental on which I will never agree with the hon. members on the other side, but I think on issues such as paying for conferences we must have some form of representation provided the amount spent is reasonable, provided we have profited - and Government can give us this assurance - provided the people chosen have the qualifications, and indeed even if they have not got academic qualifications they may well be qualified by virtue of experience and on other grounds to represent us, and once these things satisfy me, so far as I am concerned and I am sure other members of the Opposition, we will find that we will conduct this business very quickly and very swiftly, but if we get into political arguments that could be reserved for outside - I am well steeled in hearing the attacks and thrusts from outside - we will not get through our Business quickly.

5.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has occurred to me, Sir, that there is no dialogue going on between the members on the opposite side, because the member who has just sat down would have to reprimand the the member for St. James if they could discuss matters at a logical level outside.

Mr. FORDE: I was not reprimanding.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It sounded like that to me, because he is the person who has been wasting the time of the House. I think all of you should have little meetings. I heard that you have three or four different groups, but you must have meetings together and discuss your approach to the Business of the House. If you could only speak to him across the floor of the House and you do not even refer to him as the hon. member for St. James, then things are very bad. You should have a dialogue outside and let us save time in here.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be continually jumping up in this House, but I certainly know that the hon. member for St. John is a very provocative speaker. His provocation I can deal with in due course, but for the purposes of this record I should like to make it clear that the Opposition meets as a group; they discuss their business and so on. When I made the statement in here it was not intended to be any criticism of the member for St. James who has proved to be an outstanding Parliamentarian during his time in this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You were not in here, so you would not know.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, ... *(Asides)* I am being heckled.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to hear from the Mover of the Resolution what details he has of hte Conferences that are to be extended until the end of the coming financial year, and the expenses that are to be involved therein. The Addendum says, that such details are available, and I should like to get them from the Minister. We must take into consideration, Sir, the fact that we have already spent a large sum of money.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I think that I can answer that question, to some extent, for the hon, member. There are some Conferences which have not yet taken place of which we have notice here. We are now in November and there is a Sugar Cane Technologist Conference between the 31st October and the 5th November which has just passed. Mr. Jeffers and Mr. Small from the Ministry of agriculture attended that Conference. There is going on in Geneva now from the 1st of this month to the 12th a Conference on population which is being attended by the Government Statistician. There is another Conference which started two days ago for the Youth Council which will end on the 14th November. The Food And Agriculture Organisation Conference is now going on in Rome. It started on the 6th and will be extended to the 25th of this month. There is a

Conference on Research Libraries in Venezuela from the 7th to the 12th November which the Public Librarian and one of his Assistants will be attending. There is the International Civil Aviation Regional Airport Workshop in Mexico to which the Airport Manager has gone. That started yesterday, and it will last until the 12th November. To none of these that I have mentioned up to now has a Government Minister been sent. So far as the first Conference is concerned, there is a Parliamentary Secretary in Rome heading the delegation.

Now, there is the installation as Chairman of the University Grants Committee - the person responsible for University finances. I am attending the installation of the new Chancellor of the University - the first West Indian Chancellor of the University - on Saturday. *(Asides)* Yes, I am going and my wife is paying for herself. I am not even paying for her I cannot afford it. Neither the Government nor I will be called upon to pay her expenses. She was invited by the University. If they want to have equal rights, they must have equal rights to pay, too.

Then there is a Conference in Mexico, and Mr. Ernest Payne an Agricultural Officer, will attend from the 8th to the 14th of this month. That Conference deals with water resources. There is a Conference in Chile from the 8th to the 12th November, and again, Government Officers are involved. We have sent Mr. Boucher, because it is a Statistical Workshop, from the Statistician's Office. Then the member for St. Michael South Central is heading a delegation to the Regional Shipping Council, and there will be two civil servants and a gentleman from the Commercial Sector, Mr. Patterson, who will be attending that Conference. We frequently take members of the Chamber of Commerce to Conferences like Oils and and Fats, the Regional Shipping Council, and the Rice Agreement. From the 13th to the 18th November there will be a meeting in Jamaica of the Appraisals Committee of the University which the Minister of Education will be attending with his Permanent Secretary. Mr. Chairman, those are the commitments that we know of now. We do not think that there are any commitments in December, but I would not like to be dogmatic about it.

The question that Head 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 19 – Barbados Regiment – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 19 - Barbados Regiment - stand part, I should like to state that the Note is very explanatory. A supplementary provision of $1,705 is needed in order to meet the price, as agreed by the agents, for the supply of a motor vehicle. Money had been provided in the current Estimates for the purchase of a truck for the Barbados Regiment, but the provision has now shown to be inadequate. The actual price quoted by the Chief Supply Officer on the award of the tender was $12,165, but only $10,450 had been provided. There was a difference in the price, and the price was not properly quoted.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it has been many years since opportunity has been sought by hon. members or taken by the Government to indicate its policy on the Barbados Regiment. Would the Minister give some idea of how he envisages the future development of the Barbados Regiment? Members of the public and indeed at least one person who is now a member of this House have indicated that they would like to see a standing army for Barbados is one way of putting it, and another way of putting it is that the young boys should be taken off the street corners and put in a camp and given some training. All these things I have heard at one time or another; and since perhaps some colour may be lent to these things by the election to the House of a member on the other side who has expressed the same or similar sentiments, could the Government indicate whether it indicates conscription or training camps for young boys or have a standing army or any of these things?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am the Minister responsible for the Regiment. For the personal edification of the hon. member who has just sat down, I will be producing a White Paper on the reorganisation of the Barbados Regiment which not even the Cabinet has seen yet, but I have had the advice of various members of the Armed Forces of the United Kingdom and Canada on the reorganisation. We have consulted people in other independent West Indian territories and we will be producing a white paper on the reorganisation of the Regiment. I can say now that the concept of a standing army is not one which was being entertained at any stage. We have had a Committee working on this for the past two years and I hope to incorporate in the Estimates for 1972-73 all the necessary financial provision for a reconstituted and reorganised Regiment which we will have which will give some encouragement to the people who now serve in what is know as the Volunteer Force. Beyond that I am not really in a position to give any further details.

Mr. ADAMS: Would the Prime Minister say whether it will continue to be a Volunteer Force or is some principle of conscription being thought about? Even in the light of recent events of Trinidad, is he happy at the thought?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is no element of conscription. The present Volunteer Act provides for the embodiment of the Regiment on the command of the Governor-General in times of emergency.

There will be a provision - I can give a rough idea - of a headquarters company which will take over - it will not be larger than 160 if so large; it may be 96; I cannot remember the figures - all the technical services and a lot of the duties now performed by the Barbados Police Force in respect of guards at Government House and ceremonial and matters of that kind. That will be the only permanent nucleus, and I think there will be either two or three Volunteer Companies, but they will be on a much better rating than the present Regiment; and what is much more important, I am hoping to divorce the cadet service from the schools and have a cadet corp on a regional basis so that you will have one, say, in St. Peter St. Andrew/St. Lucy, another one for Christ Church two or three in Bridgetown and one may be for the east, so that boys from any school regardless of whether they are elementary school boys or secondary school boys, any boy under the age of eighteen who wants to join the cadet corps will be in a position to do so regardless of the school that he attends. These are the rough proposals.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am very happy to hear that the member for St. John is going to bring in a White Paper with reference to the present Barbados Volunteer Force. Of course from his attire alone we can see that he will be General of the Army. If I am not mistaken some time ago the Prime Minister did mention that Colonel Banfield would be appointed but I did draw to the member's attention at the time that I hoped he would leave the real powers in the hands of Lieut.-Colonel Banfield; but seeing him in recent days in his battle dress, I only hope that he does not turn out to be the Bradshaw of Barbados. I know he is a flier, ex-R.A.F. member, ex-Regiment, belonged to the cavalry and all these things; but I am one of the people who support the idea of doing anything at all that would take young people off the street corners.

Now I am very serious about this. I have advocated this on more than one occasion and it really haunts me when I look around and see the number of young boys advancing on the street corners and playing dominoes around 11 o'clock in the day.

Getting down to this truck for the Regiment, I would like to say a special word to the Prime Minister who is conducting some course at the Transport Board. I think it is a very good idea, but there is one thing I would like to be sure about; let us pay some special attention to the actual driving by those people who man Government vehicles. Some of them seem to think that because they are working with the Government that they can use the roads as they feel like, and abuse the roads. Only a couple of days ago I saw a police car - I tried to get the number of the vehicle - going into Cheapside, and I could not imagine that this was a limb of the law when I heard the screeching tryes and the laughing and dashing across the road about 4.15 in the evening. I feel that the Government should make sure that people who are given these jobs are people who have the ability to respect the pedestrians, and not because they are using Government vehicles abuse the roads and destroy the vehicles.

I was looking at the Report and I saw something like 112 accidents which we have had with Government owned vehicles. I do not consider this good enough and Government should do something about it. The Government cannot do everything. I do not expect a Minister to go and sit by the side of a man who is driving a car and tell him to change from second speed to third speed; but I believe that if they are reprimanded for their behaviour on the public roads, we would save a few dollars and also have the respect of these people who drive Government vehicles.

5.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I know you were once attached to the Ministry of Communications and Works which is now headed by the former Attorney General, and you would know what type of behaviour you get at the Ministry from the drivers and so on. They seem to think they can park anywhere and that they can use the Government-owned vehicles as they feel like. I saw some of these vehicles owned by Government carrying Government stickers and I do not think it is quite fair, but with 18 seats some of these people believe because they are driving Government vehicles they can abuse the streets as they feel like, and I would be very grateful if the Minister when he is dealing with this seminar at the Transport Board would instil in these people that they must respect pedestrians. These vehicles are owned by the people of Barbados and we cannot afford to have this abuse of these vehicles. I am going to support this Resolution, but I thought it would be in the interest of the Minister to mention this.

The question that the sum of $1,705 under Head 19 – Barbados Regiment – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 21 – Establishments Division – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman I beg to move that Head 21 stand part.

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

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

Head 25 – Ministry of Home Affairs – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, $12,000 is required to provide accommodation for an additional six Officers recruited on contract from overseas. It might be of interest to hear from the Minister exactly what type of accommodation $2,000 in a day like today is going to provide for an officer. It is a question of how long, where the officer is going to be accommodated, and the type of furniture he is going

to receive. It says basic furniture, and I wonder if any of these officers are also members of Scotland Yard who happen to be in the island at the moment, and if so, how many are members of Scotland Yard.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I was in the profession that should know about Scotland Yard, but we live and we learn and I look forward to the answer, but it is with Item 31 - Film Censorship - that I would like to deal briefly. I act as Counsel for one of the theatre chains, and I would like to apply the Immunities and Privileges Bill before it is repealed. There is something that I have advised my principals should be done, and I think that perhaps it will need the Film Censorship Board also to be advised should be done. It seems a very small point, and I know it does arouse public discontent.

Certainly at the drive-in cinemas where many children are taken, unsuitable trailers are shown before children's films. This is a complaint in every country in the world that has films, and in Great Britain the British Board of Film Censors has to sit on the trailers as well as on the films, and they give the trailers a certificate for showing to audiences when children are present. The particular film I am dealing with was one of these socio-sexual films in which the horrors of venereal disease were being illustrated - and I mean illustrated - and I gather that shortly before The Jungle Book or some other Walt Disney film they showed a French doctor examining a lady, and I gather that many parents were angry and upset at seeing this as a trailer before a children's film. I would recommend this to the Film Censorship Board, that they should ask to see what trailers are being used to advertise the films to which they give "Adults Only" certificates, because it is unfortunately that what may be thought the spiciest bits are often selected by the markets of films and run as trailers. I myself have thought that children can see that type of thing without much harm, I think the parents perhaps get more excited by it. I think that if the children see a naked woman being examined by a doctor they see it for what it is, that something is wrong with the woman and the doctor is trying to make it better, but nonetheless you cannot offend the susceptibilities of parents who carry their children out, and this is something I would ask the Minister of Home Affairs to look into.

The whole question of pornographic literature and pornographic films is becoming a matter these days different from what it was in the days when you, Sir, and when I was a child. We are a much more permissive society. I see homosexuality and other matters being advertised in magazines that come to Barbados but nonetheless the Film Censorship Board does a good job and it brings a very human approach to the films which we see. They are not unnecessarily restricted, nor I think unnecessarily permissive. I have a particular grouse, as it happens, because there was a film about the attack on Pearl Harbour which was for some reason declared not suitable for children when many other films that I think are far less suitable for children get an open certificate, but that is only in passing.

I would further ask the Minister of Home Affairs to draw this to the attention of the Film Censorship Board. We are voting more money because they have to look at more films, and I would not object to voting more money still to let them look at the trailers so that the trailers in themselves are not unnecessarily tittivating, pornographic or otherwise inappropriate for showing at open sessions where quite small children may be present.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Film Censorship Board, I wonder if it would not be a good idea for this Board to review films in the same way as they are reviewed in other countries, that is that they are marked A. B. C. and X which would designate the type of film which should be shown at a particular place at any given time.
5.30 p.m.

Quite recently there have been a number of complaints from persons who have gone to the various Cinemas in Barbados to see films which they probably, had seen in other countries. They complain about the mutilation of certain films which might be marked "A", perhaps, in Great Britain or in the United States of America, but which may have had parts in them which our Film Censorship Board may have felt should not be shown when children are admitted to the Cinemas.

According to my information, some parts have been taken out of certain films so that they would have an "A" showing, particularly in the Drive- in Cinemas. Persons who are devout Cinema-goers complain about this multilation, and I wonder whether it would be a good idea, as I said before, rather than to cut out various parts from these films, to put the onus on the parents of children and merely mark the films according to the accepted categories in other countries where persons who want to see a particular film can see it without the disruption which occur here when certain parts are taken out or whatever the case might be.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the points raised by the last two speakers have been noted and will be drawn to the appropriate Minister's attention.

So far as Item 32 - Accommodation - $12,000 is concerned, the hon. member for St. Peter has questioned the amount. The explanation is that when the origanal estimate was being prepared it was anticipated that basic items of furniture would be provided for 5 Officers to be recruited from Overseas; however, in addition to the 5 Officers budgeted for there are now 6 other Officers recruited from Overseas for whom basic furniture will have to be provided, and there has been an increase in the cost of basic furniture. I think that is the explanation the hon. member wanted.

I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

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

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

Head 33 – Meteorological Office – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 33 - Meteorological Office - standp part. In doing so, I should like to state that the Senior Meteorologist has advised that this equipment be purchased and, at his request, the Manager of the Caribbean Operations of Computer and Devices of Canada Limited submitted certain proposals regarding sale to the Government of the Automatic Picture Transmission Receiving equipment presently in operation at the Meteorological Station at Seawell. The items are all set out; the Note is fairly explanatory, and the Government has decided to acquire this equipment as certain savings would be effected and it would be more economical, at this stage, to acquire the equipment than to hire it at a fairly expensive rate.

I beg to move that Head 33 - Meteorological Office - stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this Government or any Government passing any large sums of money which would ensure the safety of its citizens, particularly in a country like ours where we are always in fear of having some storm or something to affect our lives. But what I am particularly worried about is the expensive machines which these gentlemen at Seawell are acquiring and the bad inefficient reports which are being put out day after day.

Mr. Chairman, any plantation owner, any plantation overseer, and I have been able to predict the weather in Barbados better than the reports which are given out from Seawell from day after day. I remember a few weeks ago we heard about overcast shadows, thundery rain, and the sun shone down at 85° fahrenheit for the whole day. Mr. Chairman, the following day we heard of a sunny day, and from seven o'clock in the morning the rain was pouring. Yesterday we had practically a flood in Bridgetown, and there was no report coming from Seawell of what was to come.

I have telephoned the Meteorological Office myself, and I have heard: "We have just got in a satellite picture." It was read to me of rain in the afternoon, but in the afternoon it was sunny and bright. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, it is no use having..... expensive machines if the people who operate them do not understand what they are doing. I have come to the conclusion, and I have said in this House before, that if you go to New York there is at least one Radio Station there which gives the weather conditions in Barbados every day. It is amazing to think that the weather reports which comes out of Seawell, and which are practically 90% inaccurate day after day, are given in New York where we in Barbados are depending on tourists to come to sunny Barbados. *(Interruption.)* I think that is the Pope behind there, Sir.

Mr. Chairman; We have no Popes around here.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, there are no Popes in here, but there is a Pope behind there praying. I am saying that I do not know the reason for the method in which the weather reports are given out at Seawell. I have come to a personal conclusion that the weather reports from Seawell are either meant for people in satellites up there, or for some other purpose other than for people on the land in Barbados. Every day you hear about cloudy and overcast - cloudy and overcast with possible thundery showers. Now, nobody is going to leave New York in the midst of Winter to come to Barbados with a cloudy and overcast sky and thundery showers. As unimportant as it may appear to those at Seawell, my personal belief is that such reports affect the lives of each and every one of us. We have bad reports which cannot tell us from day to day what is going on; bad reports which deter tourists from coming to this country; and it is time that this Government takes a look at the reports coming out from Seawell.

Mr. Chairman, we have to think of St. Joseph, the Bus Stand, and I now understand that the floods are affecting Cave Hill. The people listen to the weather reports in Puerto Rico they will tell you at a given time what to expect. You can listen to the weather report in England; they will tell you that snow will fall at one o'clock in the day, and by half-past one you will get a snow flurry, but in Barbados it is useless listening to the weather report.

As I have said, I do not mind voting money for expensive machines, if the machines are going to be put to a use which is beneficial to the people. But what is the sense of voting money to purchase these expensive machines, when day after day you are getting reports that do not merit the sums of money being spent by this Government? I wish that the Minister responsible will look into the question of weather forecasting in Barbados and let the standard be improved by the time the Government comes back here for another machine or immediately.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, what I would seriously urge on the Government is that they institute not only a weather-reporting system to tell us what weather is arriving in Barbados, but that they give people some idea of what is actually going on in the Island in terms of traffic conditions when flooding affects the Island. I can talk about flooding, as the hon. member for St. Michael South West knows, for hours.

5.40 p.m.

Barbados may not be the worst. It took me seven hours to drive sixty miles in Trinidad as a result of floods, but that convinced me that we must have the same sort of service they have there. If I had listened to the Trinidad radio a little better, I would not have been caught on the wrong side of a river that was rising and was not expected to go down for twelve hours or something like that. Yesterday in Bridgetown there were serious conditions and traffic was

stuck solid as far as I could see from 4 o'clock until 4.30 p.m. because of flooding. There should be somebody charged with the responsibility of telling the Met office what is happening here in Bridgetown. The Met office gets pictures from satellites but no policeman can pick up a telephone and ring the Met office and say that Constitution road is flooded, warn motorists not to drive along there. *(Asides)* I am glad to hear that somebody in Barbados is charged with that responsibility. It should be done. (CHAIRMAN: It was done yesterday.) It was done yesterday? I heard a little bit of Rediffusion, but it should be a regular thing in Barbados that if rain water is affecting roads, people should be told what roads are being affected and what road to take to get away from them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that this type of equipment which we have is new to the area, and I was also advised that we have five officers overseas in training who will be back here between June and July next year. The piece of equipment is new to the operators there and there is another problem in respect of getting your weather readings from the Atlantic. Now the hon. member for St. Joseph tried to compare weather bulletins and so on in Barbados with those in the United States, but it is to be understood and remembered that in the United States there are some 100 weather stations and these are reporting continually. We have one here and when weather develops east of us it is extremely difficult for us to get the appropriate readings, and what we have to depend on here are reports twice a day coming in from ships on the conditions in the Atlantic. This bit of equipment which we have here has been previded for this purpose, but let us face it: our men are not equipped. We have five officers in training and we hope that when they arrive in June that we will not have this type of complaint. We are aware of the problem and we are trying to improve the position, and we hope to have an improved meteorological service by June or July next year.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I must say I cannot accept that. I know the Minister is given a statement which most probably has been fed to him which he is not competent neither am I to dispute; but if the Minister would go back and look in records up to ten or twelve years ago, he will find that before we had the elaborate system of weather forecasting in Barbados, weather forecasts were nearly accurate as I can remember when I used to work on a plantation. Mr. Chairman, anybody in St. Philip can go outside and point and tell you when rain is going to fall. I remember the floods from Janet. When the manager of Three Houses could read his barometer and tell us what was going on here, the the weather station was giving contrary reports; but he was right. I remember I was at Groves as an officer when the weather station told you that the storm would strike at 2 o'clock and Mr. Reece said that by 11.30 a.m. the storm would strike Barbados, and it struck about 11.35 a.m. *(Asides)* I am not listening to the asides about the satellite because it shows something quite different. We are supposed to be far east of the chain of Islands which guard the Americas. It is said that the weather planes fly off from Barbados because we are in a more favourable position to know what happens there before anybody else, but we get the reports last, and I can tell the Minister that he cannot go back in the records since September last year and come out with any prediction from that station which has held good.

I therefore join with the hon. member for St. Thomas that I would like to see two forms of weather broadcasts in Barbados: one that they do now with cloudy and overcast skies they can keep for the aircraft coming in, but I would like to see them institute a system in which they would tell people what ground level atmosphere is like, sunny and bright on the roads, and not this overcast skies when people walking the streets can see one mile down the road. As I said, if that is meant for aircraft coming in, let it be broadcast to aircraft, or preface it with "weather stable for aircraft", but let people who are coming here for a holiday and people who are walking the streets and going out know what the weather is outside at ground level.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can remember this A.P.T equipment was installed when I held some responsibility for meteorology about three or four years ago, and I do have some smattering knowledge of it, enough I would say to make a little contribution to the debate this afternoon. The important thing to remember is that there is no precise or exact science of forecasting. We must begin on this premise. I remember last year when I was in the United States which is probably the greatest and most highly developed technological country in the world, the forecast was for sunshine, and that whole day was a completely chilly day and a day full of drizzling rain. When I was in the United Kingdom we hav had similar kinds of forecasts. In other words the charges that have been made by the speakers can be universal because there is no precise science. What we have at Seawell as far as I can recall is a bit of equipment that gives a picture every time the satellite passes over which I think is three or four times a day, showing the cloud formation over a wide area and as it passes over the second or third time we can see the movement of the clouds by comparing it with earlier pictures. The meteorologists read the pictures that are transmitted and are able to forecast not with complete accuracy what to expect over a period These pictures as far as I know do not give wind velocity. We get wind velocity by the speed of the wind in Barbados. It does not measure the wind velocity in the area given by the picture either. There can be some guage from these since in reading the pictures you can see the movement of the clouds from one picture to another, but the important thing to remember, Mr. Chairman, is that this is the kind of charge - I do not mean the one mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition of not getting any communication of what the conditions are like, say, in Bridgetown under foloded conditions - that will remain for a long time yet because no one has yet been able to devise any system of accurate predictions of weather conditions.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I wonder if the member for St. Michael North West would tell us what percentage accuracy they have had for the last three years, because when the member goes on to say that nobody can forecast with any accuracy, what is going to happen? I would say it is with the people who are trying to forecast cannot read, they are not sufficiently knowledgeable of what is going on in the pictures, otherwise if one follows the argument quite closely, the pictures of cloud movement, they collect their wind velocity from somewhere, there, must be a co-ordinating factor somewhere that you put the three together to determine something, and there must be some percentage of accuracy, you cannot be always wrong, because if you are always wrong, do away with the system. This is what is happening in Barbados, they are always wrong.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am concerning myself with the money, not with the rain, wind nor cloud We are asked to vote $11,200 to buy this equipment. The last paragraph of the note tells us that the equipment is presently on lease, it has been since 1976 and that it would be economical to continue the lease. The equipment is reported to be in good condition, and I would like to learn from the Minister whose report is this that it is in good condition. The note goes on to say that as a precautionary measure arrangements will be made to have it checked further. The equipment is in good condition, you have decided to stop leasing, it does not pay any longer to lease, you have made up your mind to buy; why is it necessary, if you have confidence in the report that it is in good order, why is it necessary to have it checked further.

This last paragraph, Mr. Chairman, casts some doubt on all that has been said here, and particularly since we have heard from the hon. member for St. Michael North West. It would be of interest, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can tell us about the checking of this machinery, and we understand that it was installed some three or four years ago. It is not know whether its performances has been satisfactory up to the moment, because the results coming therefrom by what has been put forward here today, nobody can say have been unsatisfactory, because there can be no doubt that the men who man the machines are not going to accept all the blame. I nelieve if some of them were to hear what the hon. member for St. Andrew has had to say they would like to blow him sky high. I appreciate the fact that we have five officers in training, and that is a good thing, and that they are due back home in July next year. The sooner they come the better, but if we were to look at this no doubt the exercise is one which to my mind calls on any Government to bring to bear or bring into focus the technical assistance programme from which much benefit I think has been derived, and I am to wonder if any attempts have been made in that respect to get the service of any officer to man the station so as to assist or even until our trained men come home, or to assist the present staff who have been trying their best under these most trying conditions. I feel that this is something that stands out as against many another programme which had the benefit of officers under the scheme, and I would certainly like to hear from the Minister what he has to say on this point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the cost of the equipment, we are currently paying $400 (Canadian) monthly as rental for this equipment. We can pay for this equipment in less than two years. What we pay in two years would be more than the present cost of the equipment. The equipment is in good working condition, and if we instal new equipment I am advised that this could cost about $70,000. The equipment which is there now has been checked by the Officers in the Department of Meteorology, and I am advised by the Chief Meteorological Officer that it is in first-class condition. It has been subjected to monthly maintenance and we need the equipment, so it is cheaper to purchase the equipment than to rent it at the present rate. $400 (Canadian) monthly is $4,800 (Canadian) per annum and in two years' time we would have paid out of rentals for equipment, so why not purchase it for $11,000? It is a question of the initial cost of the equipment, and the point is that the equipment is only three years old. If we were to acquire new equipment now we would have to look for $70,000. I have here now the quotation for the new type of equipment, and it is $70,000 to have it installed. This one is installed already, it is in operation, we have used it for three, we have men in training who are more or less specialing on this type of equipment. The equipment is new to the men who are currently operating it; those who are in training are being trained with special emphasis to operate this equipment, and I think that the offer of the equipment is reasonable. We need it, and despite what has been said on the other side about incompetence and so on, the only solution I see possible is to put the hon. member who has been criticising the department so much to do the work and see if he can do it better, We have sent people to be trained to operate this equipment, and what is unfortunate with some of us is that some laymen think that they know more than the people who are equipped to do a certain job.

6.00 p.m.

As the Hon. Minister of Labour who was responisble for Meteorological Affairs has pointed out, you can talk about the United States and Timbuktu, but the fact remains that none is infallible. As far as we are concerned, we are satisfied that the equipment is worth the money and it would be a saving to the Government to acquire it. That is why we have come to the Legislature to ask for the funds to acquire the equipment.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I now remember a little more of what really took place in this matter. The Government is now causing the taxpayers to reap an ill wind that the Government sowed three to four years ago. An English firm had offered to set up this equipment free of cost and to train staff free, but the Government at the time opted for this Canadian equipment. After renting it for so long, the

decision is now taken to buy it. This equipment is highly specialised and very technical equipment. The more technical the equipment the shorter its life or its life span or performance. We cannot now deny that we are buying second-hand equipment. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: "For second-hand money".) We are buying it, the Minister says, "For second-hand money", Sir. He said that in an aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not hear asides. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: I do not know what you are hearing, Sir. We are paying second-hand money for it, but we must tell ourselves that the best of its life is already gone. In the light of the money we have already paid for rent, the owners are satisfied that they have been more than paid over the three or four-year period over and above what they could have sold it for three or four years ago. What you find is that the manufacturers have now reached a stage where this type of equipment is becoming outdated, and they are unloading it on the Barbados taxpayer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, It was not the request or the proposal of the owners of the equipment for us to acquire the equipment. It was our proposal, because we felt that it would be uneconomic to continue to hire the equipment when we could purchase it for $11,000. As I have pointed out, we would pay for the equipment in rentals at the present price at which we are buying it in two years. The point is that we offered to acquire the equipment, rather than they offering to off-load any equipment. Let us get our facts correctly.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Government, three or four years ago when they embarked on this project initially, would have put into operation every effort to get full information so as to put them in a position to know whether it was better to offer to buy outright from the beginning, or to embark on a rental of $400(Canadian) per month. I believe that the Government or any Government would have done that. Any Government would have tried to find out the cost of the equipment. It is after this three or four-year period that the Government feels that this amount of money is too much to continue paying; let us try and have this lease terminated, and see if we can buy the equipment. As I have said it was second-hand machinery, and the Minister has said, "At a second-hand price."

Mr. Chairman, my view is that the time may soon come when the Government will have to look for replacements for some parts of the equipment which we are now asked to buy for $11,200. My feeling is that we will be told by the Canadian Manufacturers: "This is no longer manufactured; we have moved into another age." The Government will be having second-hand equipment, bought at a second-hand price having got less than half of a second life out of the machinery. That is what I am warning the Government against.

Nothing I may do or say can prevent the Government from going ahead, but when one reads what is written in the last paragraph of the Note one must conclude that even the Government are not at the present moment satisfied that all would be well in paying the $11,200. They say: "The equipment is reported to be in good condition." If it is in good condition and you know that it will meet your requirements and the price is good, then you can buy it.
6.10 p.m.

The Government is telling us that good conditions and a good price will meet their requirements, but as a further precaution they will have a further examination carried out. What for? It is already good.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think the hon. member for St. Peter cannot do any arithmetic because if he could just do his mathematics properly he would see that the Government is saving over $20,000, and the next point is that at first they were leasing the equipment and paying rent for it. If they intend to buy the equipment now, it must be checked. We must ask that the equipment be checked since it is absolutely necessary, and I do not see any point in talking and wasting time. I think it is about time that we got down to the people's business and do what we can do and stop talking nonsense. *(Cheers)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that as we go on, those who enter battle will be prepared to bear the battle scars. Let us continue with the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am asking.

Mr. HINDS: My arithmetic, Mr. Chairman, is too simple apparently for some people to understand because it is based on commonsense. What was wrong four years ago? *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask all hon. members in this Chamber when any hon. member is on his feet addressing the Chair to observe Standing Order No. 29(6). All other persons must be absolutely silent or speak in undertones. I am asking the Chamber to adhere to this.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe you have just mentioned Standing Order No. 29(6), but I also remember that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew in the last Parliament had said that in this Assembly where the people's business must be conducted with a certain amount of decorum, it is in keeping with the Chair that a certain amount of latitude and longitude be given to the members, and therefore while I am not questioning your ruling at all, I am too insignificant and unlearned to do that, all I am saying is that asides between members as such, as long as they do not interrupt the business in hand or the debate are not really out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to understand that I am the person to decide that and not him.

Mr. BOLDEN: I would never deny that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will sit and let us carry on.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that four years ago before the Government decided to lease this equipment at $400 Can. per month, the Government would have looked around to see from what source it could have paid this money. What could have gone wrong now, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is backing down from this? All we are asking the Government to do if it is satisfied as to the condition of the equipment and that it is worth $11,200 is to go ahead and purchase it, but pray that they do not have to come back sooner or later for a sum far greater than $11,200 to buy replacements for the same equipment to keep it running. That is what we are warning against.

Mr. BOLDEN: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister responsible will tell us what a 1971 model of this automatic public transmission receiving system would cost the Government.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have already said that it would cost $70,000.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would not consider it more appropriate in the light of the developments which are forecast for this country to order a new machine that would give us some accurate forecasting rather than to pay this money. Quite recently there has been an argument between certain members of the public and certain members of the Government about weather forecasting and the precise time in which the farmer can go about his business in order to increase his productivity at a given time of the year, and, Mr. Chairman, those of us who live in the country districts and dabble in farming know fully well that you cannot put seeds in the ground at certain times. The Ministry of Agriculture is opposed to the new scientific methods of getting plants in the ground at a given time to produce crops at given times, and I wonder if the Ministry would not think it appropriate if the new machine will give us long-term benefits - I do not mean two or three years and then come back for replacements, to acquire the new machine rather than this second-hand machine for second hand money.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture is satisfied that this machine is satisfactory and that is what the Minister of Agriculture or meteorologist will see is bought.

The question that Head 33 – Meteorological Office – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.20 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971 - 72, No. 9

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of $15,726 out of the Consolidated Fund to be placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 11 - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates. In moving the passing of this Resolution I would say that the explanation to some extent is given in the Addendum but I will try to explain it more fully.

The Bursar of the University of the West Indies, Jamaica, submitted a claim of £3,276.4s.6d. or $15,725.88 which is payable by this Government in respect of expenditure incurred on Capital Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes at the University of the West Indies. The position is that since Barbados has attained independence it has to bear its proportionate share, and the proportionate share has been calculated at 7% and 36% respectively in the following two categories:

(i) Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme which at 30th November, 1966 had unexpended balances, namely; - the University of the West Indies' allocation to which the British Government contributed 20%, Jamaica 42% and Trinidad and Tobago 38%; and

(ii) The grant for the Barbados College of Arts and Science to which the British Government contributed 100%.

In order, however, that the Barbados Government should not lose the money for which it would have qualified had it remained eligible for Colonial Development and Welfare assistance, the British Government has agreed to reimburse the expenditure payable by this Government.

The total expenditure of both categories mentioned above for the period 1st December, 1966 to 31st July, 1969 was $639,449.38. Of this sum an amount of $393,225.46 was provided by Parliament by Resolution No. 20 of 1968. Relating to the period 1st December, 1966 to 31st July, 1967 an amount of $230,498.04 was provided by Resolution No. 17 of 1969. Relating to the period 1st December, 1966 to 31st July, 1968 for both schemes there is a balance of $15,725.88 which remains to be paid and is divided into two categories -

(i) £. 470.18s.2d. or $ 2,020.34
(ii) £ 2,855. 6s.5d. or $13,705.54

making a total of $15,725.88. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr.Chairman, I would like to enquire from the Minister if there is any amount due since 31st July, 1969.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The position is, Sir, that according to the assessment by the University of the West Indies, the total expenditure for both categories of schemes for the period 1st December, 1966 to 31st July, 1969 was $639,449.38. Of this sum an amount of $393,225.46 was provided by Parliament by Resolution No. 20 of 1968. Relating to the period 1st Decem-

ber, 1966 to 31st July, 1967 an amount of $230,498.04 was provided by Resolution No. 17 of 1969. Relating to the period 1st December, 1966 to 31st July, 1968 for both schemes there is a balance of $15,725.88. That is the explanation. The British High Commissioner has confirmed that the sum of $15,725.88 is agreed, and the Government has been requested to pay this sum to the University of the West Indies at Mona, Jamaica and submit a claim for reimbursement to the United Kingdom.

The question that the sum of $15,726 under Head 104 – Education, Part 11 – Capital, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Provided I receive the consent of the Leader of the Opposition and his members, it may be that we could deal with the Resolution in connection with the Independence Celebrations at this stage if hon. members are ready, or we could report progress and come back to that later.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I should inform the Leader of the House that certain hon. members, the hon. member for St. Peter for example, informs me that he got his Resolution at 19 minutes past 11 o'clock. I got mine this evening, although that is perhaps for reasons peculiar to my movements today. Nonetheless since we are not opposing the principle of independence celebrations, and I gather that certain hon. members on both sides of the House will be featuring in them, we will deal with it now. It has been drawn to my attention by the hon. member for St. Peter that the Prime Minister did say he would have circulated this two weeks ago. Perhaps the Leader of the House could give us some explanation as to why it was not so circulated. While we are in Committee, we can deal with this, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as to why the Resolution was only circulated today.....
6.30 p.m.

the explanation, Sir, is that we were trying to get it out late last night or yesterday, and although we did our very best we did not actually get it out until early this morning. There was an undertaking that it would be dealt with today, because we had asked the Opposition to be prepared to deal with this Resolution today. I apologise for the Resolution being a little late. The principle has now been agreed on on several occasions in the past, and it is merely a question of the items which will fall to be dealt with seriatim. Some of the items may be approved by the Opposition and other items may not be approved. At this stage, I should like to mention that we would like the amount reduced to $89,291. That is a reduction of $10,000. If hon. members will look at paragraph 3 (a).....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Is the Minister starting the Resolution, Sir? I thought he was giving an explanation as to the cause of the delay.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as I can remember, the Leader of the Opposition asked about the reason for the delay, and he said that the Resolution could be dealt with. That is my understanding.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Leader of the Opposition asked the Leader of the House to give the reason why the Resolution was not circulated until today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He also said that since we are in Committee of Supply it could be dealt with.

Mr. HINDS: I do not think the Minister has been able to give us the reason for the delay. All I heard the Minister say is that he was trying to get it out yesterday, but he did not get it out until this morning. Bearing in mind that we have a more equipped Civil Service that we had before, what could have gone wrong? At the last sitting of the House the Prime Minister promised that he would do his best to get it in the hands of the hon. members before we met today, so that we would have had time to study it and deal with it today. I am sure that when the Prime Minister was speaking he was not thinking in terms of putting it in our hands today.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Are we now dealing with the Resolution, or are we dealing with permission to deal with the Resolution? If the hon. member is dealing with the Resolution, then he will have to confine himself to the Resolution. If he is not dealing with the Resolution, then what he is saying is null and void. What are we dealing with?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, The Hon. Leader of the Opposition had intimated and agreed that the Resolution should be dealt with, and he asked for an explanation as to why it was circulated so late. I attempted to give him an explanation in accordance with facts. It was not a fabricated explanation, but that is all the explanation I can give based on facts. We tried to get it out yesterday afternoon, but we could not manage it. I know that it is not a good explanation, but what else could I tell you?

Mr. Chairman, there are certain changes which took place. In para. 3(a) the President of Costa Rica and his party comprised of his wife, his Foreign Secretary, Foreign Minister and Body Guard will not be attending. Even now the Resolution has to be amended and reduced by the sum of $10,000. That gives you an example of the preparation of this Resolution, and some of the reasons for it being delayed.

Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out:-

An amount of $100,000 was provided in the current Estimates at Item 18, Independence Celebrations, under Head 16 - Prime Minister's Office (2) General to meet the expenses of the afore-mentioned celebrations. A sum of $15,832 has been expended from Item 18 to meet the cost of three (3) marquees for use at Independence Celebrations and appropriate functions. A sum of $84,168 is therefore available to meet expenditure on the celebrations.

There are numerous proposals for the Independence Celebrations which include:

(a) the decoration and illumination of certain Government buildings and institutions as well as prominent streets and sites controlled by the Parks and Beaches Commission;

(b) the holding of Independence Games under the auspices of the Barbados Olympic Association: the Games will feature Cycling, Football, Track and Field events and Judo;

(c) community activities in the form of Athletic and Aquatic Games at twenty (20) sites as well as displays, Talent shows, dancing and Band concerts;

(d) A Reception at the Prime Minister's residence as well as Receptions to be held by Overseas Missions;

(e) a Ceremonial Parade at the National Stadium on the morning of Independence Day, Tuesday, 30th November, 1971 by the Barbados Regiment, the Royal Barbados Police Force and the Barbados Cadets with un-armed units represented.

(f) the provision of special fare and entertainment for inmates of Government institutions such as Hospitals;

(g) a special grant of $2.00 per person to all recipients of National Assistance and to all Old Age Pensioners;

(h) cultural and entertainment programmes for twenty (20) Housing Estates including awards for Garden Competitions, Art and Craft Exhibitions and a competition for the Re-naming of Housing Estates;

(i) the purchase of poultry, animals, etc., for the encouragement of hobbies among one hundred (100) juvenile probationers;

(j) a Music and Drama Festival organised by the Community Development Division of the Ministry of Education and Community Development;

(k) a cricket match between Parliamentarians and a Youth Team.

I suppose that the Parliamentarians will be more agile than the young brigade.

(l) provision for contingencies.

Provision was made, Sir, for the President of Costa Rica and his entourage, but that has been taken out and the amount in the Resolution has been reduced by $10,000. The President has sent us a cable to the effect that the Costa Rican Ambassador regrets that current domestic problems make it impossible for President and Foreign Minister to accept an invitation at this time, but hopes that it will materialise some time in the future. This cable was received only yesterday.
6.40 p.m.

That gives a breakdown of the various items which Government has in mind and which will be organised in order to celebrate these festivities. We are trying to do a better job than we did on previous occasions, and I think it is only fitting that our celebrations which did not take place last year owing to numerous reasons should be well organised on this occasion, and we look forward to the whole-hearted support and cooperation not only of members of the Opposition but of the entire community.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I see that the faithfuls are to be rewarded for their attendance at the polls on September 9 and in the weeks before hand, therefore the Prime Minister will be having a reception at which the canvassers of the Democratic Labour Party will be, no doubt, thoroughly and convincingly drowned in taxpayers' liquor on Independence Day. I do not grudge it for them. If we were there we would have done the same thing. There is a vote there and I am sure Mr. St. John would have done the same thing in the opposite direction; but let us recognise things for what they are. *(Asides)* In St. Thomas we are having certain independence celebrations of our own and such minor celebrations as the Leader of the Opposition had outside were, if you recall, held to wine and dine the members of the Government because I think that 90% of the guests were certainly members of the Government. It is automatic that 80% must be supporters of the Democratic Labour Party since I asked all the members of Parliament and the Senate; but that is only in passing.

I see that all recipients of national insurance and old age pensioners will get $2.00 and, the housing areas are getting something. It is about the housing estates and housing areas that I would like to speak particularly. I believe other hon. members on my side may be drawing the attention of the House to certain more constructive suggestions than any that appear in the circulated Resolution. But in respect of the housing estates I want to go back to the old faithful, that is, the playing field at Redman's Village and the pavilion which Mr. Boxill took down because he was not getting such good response there. I say that without fear or anything. *(Asides)* As somebody said, I should not worry with that, I should have respect for the dead; so I would not go too far into that. I would like to ask the Minister who is responsible - I do not really know if it is the Minister responsible for Sport or the Minister of Communications and Works or who - to have the new pavilion ready for the end of the month because when the new pavilion started Mr. Boxill and, I believe, the Minister of Agriculture went there and promised to be ready in six weeks. Give the youths of Redman's Village their re-

ward. Never mind they gave me a majority despite all the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture, they still managed to vote for the Barbados Labour Party. *(Asides)* I wish I could hear that aside; I believe it would be amusing; it is certainly making its maker laugh. Have the pavilion in the Bagatelle housing area finished, and while we are on the question or renaming of housing estates, I would honestly suggest to the Minister of Housing - I do not know if this is in his mind, but perhaps he will tell us in a word - to let us get away from the name "housing area" and "landing scheme". The way the note reads it is just renaming of housing estates. As it stands, you could be renaming the Bagatelle housing estate "Redman's Village Housing Estate" or whatever it is. *(Asides)* I certainly was not listening to the meetings held by the other side deliberately. I went through Arch Hall when the Minister of Agriculture set the boys on me and helped me to get my seat back in the House as a result. I am glad to hear that that is coming into force.

You know, there is something about housing estates in Barbados. They are really very untidy places. There is no doubt about that, and all too often those who administer the estates place the blame for their untidiness on the people who live there. Now you see the difference between a housing estate such as The Farm and some of the others, because The Farm is an area where houses are close together and they have been laid out properly, the roads are slightly better class roads. You can afford to do that. These are days when the revenue of the Government is $100 million and with all the $100 million you cannot build even half the houses that Ronald Mapp could build when the Government's revenue was $25 million we could still build twice as many houses as you built and despite ten years of power and of having the Housing Authority when the Barbados Labour Party only had it for six, we still built more houses in those six years with a smaller revenue than the Government has built in ten; so do not come with anything about that is since you are the Minister. Go and look up your own reports if you doubt the figures. From 1955-1961. The Housing Authority was created in 1955 and more houses were built between 1955 and 1961 than between 1961 and 1971; so let us get on with the Resolution.

Many of the housing areas are untidy because the roads are not properly maintained. The spaces between the houses were never properly laid out. There is a lot of untidiness, bush and grass. The houses were painted but very little effort was made to deal with the surroundings of the houses. Some houses are nicely surrounded, the houses in Parkinson Field in the Pine for instance, but at Redman's Village the first thing that anybody sees is a big untidy area on the corner, a dump, up and down bush and old rock and the foolishness that is thrown there, and a Government yard-fowl living right next door to it and helping to contribute to the foolishness that is thrown there instead of trying to use his position with the ear of the Government as he then had. *(Asides)* I mean Carmichael. Mrs. Carmichael nominated Boxill and then I saw her turn up there as a presiding officer at a polling station.

I am glad to see this programme for garden competition and art and craft exhibitions. I am now worried about the art and craft exhibition. I would like the Government to look at one like Redman's Village, take it in hand, put up a nice pavilion and level the playing field. We have been trying to get the playing field levelled ever since the Democratic Labour Party has been in power. This is ten years of effort and you should bring it to fruition. Clean up the approach from the road. For some reason all the little ancillary roads are let down into the gutter in such a way that a vehicle cannot even get up. Improve the road, improve the drainage and make the place look nice. A garden competition is not going to make it look nice because there is too much waste ground that it is nobody's responsibility to keep tidy and make look nice.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to find out from the hon. member when Redman's Village playing field was established.

Mr. ADAMS: Do you mean to say the Minister has been a Minister of Housing and does not know when Redman's Village playing field was established? I could understand that from the present Minister of Housing, but not a Minister who took such interest in housing when he was the Minister responsible. I would really ask very much for a programme of making the housing areas look nice. If $1 million could be spent on painting, let some money be spent in this direction. Ask the Parks and Beaches Commission for its expertise. Look what good work the Parks and Beaches Commission is doing in some places! If something is to be admired, you have to admire it. Many people looked at the Parks and Beaches Commission when it started and said that they were employing all the canvassers for the hon. member for St. Michael-West, but as it happens, whoever it is they are employing, they are employing them to some purpose.
6.50 p.m.

Ask the Parks and Beaches Commission to take a look at the Housing Areas and look about at how to improve the spaces between the houses and the open spaces adjacent. The hon. member for St. James and I took a trip up to the Pine to look at that beautiful playing field and pavilion which was put there by the Barbados Labour Party, and all we could see there were broken bottles, etc., *(Asides)*. Bring your files back and see. This has been canvassed before in here and it was agreed; the place the controversy was about was Trents.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the pavilion in the Pine was built I think around 1964-65, together with the one at Grazettes, by the Democratic Labour Party, and it is on that principle that

we are now building the one at Redman's Village, but what was in the Pine was a little children's playground where we have just established the home for the elderly citizens.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, it was during the time I happened to be Minister of Housing. We did not only build the community centre at the Pine but also the one at Grazettes.

Mr. ADAMS: The one that we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, is the one the hon. member for St. James and I looked at either when we were not members of the House or were very early members of it. If there are two pavilions, as one member suggested the children's playing field, it may well be that all sides are right in this matter. I would like to know how money is assigned to this one at Item (h), and I would also like to know how much money is assigned to (b), the Prime Minister's reception. I have nothing against this, I would like to know the scale upon which the yardfowls will be given their corn to peck.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two points I should like to make on this Resolution, and I will take what I consider the major point first, and that is a point of principle. This is the fifth birthday of an independent Barbados, and to me it is a very important time. We are entering into the sixth year, and I think the time has long since past when we should be hearing from the Government as a mere policy statement that it is their intention to abolish the system of Imperial Honours and to institute for this country its own independent system of honours. In my opinion this country should not go into any further years of independence unless it establishes its own system of honours for the reward of people and the recognition of people, regardless of political affiliations, who have given outstanding service to this country. There are quite a few people whom I would have expected at this independence celebration that we should even posthumously be honouring in our country. I can think particularly as Jamaica has done for their Cuffey, it is about time we recognise our Bussa and our Franklyn, and likewise it is time we recognise in this country the contribution of people like Sir Herbert Greaves and to a lesser extent Sir Conrad Reeves, although they have all gone.

I would like also to mention that it is time we recognise some other people, some who have long passed out of this House, but who have made a contribution nonetheless, people like Sir Grantley Adams, and I should hope that when the time comes for renaming these Housing Areas, when the time comes for having some proper system of making our young people and the people of this country recognise that we have had our heroes, that it will not be done on a partisan basis, and I want to make this absolutely clear, that it will not be done either on a racial basis, because it is too easy in this country nowadays for people not to recognise that we have a history and had a history ever since the settlement and not simply in 1961, although 1961 underscores the very independence that Barbadians have always prided themselves in having, in spirit if indeed not in law, and it is for this reason that I take this opportunity of reminding the Government of its statement emanating from the Hon. Minister of External Affairs in some respects, and from the Prime Minister in other respects, that Imperial Honours would have gone for some time.

I do not believe that there is a system of honours in foreign countries that we should completely prevent our citizens from holding. Some of these are meritorious awards, some of them are done on the basis of comity, but certainly we need - and I hope the Government will take this point - I think it is the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs and the Hon. Prime Minister whose Ministries are responsible for these matters, also the Minister of Education, and I hope this point will be taken and that I will see some sort of token vote for a competition to set out the types and the names and the nomenclature of the honours which we will award in this country in recognition of the service of our outstanding citizens and our outstanding heroes. That is the major point I think which arises on this Resolution.

I am learning quickly, Mr. Chairman, I hope, and I believe it is usual for members to beg for their particular areas. I am not begging with any cap in hand, but let me state that Pleasant Hall in St. Matthias Housing Area where I spent so many years is a well kept Housing Area, despite the presence of a few Dems in the Housing Area. It is so well kept that even the Dems there are my good friends, and they have a pride in the area although it is not as elaborately set out as the area in St. Michael West where the hon. member has the privilege to represent, yet we have some of the most beautiful gardens, but there is a problem. We have tremendous flooding in that area and therefore I should wish to see that at this time when we are talking about renaming the Housing Areas that attention will be given to the flooding which is occurring in Pleasant Hall Housing Area. Although we are going to entertain various people and have cultural and entertainment programmes specifically in the Housing Areas, there is a large mass of the population at Britton's Hill, particularly Bonnetts Area, who deserve a Housing Area and who deserve a celebration, and I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will join me in this.
7.00 p.m.

Furthermore, we have no pavilion in our area, so I cannot stress the point of a pavilion. I should like to see some recognition given to clubs like Springfield; the club in Bay Land, and the club at Britton's Hill who have done a tremendous job in keeping the young people on an even keel. Although we cannot have a pavilion in the housing area for them an effort should be made to up-date the facilities at the Garrison Pasture where the toilet facilities at the old Polo Hut are shocking. When the members of the clubs finish cricket they cannot even exchange a drink or words of civility between them, and I should like to see some provision made for things like that.

The final point I am going to make on this is that there is a strong case for a housing area, a pavilion,

and improved roads in Bonnetts over Crane's Pasture which will satisfy both the member for St. Michael South, the member for St. Michael South East the member for St. Michael South Central and myself. I am sandwiched between them, Sir, but I am speaking seriously on their behalf. In this area, I should like to say that there is one head of this vote which I think each one of us should vote for without a doubt. I refer to the head which provides something for the recipients of National Assistance and Old Age Pensions. I am not doing this on the basis of getting quick political plumage or rewards. I speak for my constituents; this is a general thing, but I believe that any country which is happy about the progress that is being made - do not make any mistake about it; we sometimes get too partisan and do not recognise that this country has made progress. It has made progress, and it has done so not only from 1961 but prior to 1961. Indeed, it has made tremendous progress in the last 3, 4 and 5 decades of its history. If we have made this progress, we must not only remember our old people at the time of Independence but we must try, as the Hon. Prime Minister has said before, I think, in the Throne Speech, and hurry on to the stage where we have a proper system of National Assistance and Old Age Pensions.

I know that the Government has outlined a Comprehensive Programme for the next five years, but that Programme has not yet been debated in this House. I would appeal to the Government to make this not only a birthday present to Old-Aged people, but to bring down legislation rapidly even if it has to seek the assistance of the United Nations or other agencies - we have West Indians here who can do this - in this very urgent study. I am sure that those of us who have just come from the hustings, particularly, and those of us who have done charitable work for several years will know that our old people today are the people most in need in this community and sometimes are the people most forgotten.

I am not going to talk about any yard fowls. I do not believe in that sort of thing, although it is said on this side and hurled across from the other side. People have their political convictions, but if there are old persons, regardless of their political allegiances, each member of this House must be very deeply conscious of their needs. I hate to see a beggar, regardless of whether he is old or young, but when it is an old beggar it hurts my heart that our civic responsibilities are not being performed properly.

I believe it is comity to have a Prime Minister's reception. I myself do not think too much of cocktail parties. I know that a lot of people say that and they do not mean it, but I keep away from them for several reasons. When I attend a cocktail party I do not drink particularly heavily. I should like to give to the Government one idea on these celebrations. It is said that I cannot represent the man in the street, but I should like to remind those who say that that I probably know as much if not more about the man in the street than some of the other members on the other side and some of the members on this side. A lot of those people look forward to getting an invitation to see the inside of Government House and the Prime Minister's house for which they pay, and it is not only the supporters of the other side who look for this. The supporters of both sides and some people who have no political conviction - the people with the floating votes - look forward to this. I should like the Minister to bring it to the attention of civil servants that they should spread the net down the line. Let us make this country move from the position where today we are still having too much class snobbishness; where people are not moving across the barriers particularly at these cocktail parties and so on, and living next in line with other people.

I know that the member for St. Michael West will probably speak in support of this. Probably he will express some surprise to hear the sentiments, because in recent years he has forgotten the occasions on which I have emphasised in my lifetime in this country the necessity for breaking down the barriers based on class even moreso, I think, in this country than barriers based on race. It is necessary to do this.

I am glad the Government has taken this point of talking, when they get into the area in which I live, about Elizabeth Drive and Philip Drive associated with the Imperial history of this country. But, on the other hand, you go to the Pine Housing Area and look at people as though they are second-class citizens. You find the position where children of our generation and of the middle-class in general are not mixing sufficiently with others who are less privileged.

Indeed, if the hon. member for St. Michael South were here, he would tell you that himself and myself, for instance, embarked on a project for the Pine Housing Area with the assistance of the Lions Club to provide money to have Art Classes run by Peace Corps Teachers so that the children of middle-class homes and the children of the under-privileged could sit side by side and enjoy Art in playing the piano on Sundays.

Although I may differ from him, I have always found the Minister of Education to be a person who is receptive to ideas, and I would say that he is a very honest person. I am sure that in time you can approach him and give him a project of this nature. I would commend to him that he works hand in hand on something like this with the Minister of Housing, because I think this class structure in our community must forever be removed if we are to make progress and stop the personal vilifications, the slanders, and the denigration of which we hear so much in this community.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would not be long. I am very pleased to see that the Government has agreed to think in terms of the renaming of the housing estates. This has been stated by the Prime Minister, and I think it is a step in the right direc-

tion. This old, primitive system in Barbados of relegating some of the poorer people to either landing schemes, or to live on Sober's Land, Kellman's Land, Eckstein Village and so on is unsatisfactory. You can always tell where poor people live, because they live on somebody's land, They do not live on a Street or an Avenue, but they seem to be put in a sort of tribal situation so that they can be identified.

I am also very pleased to hear the hon. member for Christ Church West speak about the class system and the removal of imperial honours, because I think that after Independence we should not worry with them, but I know that some people persist in having them. Barbados seems to be one of the last vestiges of these imperial honours. I feel that the time has come when Barbados should identify itself as an Independent country with its own honours.

With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member on the class question, unfortunately, Barbados is still filled with this sort of thing. The hon. member said that I would be surprised to hear his remarks. If he thinks that I was surprised, I will give him an invitation to come to Fairchild Street tomorrow morning at eight o'clock and he will hear how I feel about these things, and he will know what is my attitude to them.
7.10 p.m.

Barbados has to be rooted up. The hon. member for St. James, as someone said, went to look at the playing fields somewhere, but people would not know.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I have not said one thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not say that the hon. member said so. You must be identified by your proper parliamentary distinction and if you do not want me to designate you as the hon. member for St. James, I cannot call you by any other name in here, because that is the only name I am permitted to call you. The hon. member for St. James has some pretensions for sport and I think some time ago maybe he played in a cricket match and made eighteen runs, and he never took off his clothes that evening. He kept on the cricket gear as a distinction and when anybody asked what had happened, he asked if he had not heard the score. I do not know if his looking was for the purpose of seeing what kind of cricket pitch they should have. But I should like to suggest that when it comes to independence, I hope the Government will not take independence every year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a believer in the old-fashioned or new fashioned idea, whichever way you like to put it. that on every independence day you have to do these things. Some of these things are necessary, but I am a believer that the community must be given an opportunity to do some of these things for themselves. Now I agree that in some areas you have to help and sponsor things like games, music and drama festivals which are very good to encourage; they are non profit-making, but there are lots of things that can be dealt with and organised by the organisations whose business it is to do them. I do not like this idea of handing out money to organisations whose business it is to organise sport. Let them get on with the job of organising the sport.

I feel that for the old people this is something worthwhile being done. I can tell the hon. member for Christ Church West who spoke about housing that we in the Barbados Workers' Union propose to put up housing in this Island that is going to transform thinking. We are not going to take over housing, but we are going to demonstrate that this class distinction over housing must go, and we are going to establish housing that is going to be a model for this country that anybody can follow, because we do not believe that there should be in this Island the physical separations that you have now which carry a big distinction in housing, We should like to see community housing going up where different income groups can reside in comfort and ease without anyone feeling offended by the other, but you give enough land or space that they can grow, and that would remove a lot of the tension, people would mix and move freely together, and you would get a cross fertilisation of the human mind which is so essential to progress. I feel that that is going to be a help.

I feel that this attempt that the Government is making at the basic idea of renaming housing areas, districts and streets is good, and any question of dealing with your past people is always going to be a question of who are the ones you are going to have. People have made their distinctions and contributions to life in Barbados. I do not subscribe to all that the hon. member for Christ Church-West has said about people in the past, because you have to go right into the depth of history to know whether the contribution they have made would be fitting for you to be honouring them one hundred years after. The things that Abraham Linchon said about democracy, when you begin to examine them, he would not have said now because in the context and the area in which he made the speech, they would not fit in a day like today. So you cannot lift the areas only; you have to lift the whole period to know whether Lincoln would have made that speech if he had to make that speech in the United States as it is today and not as it was when he was speaking to slaves and not to free people. There is a lot of difference when you begin to look at these things. I do not gibly subscribe to removing people from one area and bringing them into another area. or saying that a person was a good Chief Justice 100 years ago and therefore let us honour him. now I have my own reservations about these historical settings when you are not prepared to bring the whole area up to date, but I do know that people have made their contributions. We are making our contributions now and history will record the king of contribution we made 100 years from now, because we do nto know what kind of contribution we are making until it can be compared with those who come after.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that these celebrations for independence give an opportunity for the com-

munity to make a contribution. There are people in all communities and in this community who have made their contribution to life, and when it comes to honouring people and in what way you are going to do it, there are various methods. In Barbados we do not have enough institutions. For example, I returned to this House, but I must say, I would like to say that on independence I have an open criticism for this House. This House is bereft of the architectural refinement that can even match what was done 100 years ago, because when you look into the roof and you look down here there is some art that is lost, and if you see the symmetry from the top and try to make this table something that would bear some relation with the top, you find a little square thing here which is not an arch that would bear some relation to the top of the building; so that the very setting and the symmetry and woodwork at the back bears no relationship to anything. There is some white wood at the back looking like some pine that somebody had to get in a hurry. All this is where we have to get our setting so that when people come to the House of Assembly they get the feeling that they are in the highest portals of the country. I would like to see on the next Independence Day some refurbishing being done to this ancient Chamber that would give it the dignity that a Chamber in these years should possess.

Now these are just my views and not any real serious Government policy, but I do know that at celebration time it is time that we do something of this nature. The Government is holding things for people in many of these organisations, but I do feel that the Government will have to seriously look at some of these organisations in the future, and if they are going to help them, do so. I have my own views. These regular organisations which organise sport, whether it be olympics, athletics, games or anything like that, should be encouraged to put on something, but I do not know if by seeing these things here they indicate a cost factor being allocated to them to do these things, because I do not consider that cycle sports, a football match or track and field events are necessary events that would require financial contributions to take care of them. The gesture I like particularly is the one of renaming the housing areas.

7.20 p.m.

Before I close I would like to say I think the Government can take credit for the Farm Housing Area. I believe it is one of the best Housing Areas in the island, and it reflects the kind of people we get from good Housing Areas. I can say that the standard of living, the sort of *esprit de corps*, the whole thing about the people is something dood, and I hope that the time will come that the Government will find its way to build more Housing Areas like the one at the Farm for the benefit of the people of this country as a whole.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make my contribution to this debate, once again highlighting what has always been one of the things which pain me about independence celebrations. Under 2(a) it says "the decoration and illumination of certain Government buildings and institutions as well as prominent streets and sites controlled by the Parks and Beaches Commission." Mr. Chairman, from 1966 when there were independence celebrations I have often said that independence celebrations to Barbados means celebrations in Bridgetown and St. Michael. I have on each and every Independence Day and the night preceding, the night after, tried to visit as many country districts as possible, when I was living in Bridgetown to see what sort of celebrations the Government had provided for the country people. I would like the Minister to tell the House whether this year the Government is prepared to go outside of Bridgetown and St. Michael to provide celebrations in those areas in the country which would facilitate the parents of the children of the country districts. There are places like Barclays Park which would be illuminated and on which large functions could be held which would serve the people of St. Andrew and St. Joseph. There is King George V Park which in times gone by was a ecntre for entertainment and amusement for the people of St. Philip, St. John and St. George. There is now Farley Hill in St. Peter which could be utilised, and River Bay in St. Lucy where the Government has acquired land which could also be utilsied for the people in the country districts.

I know most of the activities this year will be centred at the National Stadium, but we have got to remember that despite the laying on of special buses to move people from country to town and vice versa one must always remember the parent with three or four children who at the end of the celebrations in Bridgetown will have to rush to catch that last bus home. That situation would not arise if celebrations are held within close proximity of the houses of these people. I would like the Government to think seriously about providing the necessary entertainment in the country districts to relieve the pressure on the bus service in the first place, and secondly the pressure on the parents who would have to bring their children into Bridgetown to enjoy the facilities.

With that I move to another point on independence. Mr. Chairman you sat in the last Parliament in here and you know that on this side there was always great debate when it came to the renaming of a district in St. Philip which used to be known as Penny Hole and which for no obvious reason was renamed Gemswick. If the Government has taken upon itself to rename the Housing Areas - I remember the activities which were brought about when the Government sought to rename Bastard Alley, the name was subsequently changed and the sign was put up and there were quite a lot of activities surrounding that name - I would like the Government to adopt a new system of naming streets on Barbados. The day is long gone and past when we should have all these gaps about the place. Look at the Farm Housing Area where you would have an address like Block 4D, Farm Housing Area, Deacons Road. I have always contended that this system of naming streets and areas like Grazettes Landing Scheme is the very beginning of social discrimination among the people, and I would like the Government to think seriously when they are renaming the Housing Areas and the streets. Call them Boulevards or Streets but not Gaps, Barbados is the only place where you find the

word "gap" in the address. *(Asides)* Do not let us worry about the Asides, Mr. Chairman, the names of gaps and alleys were started in the days of the Conservatives. The hon. member for St. Andrew was once a member of the Conservative Party and supported people like Dowding and that group who started the names, and he is the first person now to get up and say we should remove it.

Mr. Chairman, another point I would like to make - and I hope that the Government would pay careful consideration to it - is that for the longest time it has been a grievance to me to say that every Monday morning in District 'A' Criminal Court old ladies and gentlemen who are trying to make a dollar are brought into court for exhibiting goods for sale on the Bridge and on Broad Street.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I submit that what the hon. member is now advancing is indeed irrelevant to the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wanted to tell him that I do not want to carry anything at all before a Police Magistrate. Let the hon. member continue to deal with the independence celebrations.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that to make my suggestion about the renaming of the streets and celebrations. Without that I talk nonsense, but what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that in practically every country there is what is called a native market, as far as I know we have no native market in Barbados.
7. 30 p.m.

I should like to see the Government provide a Native Market, or re-name one of our Streets, or some area as a Native Market whereby persons who care to offer their goods for sale - sweet potatoes, yams, handbags, etc. - can go to that Native Market and be immuned from arrest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not agree that those remarks are relevant to this Resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about Independence and what is being done. We are considering the question of re-naming a housing area, and I am suggesting that one of the principles of Independence is that the Government should create a Native Market as part of the Independence gesture.

Hon. A.DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In accordance with the appropriate Standing Order, I consider that the hon. member is indulging in irrelevancies repeatedly. I now, in accordance with the appropriate Standing Order, move that the question be put.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I..... *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no debate or discussion on this matter.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of information. Can the Minister state what is the relevant Standing Order? We are entitled to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is Standing Order No. 32.

The question that the question be now put was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. E. GREAVES; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

Noes: Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 2.

The question that the Resolution for $89,291, as amended, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Hon. Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P.G. MORGAN; Mr. E. GREAVES; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

Noes: Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 2.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I always like to get the records straight. The records must show that the hon. member for St. Joseph and the hon. member for Christ Church West support the principles of this Resolution. I do not want it to be misquoted or misunderstood why we took a certain position in Committee. *(Asides)* I want it to be perfectly clear for the purpose of this House..... *(Asides)* Mr. Speaker, do you hear voices other than mine?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am at a loss to understand on what you have risen.

Mr. FORDE: On the Resolution, Sir. I am saying that the hon. member for St. Joseph, myself and other members of the Opposotion support the principle of this Resolution and have spoken on items.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is entirely out of order. He cannot speak while the final stages of the Resolution are being passed.
7.40 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, would the Hon. Leader of the House refer to the relevant Standing Order on the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Leader of the House is quite in order in drawing attention to that Standing Order. I seem to remember it but I cannot put my finger on it now. Obviously there was a chance for the hon. member for Christ Church-West to have spoken in Committee. He cannot now opt to speak again.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolutions were agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I think hon. members are anxious to have some refreshment. We have a few items on the Order Paper which we would like to deal with at tonight's sitting, and then we proposed adjourning for probably two weeks, provided we get the balance of the work done.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, would the hon. member indicate to us what are the items he proposes to deal with so that we can order ourselves and know which ones he is dealing with?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I propose to deal with Items, 3, 4, 5 and 7 and maybe the notes to be amended which would not take any time.

The question that the sitting be now suspended for one hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On resumption:

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing Labour and National Insurance who will deal with it.

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

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

THE TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the Government enacted the Tenantries Control and Development Act and in doing so at that time it forestalled a serious social problem that was developing in this country, a problem which manifested itself in the threatened mass eviction of tenants from an area of land, all of course in the name of real estate development. Government at that time came to the assistance of the tenants by enacting this Tenantries Control and Development Act, 1965. The Act has been the salvation of a number of people living in a tenantry within the meaning of the Act. We are now seeking to amend the definition of the word "tenantry" which does not alter fundamentally the Act in itself. In fact, to our minds it removes certain doubts as to what a tenantry really and truly is, because the law as it reads might give the impression that a tenantry under the Act could even be a number of vacation houses or houses for the purpose of tourism, and certainly that was not the intention at the time the Act was drafted. It was not intended that persons who are on vacation should be given the protection of being ejected from places where they live; so as it reads, it is perhaps places like Sunset Crest that might be considered a tenantry under the Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to make the definition of tenantry a lot clearer, and the occasion is also taken to exempt Government and Statutory Boards from the provisions of the Act. In fact, wherever tenants are threatened with eviction - I am referring now to persons who are living in areas that do not fall within the definition of the term "tenantry" - they almost automatically turn towards the Government for shelter, and Government has to try by some means to provide them with some land or a house within housing estates of the Housing Authority, so that Government instead of throwing people off the land has become a shelter for housing tenants. There are no problems therefore in excluding Government and the Housing Authority from this Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much more I can add to this, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is read a second time, perhaps the House will hear me on a few points that arise in this Bill. First I think, as we always try to do on this side, we should get our principles straight. The first principle we would like to make clear from the side of the Opposition is that we see the need and therefore have subscribed to the necessity for some kind of control in relation to the eviction of people in wholesale fashion from tenantries in this Island. Having said that and having made the position very clear, let us take

issue with parts of the Act. My view, Mr. Speaker, is that it is one of the worst drafted bits of legislation in that despite the principle of the Act itself, the manner of executing it leaves many sorts of not only legal loopholes, but plenty of legal contradictions.

Mr. Speaker, under the Act, for instance, a landlord may give a notice which in law terminates the relationship of landlord and tenant, but despite this termination of the relationship, the eviction or ejectment cannot take place and therefore title can be obtained.
8.50 p.m.

I would have thought that the time has come for a review of the legislation in order to remove some of the legal contradictions which have arisen in the legislation. I am not sure whether the Minister is aware of the fact that although a piece of land may begin as a tenantry where there are five or more house spots for chattels that by virtue of subdivisions, for instance, or the removal of two of the people or even one, one will end up with no less security being given to the tenants. Maybe there is a distinction and a difference between ourselves as to the legal position, but with respect, someone should not have to pay cost of litigation when it is so easy to draft the Act properly as to make the situation absolutely clear. Indeed I believe that Professor Marshall, that outstanding Barbadian and West Indian luminary, has passed his criticisms on the Act so far as its draftsmanship is concerned, and has recommended that it be tidied up, and I would urge the Government at the earliest opportunity to take the occasion to tidy up these legal difficulties.

It is not only the legal difficulties on which we take issue, it appears to me that it is current these days to treat Statutory Boards as though they were in some extraordinary special circumstances and not subject to the normal rigours of the law that one attaches, for instance, to the normal person or company in this country. If I may by way of illustration cite a position where the Transport Board, if one of its vehicles knocks someone down the time limit for bringing an action is one year, despite the fact that that Board is covered by insurance, but if an hon. member's vehicle does the same thing the time limit is six years, and you find people are being deprived of their rights or equal rights by this form of discriminatory treatment. The history of procedures in relation to quasi public boards has been to equate them more or less with the position of all other boards and certainly if we take the Minister at his word - and I want to take him at his word on this - if the Government is the protector of persons who are being evicted, even when they are not in the tenantry as such, there is no necessity to exempt the Crown, and certainly no necessity to exempt Statutory Boards from the definition in this instance. The Crown today is one of the greatest land owners in this country; it has acquired mainly by use, for instance, of the Sugar Rehabilitation Funds something in the region of over 4,000 acres, something that we should commend in this country, but if it is the greatest land owner, or is fast becoming the greatest land owner in this country, then it needs no protection. If it is the protector, why should it be specially protected by an amendment of the Act? Is the Minister prepared to give the assurance, for instance - if I may deal particularly with my constituency - that these powers will not now be used to evict the tenants in Pleasant Hall Land, and if the hon. member for Christ Church North Central was here, I am sure he would seek a similar provision in relation to the tenants who reside on that part of the estate which was formerly, I believe, known as Graeme Hall Estate.

These are important points, and we must get this assurance, and I understand in other areas the Government owns many tenantries, and the Government as well as the Housing Authority should therefore be subject to the same rigours of the law and should not be discriminated against in this respect. The reason for this is not because any particular Government is in power, Governments change and we not always have the assurance that some of the people who comprise the Government might not use different standards in judging whether to evict people or not, and it is for this reason that legislation should appear to be fair, and there is no reason for exempting the Housing Authority from the provisions of this Bill. No really good reason, and certainly this is not merely a tidying up operation, because if it were it is a very scant tidying up operation. The Minister must justify why he is asking this House to give the Crown the power that neither the Housing Authority the Agricultural Development Corporation, I.D.C., nor any of them are going to be subject to the Tenantries Control Development (Amendment) Act, 1971. Is it not fair legislation? Is it not proper legislation? Is it not a safeguarding legislation? If it happens to be these things, then there is no necessity, particularly when we are assured by the Minister of the mere protection umbrella of the Government, to exempt these Statutory Boards from this sort of consideration. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the Minister reconsider this matter - perhaps it might be convenient to send this to a Select Committee - because in my view the opportunity should be taken in Select Committee to do a proper draft of this Act.

There are other precedents, I understand that when this legislation was passed it was passed rather hurriedly, and perhaps the Government then, because of the special circumstances, I think it was a mass eviction somewhere in Eagle Hall at the time, and the Government did not have the proper time to consider the measure and look at all the legal implications of the actinn, but the time has come that there are sufficient legal luminaries in the Government, and there are enough in other spheres in this country, who would be prepared - certainly at the University, for instance - to give of their proper consideration to a proper draft. With these views I would ask that the point be taken that no special distinction be given to any Statutory Boards or the Crown in order to exempt them from the provisions of the Act as it stands.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had allayed the fears of this Hon. House when

I referred to the exemption of Government and Statutory Boards from the provisions of this Act. Quite clearly there is nothing I can add to what I have said earlier. People are always running to the Government to provide them with sites for placing their houses, and for houses as well, and Government in this sense is different from any other landlord. We cannot treat the Government in the same way as one would treat even the tenants of Peterkin Land who were threatened with eviction six years ago. In fact when those 130 tenants were threatened with eviction to whom did they run? They did not run to any representative as such, they ran to the Government and it was the Government who had to give them the protection. The protection it gave them that time was this Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is not very much I can add, but I would like to take up the hon. member for Christ Church West when he stated that a tenantry which is divided into six lots, if two of the tenants are removed the remaining tenants do not have the protection of the Act. This may be a question of interpretation, but I disagree with him, because section 12 of the Act states that this Act shall be deemed to come into force and always to have been in force as from the 8th day of June, 1965, and the definition of tenantry is that an area of land which is now or shall hereafter be divided into more than five or six lots. I need not add for the benefit of the hon. member who is himself a lawyer much to this, because it seems clear to me that after the 8th June, 1965 and area of land was divided into more than five lots then even though subsequent to the 8th June, 1965 some tenants moved their houses from that land the remaining tenants will still have the protection of this Act.

On the final point, the point raised about inept drafting, I do not want to take up, and the hon. member for Christ Church West raised the point that even though the relationship of landlord and tenant is terminated yet it is impossible for the landlord to get vacant possession of the property.
9.00 p.m.

That was the very purpose, Mr. Speaker, of drafting this Act. The purpose of drafting this Act was to protect the tenants from eviction. Even though a landlord, or a subsequent purchaser from a landlord, may be able to acquire a title, at the same time that title must necessarily be encumbered by this Act which is then a charge on that property. This is so, because of the intention of the Government to provide protection for the tenants.

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

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

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, again, I should like to underline and appeal to the Government to delete the words from "other" down to the word "board" in Clause 2 in the interest of having a proper and non-discriminatory system of legislation dealing with this matter and I formally move that those words be deleted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would second my colleague on this, but at the same time I should like to draw to the Minister's attention that the Act as it stands has a certain amount of general hardships. *(Asides)* I am speaking on Clause 2, and I am saying why I have seconded the suggestion by my learned colleague. I believe that most of the persons who run to the Government seeking shelter would not run there if the Rules under this Act had been drafted. One of the big problems is that there is still, up to now, no laid-down principles as to how...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Joseph has gone outside of Clause 2.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on what has he risen?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have risen on a point of order. The hon. member for St. Joseph has now gone on to speak about Clause 8 of the Act and not of the amending Bill. We are now dealing with Clause 2 of the Bill. If the hon. member wanted to speak on the general principle of the Bill, he had an opportunity to do so during its second reading. He can only now speak on Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Clause 2, and I am entitled to say why I am seconding the amendment by the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member is saying that he is speaking on Clause 2, and he is using the opportunity while speaking on Clause 2 to speak on other matters relating to the Act. He is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to deal with the deletion. I am not prepared to hear anything other than the deletion of those words.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the mover of the Motion said that he wants those words deleted so as

to put the Government in the same position as any other landlord - in a non-discriminatory position. I am saying that the reason for my backing this is that certain Rules have never been laid, and that forced the people to run to the Government for assistance.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is completely untrue. I know it, because I held the responsibility for the running of this Act for the past five years; therefore, I know that the hon. member is going outside of Clause 2 of the Bill in order to speak on the entire Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister speaks about his personal knowledge which does not apply to this debate. I am speaking on my grounds for supporting the Motion, and I am saying why I seek to put the Government in the same position as any other landlord.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But what I am prepared to hear is something relative to the words proposed to be deleted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Let me elaborate, Mr. Chairman. As it stands now the Crown or the Government will be a special landlord in that if tomorrow the Crown sought to raise the rents of everybody in the housing area to $15 a week, then there is no Act which covers the Crown, but a small landlord who has five or more persons on his land cannot raise the rent unless he goes through a certain procedure which is not laid down. I am supporting the deletion of the words because, in my opinion and in the opinion of members on this side, if the Crown finds itself in the position of any other landlord it would not be able to raise the rent unless it followed the same procedure.

If the Hon. Minister talks about Clause 2 and his knowledge, then I can give him an example of one of his biggest supporters in St. John who tried to raise the rent and could not do so because the procedure had never been laid down as to how rent could be raised. If these words remain they will put the Crown in a very special position, and tomorrow morning it can raise the rent to $10, $15, or $20 a week on the housing estates and nobody can tell the Crown anything about it, but if John Thomas in any other housing estate attempts to raise the rent you will see that the Act lays down that a certain procedure must be followed although the Rules for that procedure have never been made. Do not let the Minister mislead the House; he knows full well that he can go back tomorrow and sign an Order to raise rent.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the hon. member for St. Joseph does not understand the Act at all. He is stating that the Government will have power, after the passing of this Act, to raise the rents of the people occupying houses on the estates. In fact, Mr. Chairman, this Act refers to land sites and not land with houses.

9.10 p.m.

This is land without houses or land with chattel houses, so quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. How can the Government go and raise the rents in housing estates in Grazettes when in fact there are stone houses forming part of the realty of those estates, whereas this Bill refers only to sites for houses and chattel buildings?

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not like the hon. member trying to make out that he is a genius on this Act. The Hon. Minister is completely out of depth on this Act. There is Grazettes Landing Scheme where, if you go into the Civil Court in District "A" on Friday, you will find everybody going up and the Magistrate asking "how long do you want? Take a letter and go to the Housing Authority and tell them that the Magistrate says you must leave by the end of December or January, find a spot for you." And they will put him in Grazettes Landing Scheme. If you are in any part of this country and your landlord gives you notice and you have to leave, a letter is sent from the Court and the house is moved. In Lammings, St. Joseph, houses are put on the spot and Government is charging rent for the site. If the Minister calls it a site, the Act refers to housespot, and it is that housespot which the Government can charge rent for tomorrow and up it week after week. So the Minister must not mislead this House. The ordinary Landlords Act says that he must go through certain procedure, appear before the magistrate and justify the raising of the rent, and it can only be raised by a certain amount. I can tell the Hon. Minister something. Let him go down in Black Rock, an area which was sub-divided, and a certain solicitor sent out letters after the sub-division charging everybody $10 a week rent.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not hold myself out to be any genius on this Act, but I believe I have a little bit more knowledge of its operation and of the operation of the Housing Authority than the hon. member for St. Joseph, and I do know that all those persons in what he calls the landing schemes - in fact these are lands for sale to the tenants who occupy the sites - have had 40 per cent of the initial payments credited towards the purchase of these very sites since 1964. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Joseph is swimming in waters that are too deep for him.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church-West raised this question, but he must study the history of this Bill. The original Act was meant to protect people, and the reason why the Government and the Crown were exempt from that is because the Crown came in specifically as a protector and not as a land owner *per se*, and therefore we went back to the old days where after an election and you voted for Mr. A or Mr. B you had to take up your house lock, stock and barrel like an old hoe and move it because he was vex how you voted. Over the years we realised that we had to do something to protect these people. When the Housing Authority came in it was not old fashioned in the same way as a land owner, because there is nobody in the

Housing Authority who wants to get rent and put rent in his pocket and get more money because the Government had put a road in a particular area, because facts are here to show that with Government rents in Barbados, half the people do not pay; so this is not bending over backwards to ask them to pay less since they are paying 0.000%. When you evict a person for not paying, you are not really evicting him because you were not collecting anything; so it is not a question of putting the Government in the same category. The reason why the Government is exempt is that the Government has spent so much money that it would have to go and hold on to Fort Knox and anchor itself to be able to redeem itself from financial bankruptcy.

I will go further and be revolutionary and say that in the areas the Government should acquire all lands. If any baby could show me a piece of land in its hand when it came into the world, then I would say you should own land, but since all you could own is space and even when you die we will give you that underneath the earth, I do not subscribe to this idea of taking up all the little bits of land. I do not believe in freehold; I believe in leasehold because as your life is leased, I do not see why you should own land freehold and pass it on to your heirs and successors whether they are imbeciles, drunkards or what. However, people like this freehold, and in a community like Barbados which is land and house conscious, I am not going to upset this economic land equilibrium. I do not think the hon. member for Christ Church West can make this charge against the Government. In a general way, the hon. member's point would be sound, but not in a specific way. This is specific legislation that was passed specifically to protect people living on tenantries, and was nothing to give the Crown any special dispensation. I do not think the hon. member for St. Joseph is aware that the intention of the original Act was not to give the Crown any special dispensation. The original Act was to give the people who own houses on these tenantries the facility not to be evicted and ejected at the whims of the landowners. The Government in owning tenantries are not owners in the same sense. Wherever the Government is an owner of a tenantry, it is really the owner of the tenantry as a sort of decamping area. Wherever the Government owns tenantries for putting people in houses, it is for people who have been ejected because it does not pay. Let us deal with the economics of it. The hon. member for St. Joseph knows that nobody can take the place of the Government because it would not pay any person to purchase land in Barbados and put people on it on the basis that the Government has been putting people on land unless he is mad. Only a madman ready to have a certificate to the lunatic asylum would purchase land at the price in Barbados to use as a landing scheme like St. Stephens or anywhere else. Who is going to buy land at that price? Only the Government can do it. No private person in Barbados can rent houses at the rate the Government does notwithstanding the ones who do not pay; so that Government is no parallel with people with people with private tenantries.

I do not think the hon. member for Christ Church West should rope this in. I think he was dealing with a legal theory that the Government *per se* should not be any different from any other person but in this instance this is social legislation; it is not ordinary legislation where the Government is in fact different from an ordinary land owner, therefore you have to examine it in these circumstances. You exempt the Government from the area of land in the Housing Authority for obvious reasons. If you applied the same area of land that you applied for other people, some people would have nowhere to live. You give the Government this dispensation to put up houses in areas where normally you could not because you are going to lay out the area and put in roads. Let us be quite frank. I live in an area where the land owner who has sold me the land spent less money than the Government has spent in the Farm or in the Pine, and I have paid more money for the land.

9.20 p.m.

The same thing will happen to the hon. member for Christ Church West, and in a general way the hon. member for St. Joseph had more sense, he went into the country and bought land where it is sold by the acre, but you buy land down here by the square inch.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, is the hon. member for St. Michael West saying that I had more sense than he has?

Mr. WALCOTT: You had more money. I have no inheritance, and when you start a race from scratch you have to run faster than a fellow who was handicapped. If the hon. member is saying now that because you are exempting the Crown to help poor people - if you do not give the Crown this dispensation you are going to make it more difficult for the Crown, and no Minister in Barbados can come down here and increase rents - rents were increased years ago and you know what happened. When a private person increases the rent you either pay it or leave it, and I think the hon. member for Christ Church West should be aware of this, and he knows the Act says that means any area of land, either land vested or leased in the Crown or Statutory Boards, but you know what that means. So many people owe the Housing Authority so much money from all Governments that you could start a new Housing scheme again if you had to redeem all the money plus interest. Let us remember that. Which Government can come in power and go and eject people just like that? The hon. member represents Christ Church West and the other hon. member represents St. Joseph, let us see the two of them eject any of their strongest supporters because they live in these houses and prove to the world that this is another Messiah or another John the Baptist. That is the whole problem, it is a political matter, it is done with political background, but you are helping poor people who have been ejected. I mean poor people with a capital "p" not a common 'p'.

Some people live in Government houses who are not necessarily poor, some of them live in the Garrison and rent out bungalows at $400 a month furnished,

so why pick out somebody out of the house who is paying $6.00 a week and not put out these Government servants? I have the reputation of being very hard on lawyers, but this is the sort of instance which makes me hard on lawyers because they can sometimes only see the legal implications of anything they do. That is why in other cases where we have to pass social legislation we will never get it passed if we have to deal with the legal brains. Do you know the bogus argument a lawyer gives to a client? He says that he pays for the time you work with him and beyond that he does not owe you anything. Similarly, the hon. member is asking that because the Crown is a land owner the Crown should not be exempt, but you have to exempt the Crown in the Barbadian context where you are putting poor people on land and where people are pressing you for houses. You have to exempt the Crown and the Statutory authority in this instance, if not we will not be doing anything for the poor people. The Crown has to be different, if not you will not get housing done; that is a fact.

Some years ago we gave the Housing Authority authority to operate and build the houses on less land area than the conventional land area we were given because they were doing things that the people in the tenantries would not do. Go in the Pine and you find the kind of roads and houses you have up there. Go in all the estates you have in Barbados, the people who live in these Housing Areas are living in superior conditions from anything that exists where the private land owners have for them. These are facts. I represent a constituency where it is horrible to see where some people live, and do not let us fool ourselves that if you put the Government in the same position as the private land owners you will not be doing justice to the people of Barbados. I think the hon. member should realise that this is social legislation and not exempting the Crown from its responsibility.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you put the question Sir, I should like to say that the amendments proposed here are in keeping with other bits of legislation which were passed in this Chamber. I remember very well back in 1956 as Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries we had occasion to bring down legislation for security of tenure of land and it was then that these areas of land were bought for establishing landed schemes for siting these chattel houses and providing sites for people who had been ejected mainly through the election results of 1951 and 1956. Women, for example, voted for the first time around that time and they behaved just as women usually do, they could not conceal for whom they had voted and the landlords knew whom they had voted for. I speak now from personal experience, in that I had to secure 25 acres at Silver Hill, Christ Church as a landed scheme for resiting houses which were put by the side of the road. That has been my personal experience, and what the hon. member for St. Michael West mentioned here just now are the absolutely true facts of the case. First of all the Government would have the necessity for providing land for this purpose throughout the entire Island, and these have been rented at almost pepper corn rent.

The main objective was to provide sites for resiting these houses, it has not been an economical proposition for Government and there is no need really, because Government has been trusted with less fortunate low income groups, to fear that Government would do anything to hurt them, at least certainly not this Government which is now in office, or probably any other Government following this because I cannot see any Government attempting to do anything to hurt or to impair the position of the low income worker, the one for whom we aspire and claim to represent. There is no fear whatever in amending this Tenantries Bill of 1965. It might have been hastily done but it will serve a useful purpose. The amendment is a good one and will do nothing to harm the present tenants on Government lands or any other future tenants.

9.30 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the debate, particularly since my colleague on my right is not too well. There are just two points, however, which I should like to clarify in relation to what has been said for the hon. member for St. Michael South and the Hon. Leader of the House. The first is that the purpose of Clause 2 is to give the Crown a special status. It means that the Crown or the Housing Authority is no longer subject to the same restriction. Now, the Crown becomes a landowner in two ways in this country: one is the way in which the hon. member for St. Michael West has said, by decamping, where people eject them without any social conscience sometimes, and therefore they find themselves having to go to the Crown for protection. But the Crown has also become a landlord in this country by means of compulsory acquisition, and it is now controlling some of the biggest tenantries in the Island. The more estates it acquires like Spencers Estate, for instance, Graeme Hall Estate and so on, the more it is acquiring tenantries.

It is all right to say that no Government will take the steps to eject people. Let us face facts, Mr. Chairman. People's views on how they vote were not being known fifty years ago, but that can be known now. One of the reasons I am objecting to this procedure - I do not like to come in here talking about what happened at the last election and hearsay rumour - is that there were fears on the part of people who lived on housing land that if they allowed the Opposition to come to canvass them that they might be thrown off. *(Asides)* You cannot do it to me; I took on everybody, and I won.

I do not think it is right that, for instance, if the hon. member for St. Michael West finds himself in the Opposition - I am not so stupid as to believe that everybody in a political party has good motives. Even your own colleagues you might find are vindictive sometimes. *(Asides)* You might find that some of your colleagues over there are vindictive, so let us face facts. If you find vindictive Governments,

vindictive Ministers, or vindictive political opponents, you can find this sort of power being used. *(Asides)* Do not say that it will not be used, because the fear of God will be driven into people's minds about it. This is exactly why, as a matter of principle for one other reason, I object to putting the Housing Authority in particular in a special position.

Now, if the hon. member were advancing the theory that the Government must have mobility so that they could have re-arranged the tenantry and that this is what they want, in my submission under any Act at present the Cabinet controls that. You cannot re-develop a tenantry and get rid of the tenants these days unless you get specifically the permission of the Cabinet. *(Asides)* The Town Planner has no jurisdiction in this respect. When one is talking about social justice and social legislation, one does not have to be a lawyer to do this. I know the hon. member for St. Michael West to be a person with a social conscience, but that does not mean that we agree on everything. There are times that we do not even speak to each other. It does not matter whether we are lawyers or not; I am genuinely concerned about the matter, and I am not making any allegations against the Minister in this respect that he would do it or even against the Government. I am genuinely concerned about any legislation which will give any Government an opportunity of doing this sort of thing, and that is why I have moved the amendment.

The question that the words "other than land vested in or leased to the Crown or a statutory board" be deleted was put and resolved in the negative without division.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: In agreeing to that, Sir, I should like to let the hon. member for Christ Church West know that if I were in his position - in the light of the law of averages he should be around this Chamber longer than me, then I will say he should always have the Government in their place as a whipping horse. That is the advice I would give to him, if he wants to be a good politician in the future.

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

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

PUBLIC UTILITIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Utilities Act, 1951. This Bill will amend the Public Utilities Act, 1951 (Act 1951-31) in order to remove the rates for the distribution for all gas from control by the Public Utilities Board, in view of the fact that there exists under the Miscellaneous Control Act 1970 (Act 1970-5) adequate machinery for the purpose of controlling such rates.
9.40 p.m.

The position is that this matter has been examined and on further examination the proposed amendments to the Public Utilities Act, 1951, (Act 1951-31) the Government has been advised that certain consequential amendments to the Gas Works Act, 1911 (Act 1911-9) have become necessary, and to give effect to that advice, section 2 of the Public Utilities Act, 1951, would have to be amended as follows:-

(a) by deleting the definition "gas" appearing therein; and

(b) by deleting the words "or gas" appearing in the last line of paragraph (1) of the definition "Public Utility".

And further, which is a consequential Bill, that the Gas Works Act, 1911 at Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 26 and 28 be amended by deleting the words "Subject to any order or regulation made by the Public Utilities Board The Company" wherever those words appear therein and substituting the words "Subject to any regulations made under section 3 of the Miscellaneous Controls Act, 1970, relating to the supply of gas, the Company".

These two Bills are complementary, and I beg to move that the Public Utilities (Amendment) Bill, 1971, be now read a second time.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, again I know it is getting late and I really do not want to prolong deliberations of this House for too long, but I think when legislation such as this comes before the House, it is necessary that we get a bit

more information. My information, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the grounds are justified, is that the supply of natural gas is not as much as we thought it was, and it may well be that the Natural Gas Corporation - and if I may say so, it is one of the Statutory Boards in this country which has operated on reasonably good commercial principles and which has made money rather than lost money and caused the taxpayers of this country to have to pay more taxes - finds itself competing against bottled gas, and as the Act stands, it is subject to the rigours of public utilities and the scrutiny of the Public Utilities Board. For this reason - and this is my information and unless the Minister can help me on this point, I assume this is correct - I would much prefer that the Objects and Reasons should give us the full position. I would not want other public utilities to believe for one moment that because there is a Miscellaneous Controls Act in this country that everybody must be exempted from the scope of public utilities.

I should like in passing to state that this is the first industry in this country that was ever nationalised by any Government, and that Act came from the Barbados Labour Party when we took over the gas supplies in this country, and it has functioned efficiently and sets an example as to what could happen if a Statutory Board is allowed to operate properly and in the interest of the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, again I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works is not here, because I think in another quarter he would recall the necessity which we sought for amending the Public Utilities Act on much broader principles than merely deleting "gas" from the definition contained in Section 2 of that Act. The Public Utilities Board must be made to function as an efficient and up-to-date Board with proper personnel and proper technical advice available to it, and we also have a problem and I am sure the member for St. Michael-West would be interested in knowing, because I see he has been writing about multi-national corporations in which we have a problem of holding companies operating in this country or from overseas where you may find that unless the Public Utilities Act is properly amended, we cannot control those holding companies and we cannot have any proper public interests represented in the functioning of the Public Utilities Board.

There is another thing I should like to draw to the attention of the Government in relation to this Act. It is necessary to set out the proper procedures which the Board must follow when adjudicating on claims brought by the Transport Board or bus owners, by the Telephone Company or the Barbados Light and Power. This saves time, it saves costs, it saves man power, and everybody feels he gets a better break. The legislation is 1951 and it should be updated. There is a lot of precedent in the United States in particular on this matter. I believe the Government had the benefit of an expert in telecommunications particularly in public utilities aspect of this during the hearing of the telephone dispute, and I would appeal to the Government to use the opportunity of amending this Act substantially, because there are some of the public utilities in this country that are operating properly and well, one or two of them, but yet we must be vigilant; and I would like to urge the Government to take this into account. With that you will realise I am not voting against the Bill as it stands, but I would prefer the true reason. I think it is my duty to point out things that have come to our attention in the interest of the community as a whole, and I take this opportunity to do so in speaking on the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item on the Order Paper is No. 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Gas Works Act, 1911. 9.50 p.m.

BILL TO AMEND THE GAS WORKS ACT, 1911

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a consequential Bill and will make consequential amendments to the Gas Works Act, 1911 (1911-9) following upon the decision of Government to remove the rates chargeable for the supply of gas controlled by the Public Utilities Board. The hon. member for Christ Church West was a member of the Natural Gas Board so he would be fully aware of these amendments. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 7, inclusive, were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the

passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would consolidate and revise the laws relating to the conditions of service of Governors-General and would provide for pensions for such persons, their widows and children and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith. As hon. members will recall, this Bill was commenced in the last session, and the fact that it went to a Select Committee then has no bearing on what we are doing now, so this Bill is being re-introduced and being dealt with now afresh.

The position is that the Government seeks to make provision and feel that provision should be made for comprehensive and consolidated legislation for the pensions and emoluments and related matters affecting the office of Governor-General, and insofar as pensions are concerned, provision in any such legislation should follow the principles adopted in respect of the pension of the Prime Minister as contained in the Pensions (Prime Ministers) Act, 1968 and it is for that reason the Bill has been sent down. The Bill has been properly prepared by the Crown Law Officers and has been studied and examined so far as salary, allowances, pension, leave passages for the Governor-General, and salary and allowances for an acting Governor-General.

Provision is also made at Clauses 11 and 12 for the payment of widows' and children's pensions in certain circumstances, and in Clause 14 provision is made for the payment of leave passages on the same basis as paragraph 14 of the Leave Passages Order, 1966. Those are some of the main provisions of this Bill, and it is felt that our Governor-General and his family generally should be given reasonable salaries and adequate protection as enjoyed by Ministers of Government, by the Civil Service generally and by all who are in Government employ. I hardly think this will meet any opposition, it is merely a question of regularising the Governor-General's salary and bringing the legislation in line in order to protect his interest, to provide him with a proper salary, allowances and pension rights as all hon. members of the Legislature are entitled to. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

10.00 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, again, I want to rise to say that the principle of this Bill is correct, but there is one feature of the Bill, however, that I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House. Under the Bill, as it stands, if one becomes a Governor-General for an hour and dies within that hour, then automatically the widow of that person is entitled for life, and her children up to a certain age, to pensions under the terms of the Bill.

Now, I once read of a book called "King For A Month", and I have known in places like Mexico where a person was President for 24 hours. Although this may seem very far-fetched, it seems to me that it would be much more equitable to have some sort of qualifying periods and some sort of sliding scales dealing with this situation. I was not here on the last occasion when this matter was discussed, but I wonder whether this is one of the reasons why, at that time, the former House in its wisdom saw fit to refer this Bill to a Select Committee and to get the benefit of legislation from other Commonwealth countries in particular or from countries in this area.

I cannot imagine that the taxpayers will feel very happy, although we are rather satisfied with the dignity and decorum with which this office is being performed; therefore, I think it would be contrary to the Rules of the House for me to start any debate on her Majesty's representative and I would not care to do so. However, it is a matter of principle, and it does not apply to the present holder but to any holder in the future qualifying for a two-thirds pension, or if he is struck, for instance, by a serious illness and he has to retire after being in office for a day. He qualifies for the balance of his life for a two-thirds pension of $26,400 per annum. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very heavy charge on the public weal. In circumstances such as this, certainly I would have been happier if we had sliding scales to qualifying periods for office making the full pension payable to himself or his widow after a minimum of period of years. For instance, a period of five years or something of the sort for holding the office of Governor-General, and if it is a lesser period of time some provision for the widow and children and some provision for him should be made in certain circumstances. I think that it would have been much more in keeping with the public interest to have a Bill setting out the position.

I do not know how urgent this Bill is, but if it is not that urgent, perhaps, they could have some further thinking by referring this Bill to a Select Committee. The Bill contains many beautiful and new features which should be extended to public servants, their widows and children, and not simply only to Ministers or to the Governor-General whoever he may be at any particular time. We would like to see this type of forward-thinking legislation. All of these features are not in the public servants legislation. Despite the fact that there is a widows and orphans fund, they do not have as good conditions as these if you compare the Acts.

I have made a suggestion, and I am not moving a Motion. Perhaps, if the Hon. Leader of the House sees fit and there is no urgency for this legislation, he might refer the Bill to a Select Committee so

that we can have an opportunity of discussing this important matter of the qualifying period.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been under review for some time, and during the time when it was referred to a Select Committee further consideration was given to it by our Legal Advisers and others in the Establishment Branch. Copies of relevant legislation from Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and other places were sought and everything is in this file. This matter has been revised and reviewed with the assistance of the legislation which prevails in Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago. The legislation is here. If the hon. member would like to be further assured on that, he can see the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been under consideration for a long time; it has been reviewed and compared with other legislation, and this Bill is merely to bring us in line with what obtains in the neighbouring countries of Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago. I do not see that sending this Bill to a Select Committee, at this stage, will help us to get any further. This Bill has been under active consideration, and it was sent before the Select Committee for over a year.

Although the suggestions made by the hon. member may appear reasonable, in this particular case we have already established the policy and adopted the principle of payment to members of Parliament, Ministers, and the Prime Minister, and that is what obtains in all enlightened countries all over the world. No longer is this Assembly constituted of merchants and planters who never wanted any pension or payment of salary, or any allowance or any emoluments. This Assembly is comprised of people of the lower and middle-income brackets like myself and some of the members here.

In the circumstances, the principle of payment to members has been established and it is here to stay. It was brought in by the Barbados Labour Party when it was in office. As a matter of fact, it is a very impoverished and insulting scale, because to think of paying a member of Parliament $80 a month is a definite insult. That is how it was started Sir, and then the amount was increased. Even now backbenchers are not properly paid. Some people will say that members only come here once a week, but members are interviewed by their constituents every day in the year. Whether you are a Minister or a back bencher you have to go out of your way to attend to the requirements of your constituents as well as those who are not your constituents. You have to give some of them bus fares and assist them in every way. The people whom we represent are not against our being paid for our services. Threats were made that if the other party had won the Government, the first thing they would have done was to abolish pensions for members of Parliament and especially the Minister. *(Asides)* That was said in Christ Church, but fortunately for many of us, including myself, that never happened. Fortunately, we may get our pensions.

I beg to move that the question be put.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 – 5 inclusive were called and passed.
Clause 6 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

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

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

10.10 p.m.

Clauses 7 to 16 inclusive were called and passed.
The Schedule was called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item is Order No. 8, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ACT, 1971

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill which seeks to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966, and in doing so to lay down the extent to which national insurance benefits are to be taken into consideration in actions taken by insured persons or their dependents against employers and others, and to enable the National Insurance Board in suitable cases to effect a recovery of benefits if necessary by taking action itself.

You will recall, Sir, that as from 4th January, 1971, the National Insurance Scheme was extended to include Workmen's Compensation, and section 52 in fact sets out what benefits are to be taken into consideration by the Courts in arriving at special damages and Section 53 of course gives the Board itself certain powers to sue for recovery of damages.

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

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister some of the implications of the new proposed section 53 of this Bill. I think it is quite correct as the Bill seeks to do that any benefit which an insured person may get in an action where a third party is at fault should go back into the National Insurance Fund. On the other hand, section 53 only permits him to bring the action if he gives notice of his intention to bring the action to the Board, and then in Section 53 (2) - and I hope this will be made clear because I think this was what was intended - although I can see litigation resulting from this, part of the duty of lawyers is to prevent litigation and not merely to promote it, but in section 53 (2) it says -

"If the insured person or his dependants or any of them have claimed benefit as is mentioned in subsection (1), all his rights and remedies with respect to the whole or any part of his claim against the person other than his employer shall be transferred to and vest in the Board."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the interpretation of that is that it is not only his claim to the extent of the benefit which vests in the Board, but all his claim against the third party, and I do not think this is really what the Minister and the draughtsman really intended, and I will respectfully suggest that what should be done in this Bill is that the Bill should really be amended in a proper manner to clarify that any benefits which he would have got in his claiming national insurance and only those benefits accrue to the Board, and that the Board is subrogated - I am sorry to use such difficult legal English - in his footsteps to the extent of those rights. I know that is what is intended, but it is not clear in the Bill and I do not know whether the draftsman by the time it gets to the Other Place may want to consider clarifying this section of the Act. The principle is absolutely correct.

In the English 1948 Act and what we had before the person who got the benefit was the man who was at fault, and therefore you find the position where national insurance would be paying out and the wrong-doer would be taking the benefit of the damages. This Bill seeks to correct that anomaly, but in doing so it is not clear enough and it may well penalise the person who is injured in these circumstances. We could possibly pass the Bill as it stands, allow the Minister to look at the point and discuss it with his legal draftsman, it is a legal drafting point, and I am sure it can be clarified and made much clearer in this Bill, and the subrogated rights could be perfectly set out with a redraft of the section.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I take the point made by the hon. member for Christ Church West. It certainly is not the intention of the Board to put itself in a position of the insured person to the extent that the funds of the Board would benefit over and above what it would ordinarily have benefited by if the person causing the injury had been making contributions to the fund, and in fact I know the Board would operate on the principle that if what is recoverable from the Courts exceeds the amount of money that would have been paid out in benefits that the excess would go to the insured person. Now this is the way I know the Board would want to operate.

10.20 p.m.

Whether in fact the Auditors would permit the Board to operate in this way, of this I cannot be certain. I am going to have another look at it, but I will assure the hon. member that it is not the intention of the National Insurance Board to benefit at the expense of the injury of an insured person but in fact only to be in no worse position than it would have been in had the injury been caused by a person making contributions to the fund.

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

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

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

A BILL TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN, YOUNG PERSONS AND CHILDREN ACT, 1938

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really to correct an oversight in The Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1938 as amended in 1951. The Act of 1938 contains a Schedule which is in fact an ILO Convention, to which Barbados adheres, governing the employment of these persons, i.e. women, young persons and children. Under the Act children are persons of 14 years and under, young persons and women are defined as persons between the ages of 14 and 18 years, and the ILO Convention states specifically that persons within these categories should not be employed at night. Be that as it may, it sets out in Article 2 of Parts II and III which deal with the employment of women and young persons, that in the case of young persons, who have attained the age of 16 years but are under the age of 18 years, this period, that is the period that is called night, shall include an interval prescribed by the competent authority of at least seven consecutive hours falling between 10 o'clock in the evening and 10 o'clock in the morning. The position is that the Act does not define who is this competent authority, and this amending Bill clearly sets out who is this competent authority who can prescribe the hours called night, and the com-

petent authority is the Minister responsible for Labour. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Hill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the third reading of this Bill, I would only like to ask the Minister to make sure that the regulations have been passed. I think it is one of the weaknesses of Barbadian Acts that where they speak about regulations they are sometimes not passed and we run into legal difficulties, very often finding that when you have to take action there are no regulations, and I hope that some research will be made into this Act to ascertain if regulations even now have been published. I just mentioned that in view of this new competent authority.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was passed.

10.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I know that hon. members are anxious to get away, but there are only two other short matters here which are amendments to Notes, and they stand in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. I am asking leave to deal with them in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. member to proceed with the two items.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 12 OF HEAD 21

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to amend the note to Item 12 of Head 21 - Establishments Division in Part 1 - Current of the Approved Estimates 1971-72 as follows:

> By adding the words "or to any person appointed to the post of Permanent Secretary when there is no provision available elsewhere" immediately after the words "Chief Establishments Officer".

The amendment to the note is necessary to enable the payment of entertainment allowance to be made to other Permanent Secretaries besides the Chief Establishments Officer.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 16 OF HEAD 11

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the note to Item 16 of Head 11 - Pensions in Part I - Current of the Approved Estimates 1971-72 be amended as follows:

> By adding the words "Also provides for the payment of *ex-gratia* awards generally where the former officers/employees do not qualify for retiring benefits under existing legislation".

The Addendum states that this Resolution seeks to amend the note to Item 16 - *Ex-Gratia* Gratuities - Head 11 - Pensions - to provide for the payment of ex-gratia awards generally where former officers/employees do not qualify for retiring benefits under existing legislation.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business. I am very grateful to the hon. member of the Opposition who sat in and assisted us as well as the others who have helped.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 23rd November, 1972, at 2.30 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Motion is seconded I should like to crave the indulgence of the House. Hon. members will have noticed that there was an omission on my part in not having the two sets of Minutes which were circulated confirmed: Minutes of Wednesday, 14th July, 1971, and Minutes of Tuesday, 20th July, 1971. Of course, they can be deferred, but if hon. members who were present think they are in order we can have them confirmed now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I think that should be done now, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, the Minutes for Wednesday, 14th July, 1971, and Tuesday, 20th July 1971, are confirmed. May I have a seconder to the Motion for adjourning the House.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 23rd, November, 1971, at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.40 p.m.