

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th October, 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. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; 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 Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (*Minister of Home Affairs*); Mr. A. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (*Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport*);

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should let hon. members know that due entirely to the fault of the Government Printery and not that of the Clerks at the Table the Minutes of the 20th July are not completed; so when a complete set of Minutes has been obtained the Minutes will be circulated. The Minutes of the 14th July are in order. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: We were not here.)

I am also informed that, again, because of deficiencies on the part of the Government Printery, the Order Papers were circulated only as recently, in some cases, as last night. Are the Minutes of the 14th July in order?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am one of those persons who received copies at a late hour. I have not been able, in the circumstances, to

pay the Minutes the attention I would have liked to. I should very much like, unless other hon. members have been able to do better than I have, to suggest that confirmation of the Minutes be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case, hon. members, confirmation of the Minutes is deferred.

PAPERS LAID

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

Report of the Standing Insurance Committee and Statement of Accounts of the General Insurance Fund for the year 1969-70.

Also Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September 1971.

Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, permission is requested to lay the Representation of the People (Expenses) Regulations, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$129,127 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 8, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, on behalf of the same hon. member, the Minister of Finance, to give notice of a Resolution to amend the note to Item 12 of Head 21 - Establishments Division in Part I - Current of the Approved Estimates 1971-72.

Also, on behalf of the same hon. member, to give notice of a Resolution to amend the note to Item 16 of Head 11 - Pensions in Part I - Current of the Approved Estimates 1971-72.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$15,726 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72, No. 9 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Public Utilities Act, 1951, and a Bill to amend the Gas Works Act, 1911.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year 1971-72.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, 1965, be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Public Utilities Act, 1951, be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Gas Works Act, 1911, be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year 1971-72 be read a first time.

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

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

Mr. E. E. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity of consulting my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, but I have spoken to one of his distinguished colleagues in this connection. In view of the paucity of their work this afternoon - I speak of Private Members' Business - and the intimation which I got at the time, 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 in order to proceed with Government Business under the circumstances.

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

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

2.50 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1971-72 No. 6

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is a practice which is well-known to deal with Items *seriatim*, and we shall keep to that practice.

In moving that Head 3 stand part, I think most hon. members are aware of the circumstances so that it may be as well for me at least to elaborate on the matter as presented to the Cabinet. The position is that the Clerk has requested that this matter be brought to the attention of the Cabinet in which he has been granted a special course at Westminster, and it was felt that he should attend this course and be granted the opportunity of improving his knowledge of parliamentary matters. This matter deals with the expenses involved, and as there was no existing vote under Head 3 from which the cost of the course could be met and the Chief Training Officer requested to have the cost of the course met from training funds, the Chief Training Officer advised that the training funds could only meet the expenses up to the amount of \$5,153.40. The expenses are very much more than that, and this is a Resolution to secure the balance of money for the Clerk of Parliament to be granted the opportunity of attending this course.

If there are any questions, I am quite willing to give the fullest explanation possible. As we all know, the Clerk of Parliament was a magistrate and is entitled to a certain proportion of leave passage etc. having served as a magistrate for many years, and this arrangement enables him to secure everything to which he is entitled having served as a magistrate under the leave passage arrangements and also to the benefits of the training scheme. I think the Clerk is very satisfied with what has been done, and we can definitely agree to pass this Head which will take care of his commitments while he is abroad.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that the sum of \$5,410 under Head 3 - Parliament - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately due to being detained in a court up to half an hour ago, I was unable to be here at an earlier stage. I gather that the hon. member for St. Peter mentioned the question of lateness of Order Papers. Now I am speaking of course under this item and I will not object to the Clerk's living expenses being paid during his course. It is obviously desirable that a Clerk who succeeds a Clerk of long standing such as Mr. Cumberbatch, should have as ample a training course as facilities will afford, but if I may just trespass very briefly on the rest of the Resolution, it is not every item the Opposition can come in and agree to or even be prepared to argue about as we can talk about Item 36. Even Item 37 is under the same Head, and we would want to know a little more about leave passages than has been said. The sum of \$4,500 seems very ample for passages alone, but nonetheless I am sure an explanation will be given about this.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that there are Heads and items under this Resolution which I do not think you can possibly ask anybody to discuss at twelve hours' or twenty hours' notice. There are even Ministers who did not have their Order Papers up to this morning; I happen to know that. I did not get mine until last night and you are asking me to come in here and discuss Head 25 to pay the presiding officers during the past election at twelve hours' notice, just to select one item I anticipate will be more than controversial. We will go along very well, Mr. Chairman, on these particular things, but the Minister must understand that he cannot expect to deal with this entire Resolution with the notice which we have been given for it. The Clerk's accommodation in London is one thing; the payment of the presiding officers during the election, just to pick out one is another thing altogether. It is not even a horse far less one of a different colour, and I would ask the Minister to be prepared to concede at this stage that we are not going to get through this vote for \$691,000 this afternoon.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He has singled out of this total omnibus Resolution the presiding

officers as one item on which he cannot speak this afternoon. He has just come out of a campaign where he had presiding officers. It is only a question of money; do they deserve it, do they not deserve it or is it too much? What is so magical about that particular item that he cannot discuss it this afternoon? The Government's business has got to go on, and the excuse given by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is too flimsy because he has just had an election, he has had Presiding Officers, he has known whether they were good or bad, whether or not they did their job badly. That was since the 9th September, can he not come now and criticise or praise them today as the case may be?

3.00 p.m.

The question that the sum of \$5,410 under Item 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Item 37 is also new, and in moving the passing of the sum of \$4,500 I would mention as I did previously that the Clerk of Parliament had put in a claim for \$6,904.80 based on his eligibility for leave passages and calculated at the rate of three first class passages. The Clerk held the post of Magistrate prior to his holding the post of Clerk of Parliament and was entitled to certain leave passages. After the Financial Secretary, the Chief Establishments Officer and the other various Government officials had looked into the matter the amount of \$4,500 was agreed upon. If there are any further questions I will try to elaborate on this. I beg to move that the sum of \$4,500 under Item 37 do now stand part.

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

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

The question that the sum of \$9,910 under Head 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 4 stand part. I think the note is pretty clear.

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

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

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in the case of the Judiciary there were certain unforeseeable expenses which could not be very well estimated for in advance because of many witnesses who come from overseas. In the July and October sittings many

persons came from overseas and these could not have been clearly estimated for, as hon. members on the other side would know, If there are any other questions I will try to answer them, but I beg to move that Head 5 - Judiciary, Item 13 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a new House and maybe we are all a little on edge today, but a lot of things are going through and a lot of nonsense is being prepared by such persons as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, back in the House for the first time after goodness knows how many years, talking foolishness on his first day here.

It is perfectly well known to those of us who have been in this House for a little time, even five years like at least some of us in the Opposition, that business cannot always be done as expeditiously as you would like, and a little foresight enables matters to be gone through much more quickly. This is a vote for \$17,000, it is not a lot of money but it raises a question of some principle as anybody who practises in the Courts knows. We are not upon this occasion having, fortunately, to point out as we did the last time such a resolution came before the House that prosecutions of the Crown are very selective in whom they bring back from overseas. There seems to be a more general approach to bringing witnesses in criminal cases back from overseas to assist the Courts of this island in coming to conclusions, and the principle therefore of a proper vote for witnesses is not one that any of us on this side can object to, but the main part - I think the Minister will agree - of the money required here, the \$20,000, is for bringing, for example, a handwriting expert from the United Kingdom, bringing back young ladies who have suffered certain misfortunes while on a 17-day holidays from Canada and so on. What I want to know is if the Government is prepared to be paying out over \$20,000 on air fares and a pleasant fortnight at the Paradise Beach Club for a handwriting expert from England who comes out every year, as far as one can judge, several times to give evidence in Barbados and will continue to come out. Until the training scheme which is intended to prepare a member of the Barbados Police Force with the ability to allow him to give evidence in these matters is embarked upon these expenses are going to continue. Why does the Government not see fit to spend some money on ordinary every-day Barbadians who have to go to Court day after day to give evidence in criminal cases, and better than anyone else a practising lawyer knows how many adjournments a case may face and no recompense whatsoever is given for so doing. In this day and age if money can be spent to bring back the victims of sexual assault or witnesses from the smaller Islands, or even to bring back Barbadians, Civil Servants who may have gone abroad on courses, why can a scheme not be introduced to reimburse the poor people who have to stand up in hot Court yards waiting to give evidence, and who do not as things are at present get remunerated unless they are doctors, professional people, and I believe the remuneration for doctors in the Criminal Court is still at the level of one guinea.

In a civil case where you can refuse to give evidence and you are only subject to a fine, you can get a summons to go to Court but you must be paid, and when the summonser comes and brings you a summons in a civil matter you can ask him for the money there and then and if he does not give you there and then you are not liable to go to Court at all. If you do not feel like going to the Court you can refuse but you can pay the fine of \$9.60 or whatever the present fine is in the Magistrates' Courts, but in criminal matters where a warrant of arrest can be sent for you if you refuse to give evidence, you can be called before the Court constantly and all you get is grumbling from your employers. This is a day to day matter that all of us have to contend with, and this is something which I would suggest to the Minister should be seriously considered under this Head. Due to the shortness of notice I must assist hon. members, especially those who may be in need of assistance - I was going to say like the Attorney General but I forgot his services have been dispensed with in that capacity so I can avoid that remark - especially those who may be in need of assistance in seeing what this vote used to be and what this vote is today.

3.10 p.m.

This vote is rising a lot. If the Government can afford this money, they should institute some system of paying everybody who has to go to Court. I know that severe financial loss is incurred.

Only today there was a case before the Supreme Court, a *habeas corpus* application, and it revealed that in a murder case there were, I think, 17 adjournments without any evidence being offered, but witnesses were attending the Court for all those 17 adjournments. I myself have just come from a Court with the same murder accused with witnesses out in the Court Yard standing in the hot sun until half-past two to hear that once again the matter is adjourned. All of those witnesses try to work for a living; they have little children at home to look after, and the Government ought to do something about seeing that they, too, are the beneficiaries of whatever funds are now available for payment of witness expenses. We on this side cannot object to the payment, because I know that the witnesses are coming all the time, but matters of this sort must be given consideration.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am really amused at the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. It seems as if I am a red rag to a bull! He says that I have come back in here in spite of him. I will tell him that I will be in here long after he has gone. Do not let that worry him at all. With regard to the expenses which the Government are asking for, he has not raised any new points. For a long time we have been endeavouring to find a suitable officer to send abroad to learn about handwriting. You cannot pick up every member of the Police Force, because he is a constable, and send him to learn about handwriting. That would be another contributing factor for the Leader of the Opposition to get more acquittals. It would be an easy way for him to get acquittals, because the first thing he would ask would be: Where

did you learn it? What education do you have? (*Asides*) I should have said that he would get some acquittals. He would love to see us take up any constable and send him abroad to come back here as an expert.

Mr. Chairman, I could see him, as he did when he sat down here the first Tuesday at the Swearing-in as Leader of the Opposition, grinning all over his face. There would be two occasions when he would be grinning. He knows that we cannot do it like that, and that the Government at the moment have a youngster abroad who is learning this special art. His idea about this is not something new to any Government. When he talks about witnesses, I would like to know what he, as a member of the Bar Council, has ever suggested to me as Attorney-General. (*Asides*) When you are versatile you could be Attorney-General, Foreign Minister, Minister of Communications and Works or anything. My services have not been dispensed with; I am moving from one Ministry to another, so you do not say that my services have been dispensed with. That is a sign of versatility and competence. As I have told the hon. member already, I have been the first Attorney-General of Independent Barbados, so he cannot talk that nonsense. Anyway, it would be a long time before he could even get there.

Mr. Chairman, he acknowledges that you have to bring witnesses from abroad. What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has already been doing in this country is to fool the people that the Government have something to do with who is prosecuted and who is not. In his remarks he talked about selectivity of whom they would bring back and whom they would not bring back. He knows as well as I do that under the Constitution of this country that, in the sphere of criminal law, this Government have never had any say - since Independence at any rate - in whom should be prosecuted, when, why and so on. He has always been fooling the people of this country, as a lawyer who should know the Constitution, that the Government prosecute this and that person.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The first time it was said I allowed it to pass. The second time I would have to refer the hon. member to the Standing Orders. I know that we have not been given any at the opening of this Session, but he must not say, in my respectful submission, that one hon. member is trying to fool anybody because that is imputing bad motives to hon. members. Is it Standing Order 32, Sir? I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you will know the Standing Order. I allowed it to pass the first time; I allowed what he said about selectivity to pass, because I specifically said that I am not making any accusations as to selectivity on this occasion. I allowed what else was incorrect to pass, but he must not think that because it was allowed to pass that all will be allowed to pass. You cannot, in my respectful submission, accuse another hon. member of fooling anybody. That is my respectful submission to the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether he is objecting, because he, obviously wants

an occasion to interrupt rather than to object. Be that as it may, as I was saying, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition himself.....

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, on a point of order. Am I right in saying that you are considering my objection?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As I was saying, the Director.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am considering this matter to see if he has a valid point. Please take your seat. Standing Order 26(7) states:

"No Member shall impute improper motives to another Member." In my submission, I feel that the remark should be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As you please, Mr. Chairman. I withdraw it, but I was trying to say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in spite of facts well known to himself and contrary to those facts, has endeavoured to persuade the people of this country that the Government are responsible for public prosecutions and for bringing anybody before the Courts, which he knows is contrary to the Constitution of this country. I did not expect him to rise on this issue at all, because he knows that the Director of Public Prosecutions himself decides from time to time and he alone decides. Section 79 of the Constitution states that in the exercise of his functions in instituting or terminating of criminal matters he is subject to the control or authority of no person in Barbados - not even the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: Will the Hon. Minister deny that, when he was the Attorney-General, he told me that that section of the Constitution should be amended to say that the Director of Public Prosecutions should be subject only to the Attorney-General?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is my feeling, but the position as it stands at the moment is what the Constitution says. I still feel that the Attorney-General of an Independent country should have some say in it, and I am not denying that. What is the point of order? I am saying that as the Constitution, until amended, stands - the hon. member knows that the Director of Public Prosecutions is the only person in Barbados who can bring a prosecution, who can say which witnesses are to come back and so on.

3.20 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has taken advantage of this Government because this Government could not institute prosecutions when the Government felt that they should be instituted. On the B.W.I.A. issue the Opposition ran through the country telling the people that our Prime Minister shot off his mouth, no case is brought and nobody is prosecuted when they knew that the Prime Minister or the Attorney-General, as I then was, could not bring

a case, but it would have been for the Director of Public Prosecutions. They went around the country fooling people on this increase of fares to look at what the Prime Minister has said, and asked what he had done about it, when they knew that under the Constitution of Barbados we had no say in doing anything like this. The time has come in this Hon. Chamber, Mr. Chairman, when this misleading of the public has got to stop and that is the only reason why I got into this debate, because the impression is constantly being given and the people are being fooled - I have not said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - by the type of nonsense you hear from time to time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned at the very outset in moving the passing of this item, it is not possible to accurately estimate the amount which is needed under this particular item, and as past experience has shown, in 1968-69 an amount of \$3,600 was voted and a supplementary of \$3,367 was needed; in 1969-70 a sum of \$5,300 was voted and a supplementary of \$14,663 needed; in 1970-71 a sum of \$6,400 was voted and a supplementary of \$7,288 was requested; in 1971-72 an amount of \$6,400 was voted and the sum of \$17,765 is now being requested. In the current financial year, witnesses are expected from England, St. Vincent, Grand Caymans, Canada and St. Lucia to give evidence at the July Assizes and their expenses are in the region of \$6,210, and for the October Assizes and January, 1972, expenses are in the region of \$8,000. This money is urgently needed for this purpose. I hardly think I need say anything more.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I just want to make one observation. I am not going to get involved in discussions as to whether the Constitution needs amending or does not need amending; I will leave it to the legal luminaries on both sides to argue that point. But there is something which I would like to say on the question of witnesses' expenses. I think the aspect of the criminal proceedings before the courts in this Island which has not been brought out is particularly that a large number of criminal prosecutions in this Island are initiated by private persons by way of information, and like some other people in other spheres of public life and in private endeavour in this Island, a lot of these people think that the case is often won by the plurality of witnesses that you can produce rather than the veracity; so the Government could not embark upon a system of paying all the witnesses whom the informant elects to summon to a court. Sometimes a whole village is summoned when they do not get paid. If they did get paid we would get not only the whole village summoned but the villages in the immediate vicinity as well being dragged into it, and this has now become a major occupation in the courts and in the administration of justice in the public life of this Island. What I am concerned about having been a practitioner myself and now being Minister of Finance and in some way responsible for economic development in this Island is the fantastic waste of time, not so much the loss of income, because invariably if a person is working for an employer and

he is summoned as a witness to the court, the employer does not, I cannot say he cannot deduct anything from his wages, but I am sure if he deducted from the income of the worker the daily or hourly wage which he should have been paid during his attendance at the court or in the courtyard more frequently than in the court and the travelling time to and from the court, the Trade Union would take strenuous objection, because every citizen is supposed to assist in the administration of justice whether of a criminal or civil nature.

I think perhaps that one solution which I would recommend to the Bar Association and the Law Society would be that people who bring private informations should themselves guarantee the payment of the witnesses and in the computation of the cost against one party or the other the cost of the attendance of the witnesses day by day should be taken into consideration. But I am concerned about the number of man hours which are lost day by day in the several magistrates courts or in the several magistrates courtyards of this Island. Now that we have a situation where people are becoming more and more gainfully employed, we cannot tolerate a situation where people attend a court as I have experienced on 37 separate and distinct occasions so that when the case actually comes up for trial, the witnesses have to rely largely on the fertility of their imaginations rather than the precise knowledge of the facts. Now this to me is defeating the whole purpose of the administration of justice, and what I should like to see is some tightening up being done in the setting out of the calendars of the magistrates courts, the number of cases which they can competently try within the course of a day, and secondly that not so many adjournments should be granted to barristers who, if I may quote, "have big work to do".

I remember one occasion on which I was in the High Court of Justice when the judge sent to call a particular barrister, he sent back a message - he did not intend the message to be relayed, but he certainly did deliver to the messenger a statement to the effect that he could not mind the court now because he had some big work in his Chambers. I do not want to call any names because members of the legal profession around here would know the gentleman to whom I am alluding. So you get this sort of contempt not only for the witnesses who have to appear because you really did not know them, and they are just, according to the likes of some barristers, the hoi polloi hanging around the courtyard like the days of ancient Rome, but you get a contempt for the magistrates and judges themselves by barristers who feel that their income-bearing propensities have greater importance than the actual speedy administration of justice in the Island. I am looking at the whole question of wastage of economic man power and man hours and wage-earning capacity of people who hang around the court yards of this Island. You have heard, Mr. Chairman, of the Dequincey case; I must almost say this is the fabulous case of Jarndyce and Jarndyce, a chancery case that went on for over sixty to seventy years. I have had a case which as far as I know has not been completed yet. It started several years before I stopped practising and I have

turned up on the court time after time and adjournments have been granted for one excuse or the other by the other side on a few occasions and at my behest as well, because after a period of seven years I must have some other work to do. There is an utter disregard on the part of the legal profession, generally speaking of the people who are responsible for the administration of justice, particularly about the way in which cases are set down for trial, and the general administration of justice and the human torture that people have to undergo going back to their villages night after night with disputes being unsettled and witnesses getting bunions and corns standing up in the court-yards with only a snowball cart to give them any kind of sustenance, and that kind of thing is not good enough for a civilised community.

3.30 p.m.

If the Press in this Island did a survey day by day of what went on in the Court yards and in the Magistrates' Courts of Barbados, how time is wasted, how people have to hang around, how little children waiting for maintenance orders who have not had a meal for 24 hours and hanging on to the skirts of their mothers and that kind of thing, have to hang around not only the people in Barbados would be shocked but the whole civilised world would be shocked, so I do not regard the payment of witnesses as being fundamental to the solution to the problem. I think that if we are going to pay the witnesses the unsuccessful parties should pay the witnesses day by day and then they will stop going to Court altogether over frivolities, and lawyers only make money out of people who do not have any work to do themselves, because the people who are earning good incomes in this island do not have to have recourse to the Law Courts of Barbados except in very rare, important, civil and probate matters, and maybe divorce. But the kind of thing which the working class man can ill afford and goes to Court about in Barbados is inconsistent with a high standard of living in this community, and Government is not willing to undertake to pay witnesses on that basis at all.

First there must be a tightening up in the general administration of justice, and after that is done maybe we will introduce measures whereby people will be dissuaded not only from wasting their time but the time of people, useful citizens, who may be otherwise gainfully employed.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in the first place I would like to make it quite clear that the members of the Opposition will be voting for the passing of this Head, and we do so satisfied in the knowledge that it is of the greatest importance in this country, indeed in any country, that people should not only see that justice is done but that justice should be done, and if it becomes necessary in the interest of any criminal prosecution therefore that a witness should be brought from abroad then I think that the Government should be prepared as it has been prepared on this occasion to pay the cost of bringing that witness. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let me try to correct a few misunderstandings. Under the Magistrates'

Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 of this Island, a Magistrate has the discretion to award costs in favour of an informant if he wins the case or against him if he loses the case, and those costs usually take into consideration the costs of witnesses who have attended the Court.

There has been a tardiness to do this in criminal prosecutions because in many cases, contrary to what the Hon. Prime Minister may think, some of the adjournments are requested by the Police who are prosecuting the case, and he finds therefore that if he awards costs in these cases he may have to do the same thing in private cases but the cost to public funds could be considerable.

Mr. Chairman, I think before we get into personal rancour in this House or anywhere else, particularly as lawyers are usually attacked, that we should do a bit of research, and if we do this research we will find that during the past 13 years the increase in litigation in the Courts in this Island has been tremendous, and indeed it is a tribute to the Judiciary which we have in this Island not only at the level of our Judges but at the level of our Magistrates that they have been above corruption and have done their duty fearlessly and unselfishly to this country.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make this clear. I doubt whether any member of the Opposition, and certainly not myself, would ever in this Chamber or elsewhere cast one word against the honesty and the integrity of the present Director of Public Prosecutions. He makes no selection in whom he prosecutes but that does not mean that at any stage that a person wants to make a statement concerning other statements made about prosecuting people that they should desist from so doing, and therefore if we are talking about this Head I should like to make a few suggestions that I think are very important. The Police for a long time in this country have been crying out for the need of a forensic laboratory, and certainly the Government should make such provision for the simple reason that it would save the bringing of certain experts.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member of course to his own surprise has only recently come in here, but if the hon. member were to.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order, you cannot get up objecting while I am on a point of order, I will have to teach you the rules as well. The hon. member has only recently come in here, much to his own surprise, like Rip Van Winkle he woke up after a sleep of 40 years. Had he been in here in the last session the hon. member would know that the Government has made provision for a forensic laboratory and that in the speech from the Throne which he attended at the opening of the session that there was mention again in the speech from the Throne of a forensic laboratory. The reason why the forensic laboratory was not erected before was be-

cause there had been an allocation of \$72,000 from Development and Welfare, and we could not get an agreement from the other Islands that this laboratory should be erected as a joint enterprise and the Barbados Government decided to go on, so let the Rip Van Winkles go back and catch up with what is taking place.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I know that throughout my five years in this House, no matter how much it may displease the Hon. Prime Minister, and indeed he did all in his best to make sure that I was not in this House, but the people of Christ Church West have seen to it that I am in here as a thorn in his side...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of elucidation, I wonder what makes the hon. member feel so strongly that he will be in here for five years; maybe the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not see him lasting five months.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the good Lord might see to it that the Hon. Prime Minister will leave before I do. Indeed within his own Party that may be seen to but I did not come in here to rancour on asides on important points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have given both sides sufficient latitude.

Mr. FORDE: The point remains that for many years the Police have been asking for a forensic laboratory. The Hon. Prime Minister must admit this, and I am saying that a long-term planning by any Government, not necessarily this Government....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I was asking for it before the Police. I doubt the Police knew what a forensic laboratory was, they were not even concerned about it before I came along in the law Courts.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the point remains that up to today that forensic laboratory has not been provided.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us keep directly to the Resolution which is for payment of witnesses and not for a laboratory.

Mr. FORDE: On the Resolution I am suggesting that the provision of such a laboratory, the provision of proper training in certain areas, will prevent the importation of witnesses from overseas to give expert evidence, and apparently this is a touchy Government, you cannot get up and make a suggestion unless the Prime Minister believes you are taking away his fire, but the position is that this is important in the interest of the country and I am happy to see that the present Minister of Home Affairs is here because with his zest and zeal I am sure that he will make sure that he fights the battle through Cabinet and that for the next five years we will not hear it is still in the Throne Speech. There are many things that are in the Throne Speech that have been in

Throne Speeches before, but the point is that they have not been fulfilled and on this side of the House in voting for this Resolution I would ask that we try to see that we make these provisions rather than an attack be launched at lawyers, Magistrates and Directors of Public Prosecutions.

The question that the sum of \$17,766 under Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

3.40 p.m.

Head 7 - Registration Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 7 - Registration Office - \$5,916 - stand part.

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

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

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - \$895 - stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I was thinking that this was two separate items under the same Head. I want to draw to the Government's attention that the air conditioner at the Law Library is again not working, and there are many thousands of valuable books in the Law Library. What I predicted the last time I drew this to the Government's attention about four years ago, namely, that unless they are air-conditioned the books will go into a state of some sort of dry rot, is now taking place.

Today a Law Report was needed in Mr. Justice Ward's court, and when it was opened every page that was turned broke in half. The books will go to nothing. In fact, it is my opinion that a new set of English Reports should now be bought because this is, apparently, not the only volume which has this dry rot or whatever you call it. The books are shut up for a long time; when you open them there is no moisture in the page, and as you turn the page everything collapses. It is time for an air conditioner to be bought again in order to protect the books. The whole Law Library should be air conditioned. For the price of a \$1,000-air conditioner you will save \$20,000 or \$30,000 in books.

The question that Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - \$895 - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11 - Pensions - \$50,000 - stand part. I think I should mention, briefly, the position so far

as this particular item is concerned. The Minister is here and he will probably elaborate further but, briefly speaking, the position is that for quite some time the question as to these contractors - I refer to the carters who have been conveying gravel and moving tools from one side to another. In many cases they owned the carts, and in other cases they employed people who actually performed the operation. This matter has been under consideration for some time now by the Barbados Workers Union, the Minister of Communications and Works and the Cabinet, and it has been felt that the carters who have been performing very valuable service in this country and in the Ministry of Communications and Works and who do not fall under the Casual Employees Pensions Act or any Pensions Act, should be given some measure of consideration after putting in 10 years' service.

This matter has been engaging the attention of the Cabinet for some time, and it is felt that carters who have rendered useful service to the Ministry of Communications and Works and to the country generally should receive some sort of consideration after a certain number of years' service. This is a provision to pay gratuities to such operators of carts who perform this service. If there is any other information needed - I have everything here - I think the appropriate Minister will be pleased to supply it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second this. As the Minister responsible for this aspect of the matter, only this morning I spoke to my administrative staff in an endeavour to have this matter implemented and payment made as soon as possible. This is another indication of this Government's serious concern for people who have rendered service to this country. It was a mere coincidence this morning that three men came to me, who must have heard of this, who worked for years and years with the last Government as carters and stopped working in 1956. They worked for years and years with their carts in the road and up to today except for getting old age pensions - they are from St. George; they have worked with different Inspectors - they were unable to get a penny after working for so many years. I passed them on to an officer in my Department to see whether or not some case could be made out for them to get something for the services they gave under the last Government.

I pledge that as soon as possible all payments will be made, and those who are entitled to them will get something as a measure of appreciation for the vital services which they have rendered to this community. Let it be understood that this is another of the million-and-one ways in which this Government is looking after the interest of the people in the lower rungs of the ladder who have given service to this country.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I should like to say that I am very pleased that, after many years of negotiations between the Government and the Barbados Workers Union, this matter has come before the House of Assembly. We

have had very many difficulties in solving this matter. Some of the public servants, who are entitled to pensions, gave us a hard time in dealing with this matter. At one time they were saying that the Government were employing the carts and not the men and, therefore, they were not entitled to a pension. I have never heard such fantastic argument in all my life, because I have never yet seen a cart in Barbados working automatically. I have always seen carts being worked by men, but we had this fantastic argument that the Government did not employ the men but the carts and for that reason you do not give a carter a pension.

On this question of pensions, I think, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when there must be a complete re-thinking and re-orientation in our minds about pensions in Barbados. I think the public is becoming pension conscious, and I think the time has now come when the Government should overhaul their own thinking about pensions and look at pensions in the light of all persons working for the public in one form or another and allow people to come within the whole jurisdiction of the Pension Scheme.

Furthermore, now that you have agreed to a pension for these workers, I should like to see the Government set up a committee to study the whole pension arrangement, so that in the years to come you will know how you are going to treat a pensioner on the basis of whether he is on a pension for 10 years, 15 years or 20 years. My private view is that a pension should be non-negotiable. You should be able to negotiate a pension at its inception and after that you should have a formula. The formula should be that whatever takes place within the given work arrangement - whether the man is a Chief Justice or a carter, whatever happens to the salary attached to his former post subsequent to his pension - his pension should be an automatic situation, and he would move from stage to stage so that we would not get pensioners who are out of the labour force being battered about by politicians who say that they are fighting for pensioners when in truth and in fact there are not enough in the labour force to create any great number of people one way or another on a political scene.

3.50 p.m.

I feel the time has come that pensioners should be given the right to have their pensions escalated on the basis that if the Chief Justice retires now, whatever takes place with that office subsequently, his pension should have a corresponding adjustment and there would be no need for anyone to make any stupid talk about what you are going to do about pensioners, and that as a formula should go for every pensioner in Barbados. The Minister of Finance is here and I have said so about ten years ago, and I again maintain that it is not beyond the capacity of the Government because everybody knows that we have to draw a pension one day, and I hope that commonsense will prevail and that this measure of bringing automatic relief to all of the pensioners will be instituted and relieve them from what I regard as the football area where some politicians sometimes from one part or the other say they are fighting for

pensioners, but in truth and in fact pensioners are not big enough in the voting area to make any difference if they would want to vote or favour one side or the other. I think this is something worthwhile although some of them have died.

The last call I would make is that whoever is the Minister responsible, should tell the members of the administration not to sleep on this because there is a tendency in the administration that if you are dealing with something for a carter or for a worker low down that they cannot find the files, the papers are at the Drill Hall or underneath the cellar, and these people have to wait months and months and years before they can get this microscopic amount they are to receive. I hope the time will come that this nonsense in the public service will be put to an end and you do not have people rushing like mad when it comes to the Civil Establishment and when it comes to people who are drawing housing allowance in a jiffy you can find the voucher and they can draw their money in a matter of weeks, but these other people have to wait until their grandchildren appear on the scene before they can get their money. The administration must be told that productivity begins high up and not at the man lower down.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to learn from the mouth of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, the member for St. Michael-South-Central that these carters for whom provision is made today are people who have rendered vital service to the community. If these people have rendered this type of service as we hear from the Hon. Minister, is it not the Government's duty to consider giving them something adequate in return for their services. Let us see what the Government is doing for these people who have rendered this valuable and vital service. They tell us that after a man has been supplying his cart and work for ten years up and down along the road, he is going to get one year's emoluments; if he has put in five years and less than ten years, he is going to get half a year's emoluments.

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting in the first place that we need a complete revision of the structure of things. We need a new scale of fees or wages for these carters and their tasks, whatever it might be, because when one takes into consideration what these people have earned in a ten-year period, some of them have earned little or nothing in terms of today's money. What we have got to do about this is to be quick and on the uptake. Some of them are employed removing the grass as it is weeded from the sides of the road. I am saying here and now that the same scale of pay that applies for the moving of grass should not be the same scale that should apply when the carter is called upon to remove tools from some work site to the depot, or to remove gravel from one site to another. According to Government, they have been employing a man's cart to perform a day's work; they pay him so much for his cart, and they have now come down to give him one year's emoluments after ten years. On what is this based? We

feel that something should be given to these people.

I have championed the cause of these people on the floor of this House and a former Minister told me that they employed the cart and not the man. What we are trying to make out is that you should employ these people in such a way that they would be earning something during the course of a day, during the course of a week, and consequently during the course of a year; so that when you arrive at this ten-year period and decide to give them one year's emoluments after ten years of service as a gratuity, you would still in the long run be giving them something because they would have earned it. As it stands at the moment, we are really giving these people, as Barbadians would say, little or nothing, and that is our complaint against this matter.

Now one other matter comes to my mind and this is something that the Minister has got to look into most readily. When these cantonniers and other workers weed the sides of the roads and heap the grass and other debris on the edges of the roads, we need this to be removed as quickly as possible. Our roads are already narrow and when we put these mounds on the sides of the roads, we are narrowing the width of the streets and creating problems, and it may mean that we need more carts, and if carts would not do, by all means let us get something that might be quicker. But for Heaven's sake we are not suggesting that any of these old people who have been in the job and doing something to help us throughout all the years and have given of their life, their blood and their sweat in this respect should be laid off at all. What we would like to see is a new rate of pay introduced so that when they reach their ten-year period or whatever it might be, they would have something on which this one year's emolument would be based.

4.00 p.m.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that at long last these Carters are being considered, but I would like to see that if their work is work of such a vital nature to the community that it be given the type of consideration that it really deserves. Do not let these people perform vital work and then not pay them the type of remuneration that they ought to have, it is still robbery to my mind if we have decided to give these people one year's emoluments in respect of 10 years of service. They are still being deprived of much of what they have really earned during their former years. This is not all they should get, and any Committee that might be set up to go into the matter would certainly do well if consideration can be given to improving the situation by seeing that a better scale of fees is arranged in order that these people can earn more and consequently get a better gratuity or pension as the case may be.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I am not speaking for the Minister, I am speaking as one of the people who negotiated this matter. This matter is not as simple as what has been stated and that is why it is not necessary to

raise all the complications in this matter, but what we do know is that reasonable arrangements are being made on behalf of these people. It is no point anyone getting in here and not examining this situation, we know the conditions under which Carters were employed, we are aware of those conditions, we are aware that the Carters are not at all times bound to be there when the job is being performed, we know that. That is why it has been so long in negotiating because we know as a fact that some of the Carters can be engaged elsewhere and you will have to pay them as long as they have supplied their carts and they have turned up, so it is not a question of a man working with his cart and he has to be there on the job. He can send one cart to a job and work somewhere else, he is not bound to be there, he can send anybody to do the job, so the question of the man being on the spot when the cart is working is not true. It is a false statement to make that the man has to be there where the cart is being employed, and that is where we had to fight this issue because the Government was saying that they were not employing the man, they were employing a service, they were employing a sort of haulage and they were not employing the man. Just like in some instances where they employed the man to do a haulage for them, they did not employ the lorry driver, they employed the contractor.

So far as this is concerned, this was the problem we have had to face for years, but we had to bring it down on moral grounds and explain that you could not produce arguments that all the Carters were employing people to work on the carts, and some of them had this as their only employment. To suggest that this is not reasonable is not facing the fact because this amount of money per year is reasonable. They were not working for weekly wages, they were working for wages based on the amount of jobs they did, and when you look at the calculation you will see that it is quite patent that you are compensating them in a manner that people normally have been compensated, on the basis as if they were getting an *ex gratia* payment because you are giving them \$X based on how much per week for so many years of service, and you have to arrive at something like this in these circumstances. This is a matter for negotiation. In some instances it would be two and a half weeks, in some instances three weeks for every year of service, in some instances four weeks for every year of service, and in a few cases five weeks for every year of service.

This is a reasonable settlement, and nobody in these circumstances can accuse the Government of not doing something reasonable. The Carters themselves will have to agree, and we who represent them as a body of people regard this as a reasonable settlement in the circumstances. We know that in other circumstances we might not have got anything for them because the argument was that they were not entitled, and that is why it was put as an *ex gratia* payment. This is a reasonable payment and there is no sense talking about the payment and how it should be paid, because in arriving at a year's emoluments you have to take not all they have earned, you would

have to know what the year's emoluments would be, and for a man working for ten years obviously you would have to arrive at an average. You were not going back at the lowest point, normally in these things you have the last three years to work by or the point that would give you the highest rate of earnings. You could take him back up to 1910 and say you are going to take those earnings but you would be giving him actually nothing, so we always take the last three years or so. This is a reasonable adjustment and one that is in favour of the Carters. I will say this, that other Governments had an opportunity to do something about it and they did nothing about it, so we should give this Government credit for acting on something that has been dragging for so long.

The question that the sum of \$50,000 under Head 11 - Pensions - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 13 - Customs - stand part. The position is that the Prime Minister has created under the Civil Establishment Order new posts, and that is furniture needed for the staff that has been created and which is set out in the Addendum. I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

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

The question 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. FERGUSON: 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. Again the notes are fully explanatory.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
4.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the registration of electors brings to my mind quite a few things, and it might be very much to our credit that we have with us in this Chamber our Minister of Home Affairs - both past and present. The first thing is that we have a Resolution for \$60,438 to supplement the Estimates. The Addendum tells us that there has been an increase in staff at the Electoral Office in preparing the registers of Electors amongst other things. As for the remuneration of Registering Officers in consequence of the additional duties resulting from the coming into force on 1st June, 1971 of the Representation of the People Act, 1971, nobody has any grouse, but the position of the Returning Officers, the Election Presiding Officers, I believe the Election Clerks and others is set out in a booklet entitled "Notes On The Direction And Supervision Of And The Procedure Of The Election Of Members To Serve In The House Of Assembly Of Barbados". It was issued by the Supervisor of Elections, 1971, and printed at the Barbados Government Printing Office. This document is, to my mind, a very, very interesting one.

I want to hear from the Minister of Home Affairs if he has ever read this document, and if after having read it, he is satisfied that the voting or balloting in this country could be a secret ballot, or could be considered a secret ballot - whether his side has 16 seats, 20 seats, 40 seats or all of the seats, or anybody's side has 2 seats or no seats. This booklet makes it abundantly clear that casting a vote in this country has nothing called secrecy associated with it. The booklet in itself is a fraud upon the people of this country. I am satisfied that sooner or later the Minister will seek to and must of necessity have it withdrawn. It is badly printed, in the first place. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Like your manifesto.) This is not something to make fun about. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: *The Beacon* of 1st September.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw to the attention of all members of the Assembly Standing Order 29(6). I am prepared, whilst I am here, to see it implemented in carrying out the letter of the law. It states:

"While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

I do not want to hear them at all in this Chamber - no elections, nothing at all. Let us get along with this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that hon. members on that side are going to tell you that the interruptions are not meant for your ears. However, what we are dealing with is that the procedure to be adopted in the casting of the vote was not regularly adhered to in this Island, or strictly adhered to, because there have been instances where - people have no doubt about this - there is abundant evidence of it that on account of the methods employed it can be

discovered today who voted for whom. I will explain the matter. There are known cases where persons went to a Polling Station, tendered their Identification Card to the first Clerk; he examined it; asked the person's name; checked the name according to the Electoral Register, and he announced it loudly enough for the second Clerk to hear the address and the number on the Electoral Roll which is the same number on the Identification Card. Now, when the person applying for the ballot paper goes to the Presiding Officer, it is at this point that some Presiding Officers copied the number from the Identification Card - not on the counterfoil, but on the ballot paper that they gave the people. That is a fact. 4.20 p.m.

It sounds far-fetched and nobody wants to believe it, but it is perfectly true. It is not a case where the official number was to have been kept on the counterfoil alone and nothing on the ballot paper, but there were some presiding officers who apparently had not been properly instructed, and they copied the number from the identification card on to the ballot paper that they handed to people to take in the booth. That is perfectly true. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member for St. Peter addressing the Chair?

Mr. HINDS: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman. I would not be on my feet addressing any other person than the Chair. What I am saying is exactly what happened in some cases. I am not saying the presiding officer was right; I feel he was not properly instructed or he did not follow the instructions. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if a former Attorney General of this country had read the book, he would have ordered that it be destroyed before the election was held, because it would have misled everybody who had to take part in the elections. That is my feeling and I happen to know the member to whom I referred as a former Attorney General. You found that candidates were in a position to send out circulars to electors telling them that their I.D. number was 1934678 as the case may be. That was printed on the candidates' circular and the person receiving a circular could check his I.D. card and see that it was correct; but when the person went to the polling station his name was not on the voters' list. The interesting thing is from where did the candidate get the correct number of a person's I.D. card to place on his circular to send out, and yet when the person went to the polling station his name was not there. Something must have gone wrong under those circumstances. We would certainly like to hear from the former Minister of Home Affairs who took us through the elections and would be *au fait* with all these things, and I am sure he is ready to reply now.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to reply but I find there is nothing to reply to, because up to now all that the hon. member has been saying has amounted to nothing; no charges have in fact been laid against either the former Minister of Home Affairs or the present Minister of Home Affairs.

The hon. member talks about secret ballots. Mr. Chairman, I can understand how the hon. member feels after the election gave back 18 to 6. We know that the Opposition had conned their way throughout the West Indian region and in fact beyond in the United States of America and England trying to make people believe that they had the election sewn upon their pockets and they had created overnight a new Prime Minister, and I can understand now that they ended up with six seats out of twenty-four how they feel, and they are looking for some kind of excuse to present to the general public that they had the elections. Their problem, Mr. Chairman, is that it was the Opposition that read this election pamphlet and it was they that got destroyed. We did not read the election pamphlet and therefore we had no problems. The hon. member said that if the former Attorney General had read the election pamphlet, he would have destroyed it. Well the former Attorney General did not read the election pamphlet, therefore it was not destroyed. It was the Opposition that read it, and we know exactly what has happened to them.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the election pamphlet to which I referred was issued by the Government to their officers; no Opposition issued it. The Minister does not know what he is talking about. He has just got up ranting and does not understand what it is all about. I have laid specific charges that something has been wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point of order made.

Mr. HINDS: I warn you that when the Prime Minister rose on a point of order, you allowed him to carry on making a speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to warn the hon. member that he does not have to respect the person in the Chair but he must respect the Chair, and when I say his point of order has been made, he will take his seat and there will be no argument at all with this Chair from either side of the House. When I say that I mean that. So long as I have to sit here and govern, both sides will adhere to what I say. I do not want any rancour whatsoever while I am sitting in this Chair.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the elections of 9th September this year were conducted using the same procedures as in former elections, and in fact the only additional procedure was the presentation of I.D. cards. At all times during this election those persons who presented themselves to vote had in some form to identify themselves. What we did on this occasion was to make provision for additional identification, but the fact is that the whole conduct of the elections was done in an identical manner to former elections and the ballot was as quick as before. I challenge any hon. member who has made any challenges to tell me how anybody apart from his friends who spoke with him voted in his particular constituency. I have been a candidate myself and I have not got the foggiest idea who voted for me in the election unless someone comes

and tells me this. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, have been a candidate and I presume the same for yourself. I challenge anybody on either side of this House to tell me, unless he has special powers of divination that he would know how a person voted unless that person vouchsafed that kind of information to him. The fact is that they do not know. I do not know and I do not care to know.

4.30 p.m.

They do not know, and if this is the case, Mr. Chairman, then the vote is secret and ballots were as secret as always.

On the question of the voters' lists, Mr. Chairman, I do not know on what evidence the hon. member has based his allegation. I can only say that I know the Chief Electoral Officer took it upon himself to inform the voters of this country by circular what their registered number was and what polling station they should attend to cast their votes. If a candidate took it upon himself to give any kind of instructions to voters to present themselves at particular stations that was not official, the official instructions came from the Chief Electoral Officer, and if those persons who received those instructions from the Chief Electoral Officer followed them and went to the stations they would have been able to cast their votes and not to be misled by persons who had copied names or numbers, I do not know from where. Mr. Chairman, I know how they feel about this, in fact they have expressed themselves on several occasions, but I can say without any doubt that these elections were as fair as any conducted anywhere.

Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that much heavy weather has been made of a very simple matter. The matter before us is a Resolution asking for money to pay the expenses incurred during this election, and the reasons for asking for this sum of money I will give. Polling stations have been increased from 110 to 212, the number of Returning Officers has increased as a result of increased constituencies, the polling hours were increased from 8 hours to 12 hours, other additional staff resulting from the aforementioned factors, the increased rate of remuneration for Electoral Officers over the 1961 rates which the Minister proposed and which is the subject of another submission. I am here to be enlightened, and I would have enjoyed listening to reasons being advanced why there should be no increase in the number of polling stations, why the number of Returning Officers should not have been increased or why there should not have been increased rates of remuneration, but the type of discussion which has gone on so far surrounding this Resolution in my opinion can certainly not be considered sublime. I have taken a note of what the hon. member for St. Peter has said and I would ask him to put any allegations in writing and I will look into it.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, put what in writing? I am a member of this Hon. House.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was very amused when I sat and listened to the hon. member for St. Peter. He was going by stages to show this irregularity, but the irregularity he spoke about was that people went to the polling station and they did not find their names on the list, but this was going on from the days people began to vote in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to find out what the hon. member has risen on.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am addressing the Chair, on the Resolution, so I do not have to inform the Chair what I am rising on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was waiting upon the Minister of Home Affairs to find out if he had concluded his speech.

Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I have finished with my remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, those who know the rules better than anybody else, all I am saying to them is that I do not have to inform the Chair when I rise to speak. It is my duty to speak. I saw that the Hon. Minister had concluded his speech and I rose after he took his seat. If I had risen while he was still speaking I would have to inform you of what I had risen on. The hon. member for St. Peter made a charge about irregularities and that the voting was not secret. That was his main charge, and he said he has evidence that the voting was not secret but he proceeded to state that some people went to the polls and their names were not there, but that has been going on from the year one. You can do nothing about it, that is the law of Barbados. If your name is not on the register you cannot vote. The hon. member proceeded to show that when you go up to the register and announce your name, a number is put on a paper, and he says that when you go before the Registering Officer he will take down your name and copy that number. Let us take a constituency like the one I represent where there are 5,522 names. You have 5,000 people voting, so where will the Registering Officer put 5,000 pieces of paper? In his fob pocket? To determine what? When you announce the number and the people who are there checking on the numbers copy the code number, that code number is put and it is sealed and that seal is not opened during the count, when the votes are counted the seal is not opened so there is no possibility that the person whose number was 1824 would know that 1824 was his because the votes do not come up by numbers, you throw them out of the box for the people who are there at the counting. Sometimes the Registering Officer does not bring back the same people at the count, sometimes he has different people so the possibility of any Officer really knowing how people vote was very remote, and to say that it is not secret is going to suggest that when you go into the ballot box and vote like all of us should have been able to do and have done, who can come behind us and watch us? Where is the vote not secret?

On the other suggestion I can only say that the hon. member has said so on the basis that they have

not won. This is a sort of aftermath but this is what people say about elections, and I do not think that members on the other side should worry. I listened to some of their meetings, they won the elections but before 9th September, because they arrogated to themselves who would be Prime Minister. I heard them one night saying "stand back and let the new Prime Minister come up." (*Asides*). You will ask me now what I am speaking about but you did not ask your colleague what he was speaking about when he said that the voting was not secret.
4.40 p.m.

That is the same voting I am talking about. If the hon. member is grieved because the new Prime Minister did not take his place and he has not taken his place in this Assembly, then do not throw any aspersions at the people who were running the Elections. You have been beaten 18 to 6, and the only excuse you want to give now is that something went wrong at the Elections. Be fair; you know that nothing went wrong. It would have been the opposite if something has gone wrong in Christ Church South Central where your Prime Minister was to be, and you would have known that something had gone wrong with the votes. That would have been the only possible uproar you would have had in Barbados. You are throwing aspersions at whom? Not at the Minister of Home Affairs. The former Minister of Home Affairs was a candidate fighting in the Election, and the present Minister of Home Affairs was a candidate fighting in the Election. They could not be worried about looking to see who voted for whom. They were concerned about getting people to go to the polls and vote for them.

The hon. member for St. Peter spoke about a fraud. I would not challenge him on the basis of suggesting that the Election was a fraud. I would not challenge him on anything fraudulent at all. Any man, who now the Election is over is accusing the public servants of fraud.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My reference to a fraud upon the electorate was with reference to the book of notes that was issued for the guidance of Presiding Officers. I stressed that it had been issued to Presiding Officers, Election Clerks and, I believe, to Poll Clerks. There are a lot of things that he would never challenge me on, but we are going to challenge each other from time to time until the truth about everything comes out.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would not challenge the hon. member on fraud. There is no secret about fraud with the hon. member, and I am not going to challenge him on that. If he expects a challenge from me on that I will not do it. All I am saying is that when he talks about fraud after the Election and he says certain things about the public servants, then no one in this House who knows anything about the Election we recently had can sit here and allow such a statement to go unnoticed. He knows that he is not going to get any evidence to support that. Where was he when this sort of thing went on? Where was he when he saw a Presiding Officer make these notes on the

back of a piece of paper? If he had seen that taking place in the constituency in which he was a candidate, why did he not protest? He had the authority to protest as a candidate. If he saw that taking place, why did he not protest there and then? He knows that he could not get any evidence to that effect. He was running in a constituency, and he was kept so busy that he could not go into anybody else's constituency to see what was taking place. Where could he go on Polling Day to see what was happening in the other 23 constituencies? He could only be speaking about what took place in St. Peter. If it took place in St. Peter, why did he not challenge the Registering Officer in St. Peter? If there is anything about fraud, the statement he has made is a fraudulent one.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments on the Resolution which is before this Chamber. This is the second meeting of this Session, and I am sure that you are going to have a very difficult time. The only member so far who has said anything about this Resolution apart from my colleague is the present Minister of Home Affairs. I thought that James Brown was in hospital. I did not know that James Brown had come back in here. This talk about expressing yourself and move away let the Prime Minister pass - What is wrong with that? I used to hear about the heavy roller in 1966, and later there was no heavy roller, but the heavy roller is now back in here. This is democracy. The people have made a choice by giving 18 seats to the Government and 6 seats over here. We have a duty to those who supported us. Must we ignore them? The people say that you must rule, and we have to bow to the people's wishes, therefore, jumping up every minute and talking about 18 - 6, 16 - 2 is nonsense. That is now history. We are here for 5 years, so let us try and get on with the people's business. Why play to the Gallery?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you to put the question, and let us get on with the business. No one can deny that irregularities have taken place here and there. I know of a family who lived in the same house for 30 years; 2 of them had to vote at one Polling Station and the others had to vote at other Polling Stations. I know of two George Butchers who had Identification Cards, and when they went to vote they were told that they had voted already. This type of thing can happen, especially under the new system. The former Minister of Home Affairs said that it was conducted under the old system.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not want to be misrepresented, and I want to make my point quite clear. I said that, except for the introduction of Identification Cards, the balloting was conducted in the identical manner to former occasions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your elucidation is accepted.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, no one can deny that we had our little irregularities here and there. If we had won the Government, as the hon. member for St. Michael West has said, they would have had the same aftermath as he had in 1966. There is nothing wrong with

a person losing an election. You fight an election and you lose. I was hoping to win, and it is as simple as that. If the former Leader of the Opposition is not with us there is nothing wrong with that. The present Prime Minister was not in here in 1956. He lost an election; he came in here in 1958 after winning a by-election, and today he is the Prime Minister of Barbados. What is wrong with losing an election? Do you think the world has come to an end? What nonsense about 18-6? Do you believe that you have tyrants over there? You have paper weight over there.

For the past 5 years, Mr. Chairman, you sat on the other side of the House, and you recognised the fact that 6 of us over here fought the Government. The former member for St. Peter had gone on the other side with Mr. Lloyd Smith. I am talking about the elections, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the Resolution. 4.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not talking about the elections.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am leading up to these things. What is wrong that we are having this nonsense every minute. I would say that we went into a struggle and some of us came out with scars. If they had lost they would have been saying what we are saying and sitting down and licking their wounds. Let us forget this nonsense and get along with the people's business because I know this will be a blistering five years, and any of the former members who sat in here can tell the new members that this side is no easy side to push around. It has never been. If 53,000 people supported them, 40,000 supported us and we have a duty to them in here. I heard the Prime Minister get up in here with some sly remarks to the hon. member about his awaking up one morning and finding himself in here and it was an accident. I want to know if the Prime Minister dropped down and came in here. He was an accident of the War for that matter. I would suggest to you, Sir, to let us finish this rancour and foolish argument and showing off before the Gallery because that is all it is. You should put the question and let us finish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already made that statement, and it is my intention to rule, and when I speak I am going to act.

The question that Head 25 - Ministry of Home Affairs - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 26 - Land and Surveys Department - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 26, I would like to mention that the Chief Surveyor is entitled to this house allowance to the sum of \$960 a year, and this is to make provision for paying him from the Department itself and not from the Establishment Division as such. He has already been receiving this, but no provision is made under the Department.

I beg to move that Head 26 - Lands and Surveys Department - stand part.

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

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

Head 29 - Town and Country Planning Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

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

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

Head 32 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 32 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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 stand part.

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

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

Head 39 - Ministry of Health and Welfare - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 39 stand part.

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

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

Head 40 - Welfare Department - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 40 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, your speed is something to be admired, but when it comes to the taxpayers' money I think that there must be a check-point somewhere or the other. Under Item 24 - Welfare Grants - for the sum of \$137,500, I am sure that the Minister would be in a position to tell us, as well as at Item 25 - Old Age Pensions - how he arrived at these amounts.

I would like perhaps to say something in respect of the old age pensions first because as I

understand it, Sir, the Post Offices at which these old age pensions are paid use well over \$49,000 weekly to pay these pensions, and I just cannot for the life of me see how this amount that is now being asked for could really be enough, because it is understood that the pensioners are now over 13,000 in number. St. Michael and the City alone carry almost 6,000, St. James over 550, St. Philip, 1,000 and Christ Church is another parish with a large number, 1,400, and in St. Peter, my own constituency, there are 565, whereas St. George has 950 and St. Lucy 500, St. Joseph 500, St. Andrew has 400 and St. James has over 850.

Now it would mean therefore that if all of these people are to receive their allowances at the present rate, something must be wrong. Your present calculations could hardly be right.
5.00 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member must remember that there still exists in this country a means test, and the amount of pension payable to an old age pensioner depends to a large extent on the findings of the Old Age Pensions Claims Committee in respect of the means test. It means that if you have a means test and a person has been in receipt of some form of income, whether it is by way of rent from houses or if that person has land, they can receive pension below the maximum. The note itself is self-explanatory but I just want to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that not every pensioner receives the \$5.00 because, according to the Old Age Pensions Act the amount of pension paid to an old age pensioner bears some form of relationship to the findings of the Old Age Pensions Claims Committee in respect of the means test.

The hon. member must remember that in the Throne Speech reference was made to the means test, but the whole point is that the Act provides for this means test and we are having a look at it, but he must understand that some pensioners can receive less than \$5.00 because of the means test.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Hon. Minister has just said, but the note we have before us tells us that provision is being made to pay 12,200 pensioners each receiving \$5.00 per week, and that during the year there has been an increase of 800 more.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we must provide for the total number of pensioners at the maximum rate, and that is where the provision in the Estimates comes. What I am saying is that not all of these pensioners receive the maximum rate because if after the means test is applied it is discovered by the Old Age Pensions Officer that this person is in receipt of some form of income over and above \$7.00 per week, the person does not qualify for the maximum pension, but as far as the Legislature is concerned we do not know how many during the year would qualify for a reduced pension, therefore we have to provide for maximum pensions. So when we ask for \$30,000 it

means that some people have been receiving reduced pensions and that is where you have more money than in the ordinary course of events.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister were to look back at his files he would see that in October last year they underestimated; they had 200 more than the amount for which they had estimated. The Minister does not understand what this is all about, but in truth and in fact the means test should be at least 15/16 in our view, at least \$20.00 a week when we bear in mind today that there are some cases where we have old people - because to receive this old age pension you must be 68 years of age - and we have some old diabetics who because they have some little board and shingled house or they have to depend on a pension that they are getting from somewhere they cannot receive a pension. What we are saying is that the means test will have to be examined quickly and most carefully and provision will have to be made for these old people, because it is after 68 that these people really need something to keep body and soul together, and we cannot fool ourselves about this any longer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. member is not telling us anything new, we have already declared as policy in the Governor-General's Throne Speech that we are going to do something about the means test.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record I would like to clarify the situation. The sum of \$3,172,000 has been provided to pay old age pensions to approximately 12,200 persons at the rate of \$5.00 per week during the current year. At the 1st April, 1971, the number had increased to 13,000 persons and the expenditure at the end of August amounted to \$1,252,830 leaving a balance of \$1,919,170 so that the balance which is needed is now \$30,830 which is now being requested to supplement this item. The means test has not yet been removed, it is under consideration and that is what is engaging the attention of most hon. members, but the fact is that the number of old age pensioners has increased and this is really to make sure that each and every one is given an old age pension up to the end of the financial year. This is a regular supplementary we come for every year.

Mr. HINDS: What information has the Minister added? The note tells us that the original provision was based on 12,000 pensioners but that there was an increase of 800 at 1st April, 1971. The Minister told us that they had risen to 10,000 but I am telling the Minister that by the end of March, 1971 the number had risen to 11,000. Ask the Minister how he accounts for that amount?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, I am being misquoted as usual, I said that at the 1st April, 1971 the number had increased to 13,000. 5.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I did not follow the Minister closely enough. If he will repeat it, I will appreciate it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. member, I will read the first paragraph again. I said that the sum of \$3,172,000 has been provided to pay old age pensions to approximately 12,000 persons at the rate of \$5 per week during the current year, but at 1st April, 1971, the number had increased to 13,000 persons. I went on to read further, but I do not know if he wants to hear the balance again.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, people may think I am mad, but I should like the Minister to read his notes again.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is confusing welfare grants with pensions. There are two separate and distinct notes: One is Note 27 and the other is Note 28. The one dealing with the 8,500 people is in respect of welfare grants, and the other one is in respect of old age pensions.

The question that Head 40 - Welfare Department - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 44 - Ministry of Trade Industry And Commerce - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 44 - Ministry of Trade Industry and Commerce - stand part.

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

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

Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates Post Office stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$691,840 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 7

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$55,300 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1971-72 No. 7 which form part of the Schedule to this Resolution.

This is to authorise the payment of \$55,000 for the construction of Communal Baths and Latrines. The amount of \$200,000 was provided in the current estimates and this has proved to be inadequate, in that the sum of \$61,238 was released for the construction of similar facilities at Ruby, Brereton and Black Bess: two in the parish of St. Philip and the last in the parish of St. Peter, and there are plans for the building of 7 additional facilities at a cost of \$193,354.18. That is the explanation, Sir.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I think it is right that where the Government are acting on behalf of the public's interest and doing plans that are worth commendation that they should be commended. On this Resolution we will commend them for the actions they are taking in relation to the provision of Communal Baths and Latrines in this country.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite correct that where the Opposition notice that there is room for improvement we should make our point and make it forcibly. One of the aspects of the amenities that happens to be lacking in this country is amenities for latrines, public baths and facilities in the City of Bridgetown. There is no doubt that this country has made progress in my lifetime and, I am sure, in the lifetime of most hon. members. But one of the noticeable features in Bridgetown is the failure to provide adequately for toilet facilities. I make the point not only or not primarily for the tourist industry, but most specifically for Barbadians in this country. I think it is a sad commentary on our capital City in the year 1971 that we should find a sad lack in these facilities in this country.

I am glad to hear the Hon. Prime Minister say that there is provision being made for more Communal Baths and Latrines. I hope that these will be provided not only in the rural areas of our country, but that we should give a face-lift to these facilities in Barbados. Perhaps there is room for charitable organisations to help the Government in this respect by themselves offering to operate such facilities.

I can assure the Government that, certainly, we on this side will help them in this respect wherever we can, because we think it is a vital need and that any country that is thriving in this respect should have adequate facilities made for its people.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Leader of the House would call this my old song. I have been singing this song now for 5 years, and it looks to me as if I will have to sing it for another few weeks. I am glad, as my colleague has said, that there is provision being made to have some Communal Baths and Latrines. I would have thought that after crying almost in the wilderness; taking the Leader of the House on the spot; taking the Town and Country Planning

Officer; taking the then Minister of Communications and Works - much to my regret he is not a Senator - down to Fitts Village that something would have been done for those people. For 5 years I have been asking for this plum. According to them they can win the Fitts Village box at any time, so give the people at Fitts Village something. There is beach land down there which the Leader of the House has seen on two occasions. I pleaded with him and he told me that they had the money provided 5 years ago. The Ministry of Communications and Works could not get carpenters and masons only because it was to do something for the people of St. James. 5.20 p.m.

The Minister of Communications and Works said they could not get carpenters; carpenters had gone on strike. Masons have gone to Mars only because this is for St. James. You cannot win the St. James seat, so give it to me. You are not going to win the St. James seat in 1976 either; so give me the little thing for St. James. The people of St. James pay taxes. I scored 418 extra runs which are a lot of runs to knock off, and you cannot knock them off in a hurry. Give the people in Fitts Village where according to you, you have your strength, the little communal bath and toilets. You find that children and men coming from fishing have to go on the beach and use the beach and expose themselves to the ladies who go to swim there. I am not considering the tourists because I believe that Barbados is for Barbadians first in spite of the little change we have in Parliament now. You only have to get some mad journalist write some nonsense in the papers some morning that there is a yellow fever outbreak in Barbados or the West Indies, and a lot of people believe that Barbados is in Jamaica, and any time you say the West Indies, this to my mind could be the collapse of the tourist industry. I sincerely hope this will never happen because we have established it in the interest of our Barbadians. Let me see these things done for Barbadians some of whom live right there in Fitts Village which is a small fishing village. I am told that Mr. Holder, a former member of this House was calling for it. I am told that Mr. Carmichael who was from that side on that occasion or was half with them and half with the other side was calling for it also. They did not get it. I have cried for five years already; am I to continue crying? What have the people done the Government or to my Government when it was in power? Is there something wrong with the people in Fitts Village?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education is from St. James and I would hope that he would join in Cabinet and ask for this dire need for the people at Fitts Village.

There is another point, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry the hon. member for St. Michael South-East is not in his place because I heard him say once in here that you do not want these things in Barbados. It was a very pretty story then. I also heard the then Minister of Communications and Works say that that is how it should be. Now I hear today that the Government has set out to provide more baths. To me, there

is a conflict and some inconsistency along the road. I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has set out to do this. I realise I cannot get into this eleven because it has been picked but let me be the opening batsman in the next eleven because that the people in Fitts Village can have these facilities. The Leader of the House went there with me on two occasions during the last session and he promised us then. I am asking the Leader of the House along with the Minister of Education to help me and by helping me they will be helping the people of St. James and the people in Fitts Village in particular where they are supposed to be strong. You cannot win the St. James seat in 1976 and you can put that in your pipe and smoke it. I am no peanuts. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You mean you are no "Bree"!)

As Senator Wes Hall would say, I am no sweet bread; you know you have to drink water with me. I am asking the Minister who is in charge of this Resolution to visit the site again and see if they did not have the need for it fifteen years ago, whether they do not have need for it in this coming session, and to place it at the head of the next list. We are in need of it. It is an area where there are approximately 1,100 people living and it is mainly a fishing village. It is a pretty spot and people go there and have their fun; so I am asking the Minister who is in charge of this Resolution to please give the people of St. James this requirement.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in a general way I share some of the views of the two hon. members from the other side about these facilities and especially the facilities for a metropolitan area like St. Michael and the City of Bridgetown. The hon. member for St. James has said that he knows he is not in this eleven and he would like to be opening in a new team. If I were in his position, I would not say that. I would demand a play in this eleven because he is sort of discounting himself and his own ability by saying he knows he is not in this eleven. I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church-West that the facilities in the City should be improved and upgraded. I feel that there is a tendency in Barbados to downgrade toilet and latrine facilities even in the establishments, and I think the Government should call upon the business places in the City. They are very shoddy and inadequate and they do not provide enough toilet and latrine facilities for the staff and their clients. It is appalling to go into some of these business places in Bridgetown, and it looks as if you come from Mars if you ask to use any of the facilities. In some cases you had better not use them. This is something that is shocking because they are places where thousands of people congregate at Christmas time. Thousands of people are going to be in the City next month and at Christmas time, and there are not enough facilities in these business places.

I agree with the hon. member for St. James that it seems he is representing a parish that has come upon bad days both from his own party and for everybody else, because it seems as if his own party bypassed St. James and now it seems he will have to wait. What I would like to suggest to the Hon. Prime

Minister is that when it comes to the rural areas, I note that the Prime Minister has been sending down Resolutions for the purchasing of land. Now I have some very revolutionary views on this. I feel that in this country we should be able to call upon these plantations and estates to provide land free of cost for these services because they are services that some of them should be providing for the people on the plantation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I just want to get the records straight. We do not pay for any land in St. John; so he has got to organise his constituency now to get land in the same way that I got the land free from Kendal Plantation. I do not even have to canvass up there; so when all of you can do that, then you will be able to come in here and talk. Every individual member ought to have such good relations with all his constituents that just as when I want a bath for the general public in St. John I go and pick out a piece of land that the people want and tell the owner of the land this is the one we are having, they can do the same. If the hon. member for St. James can guarantee us some of that expensive seaside land at Fitts Village.....(Asides) That has nothing to do with me; that is not Fitts Village, that is Paynes Bay. The hon. member omitted to state that in this small allocation of over seven units he has got one at Baywoods which is much more important. I really was on a point of order and the hon. member gave way. The point however is that St. James has one in this new plan, and in the fullness of time if other members can do what I did in St. John and get the land donated free, I will guarantee that we will get the one in Fitts Village tomorrow; If the hon. member would give me the assurance that we can get the spot of land free, I will start the programme by next month.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, did the Hon. Minister say that there is one in this plan for St. James? I am getting mixed up. This is supposed to be in Baywoods which is adjoining St. Andrew.
5.30 p.m.

If I go and ask for anything in Orange Hill will it be all right? Is that St. James?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has one in Orange Hill already, but Baywoods is in the parish of St. James, I am not talking about constituency wise.

Mr. CRAIG: I want to get the record straight, I hope the Minister for Agriculture and myself do not get mixed up.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Prime Minister said that hon. members should use their influence to get some of the lands from some of their constituents but I would like to put it up and beyond the members doing this, I would like to regard it as a solemn act of policy of the Government and I would like to see all of these throughout the island. It may be difficult in certain areas but moreso when it comes to the

rural areas - and I can speak objectively on the rural areas, I do not represent a rural constituency as such - but I feel the land in the rural areas where the plantations have not provided this important facility for centuries, that it would not be asking too much of all the plantations in the rural areas as a matter of right to provide land for these purposes. This is too microscopic an amount of land, but when it comes to the City I feel that the powers that be, the Minister of Health and the other appropriate Ministers should step up the facilities in establishments and stores in this island and make sure that they provide adequate and decent facilities consonant with a modern society.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, my view on this whole question of communal baths is that I personally do not favour communal baths as the ultimate socialist aim for the people of Barbados. I am prepared to accept it as a temporary measure in view of the fact that the economic positions of some people in this country do not permit them to have water in their backyards to have their baths in private, unknown to the neighbours when they bathe and how often they bathe as can often happen in in these public places, and I would certainly hope if I stay in a Ministry my aim would be to see that services are put into the houses as fast as they possibly can, and on this issue I think this Government has an excellent record. My aim would be that people should be asking for communal baths and latrines in constituencies but should be concerned that their constituents are in a position to have running water in the back of their homes so that they can have their baths in private. For my constituency my aim is that everybody should have running water in his home.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, it is a strange thing when there is a bit of rust on you. I do not understand this, no one is saying that everybody in Barbados should not have a bath and water toilet, and I do not like the way that the hon. member for St. Michael West and myself seem to be agreeing this afternoon. Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts; if this continues I will have to run him out. What the hon. member for St. Michael West said was that you are going to have thousands of people in the City just now, and the people who come into the City will have to make appointments with their own toilets at home to go in them before they come into the City and then when they get into the City make appointments to go out.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, I was not dealing with the metropolitan area, it is obvious that you have to have public facilities in the City. I was talking about a general principle. How could I be such a congenital idiot as to suggest what the hon. member for St. James is suggesting?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I would not call on the hon. member to withdraw that remark calling me an idiot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is the Chair's prerogative to ask him to withdraw it and that I am quite prepared to do.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, I asked how could I be a congenital idiot, not him, if he thinks he is that is a matter for him, but I am talking about myself.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, knowing the Minister for several years I do not think it is beyond him to say anything, he is quite capable of saying anything at any time. Lionel Riley would know this, not me. The Minister said that he spoke about the rural areas. I understood him to say that he does not agree with having these baths and toilets, but if this is what the Minister meant probably I did not understand. Under those conditions I really cannot say what I had to say.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think that the points which were raised in this Resolution have been valid ones, particularly the ones which the representative for St. Michael West made. This is one of particular concern to people in the rural areas, and I think that one has got to recognise that in the rural areas you might have people who might be travelling through the area and who might not know of anybody in the area if they run into any difficulties where they can go and have independent facilities. The point which I would like to make relates to the administration of some of these facilities. It has been drawn to my attention, for example and I do not know how widespread this is - but it has been drawn to my attention that in some areas some of these facilities are closed on Sundays. I remember particularly one instance where we had a function in a particular area and we had a group of people there but these people could not use the facilities because the building was closed, and I think this is something which obviously the Minister has to look into and make sure that if these facilities are provided they are provided all the time so that they will be available to the people for use.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, my personal view on communal baths has been expressed in the last Parliament. I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South-East who said that communal baths are not really what he would like to see. I said in the last Parliament that when one considers the cost of erecting communal baths, if a proper census were made of any of the baths if would be found that they are used by a small percentage of the male population and very few females use them.

Let us look at Branchbury, St. Joseph. There has been dispute about whether or not a bath should be placed at a particular area at Branchbury. The hon. member for St. Michael West, I think, speaks about communal baths and says that land should be donated by plantations. What we have to understand, Mr. Chairman, is that there are certain plantations which have large tenancies. I am in agreement with his suggestion that where the tenantry is abutting and bounding on plantation land the plantation should give up an area of land to provide for a communal bath.

On the other hand, where I disagree is when compulsory acquisition is used to acquire small

areas of land belonging to private persons. When a communal bath is placed in the middle of a surrounded area of proper houses it immediately devalues the price of the properties in the area. Look at Brereton Village and see where they have placed a communal bath! There is a lady right opposite the communal bath who has just built a proper house and it devalues the lady's house immediately. Nobody is going to give her a good price for a house with a communal bath in front her door, an 8-foot road, not to mention what is going to happen when the people start using the bath.

During the last Session the Minister said that these baths were costing in the vicinity of \$40,000 to build. I have said it before and I say it again in this House that where a bath is going to cost \$40,000 to build, then the Government should take an estimate of the number of persons in the area who are likely to use that bath. That money can be utilised in the Waterworks Department to install water in those houses even if it is repaid on a diminishing basis on the same method that is being used by the Light And Power Company. That is the policy which should be used when thinking of the erection of communal baths.

Mr. Chairman, where you have an area of 1100 or 1200 people and the cost in relation to the bath exceeds that in relation to offering services to the people in that area, then it may be necessary to erect a communal bath, but where the number of the people who will use the bath is small, then I believe a different consideration should be applied.

When it comes to the Metropolitan area, Mr. Chairman, my views are that the Town and Country Planning Department should not pass a plan for the erection of any building - there is a lot of building going on particularly in Bridgetown - unless adequate facilities have been provided in relation to the number of persons who will be expected to use the building. I have said before that in this country we have been lagging too much in our technological skills.

Mr. Chairman, I see that building is going on in Broad Street, and I can rest assured that no provision has been made whereby that area could be excavated and proper facilities placed in the basement of the building. The store could remain at top and the facilities could be entered by way of a side door or a door to the main building. In that case we would not have the problem of people having to go by the old Trafalgar Hotel where others passing nearby cannot avoid the smell.

I believe that the Government should investigate this matter. I have heard a rumour once that you could not excavate in Bridgetown. I have known where excavation has been carried out next door to the sea, and I believe that is what should happen. The Government's policy should be that, when any erection is taking place in the Metropolitan area, proper facilities should be incorporated in the plan before it could be passed by the Town and Country Planning Department.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two inaccuracies which I should like to clear up before this debate is concluded. If I may deal with the hon. member for St. Joseph's remarks first, he started off his speech by saying that these communal baths in the country are used very little by females and mostly by a handful of men in each district. There are 58 facilities in the Island. This is not a kitchen debate; it is not a lavatory debate, and I would not like it to descend to that level. We have to call a spade a spade. As I said there are 58 facilities in this Island. That is an average of 5 in each parish. Some parishes are more equal than others, and some have 7 or 8 while others have 3 or 4. In my parish I do not think we have more than 3. As far as I can remember very quickly it should be Sargeant Street, a new one at Kendal, one at Venture, Edgecliffe..... (Asides) We need one at Venture anyhow.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the average number of attendances per unit during the last calendar year 1970 was 10,758 users. It stands to reason that in a rural area the utilisation would be greater than in a district where the people are already provided with their own facilities. We must not forget the same time we are discussing this that the Government have installed over 24,000 private installations during the past 10 years. There are something like 58,000 corporeal hereditaments according to the Local Government Act in this Island. When we came into office there were less than 25,000 of these supplied with facilities. There are now something like 44,000 or 46,000 out of the 58,000 which means that every little 16 x 9 with or without shed roof attached - we describe all of those as corporeal hereditaments. Some of them cannot be dignified by the name of a house or home, because we have a large backlog to catch up with in the Urban and Rural Renewal Programme in this Island.

Now, we must also distinguish between what you call a communal bath and latrine, which is a neighbourhood project, from a public convenience. Let me use those words which appear emblazoned on the proscenium arch of the one between the two theatres in Probyn Street - Public Convenience. There is a need for more of these facilities, because there are 105,000 people living in the Metropolitan area, and in the City area most of the business in Barbados is concentrated.

I agree with the hon. member for St. Joseph and the hon. member for St. Michael West that every single building going up now should have in these facilities. It should have adequate facilities not only to provide for the staff in which they are grossly inadequate, but for the general public as well.

I am going to go further now than that. I know that the Public Health Inspectors - I do not want to use any harsh language, but we have inherited a lot of people, who do not feel the bit and you call that in race-horse language "hard-mouth people", from the last Government. From the Bridgetown City Council we have taken them over; given them better salaries; torn off the khaki; stripped the enamel ladle from

dangling from their belt; given them some status in this community, and those same people are going around in places like Baxters Road, Bank Hall, in the Bay Land where a man has a little 2 x 4 shop selling refreshments and telling him that, if he does not put in all of these tiled facilities and so on within 10 weeks, he cannot open business!

I want to see some of those Public Health Inspectors going into Broad Street, Swan Street and Roebuck Street where the Barbados Shipping And Trading and those big firms are doing business and inspect what they have there and they will find that conditions are far worse than some of the facilities provided by a woman who is selling fish and floats and trying to supply civil servants and workers with breakfast in this Island. It was not until I and some of my Ministers went around and advised some of those small shopkeepers to apply to the Development Bank for loans to assist them in refurbishing their shops that they had any idea of how to face the problem.

5.50 p.m.

Now this key which I have is not a key to any convenience. The manager would keep the key in his pocket and like when you were at school you have to say "please for a pass" to go outside; and if you change the vowel you would have to go to the manager and say something like that, and you have to change the vowel from "a" to "i". This is reprehensible and as far as we are concerned, and I am sure the Minister of Home Affairs - will agree with this, the Town and Country Planning Officer will not be giving permission for any new buildings, but as far as the Ministry of Health is concerned, I certainly would like to see some of these recalcitrant public health officers who spend all their time in electioneering and so on going around to some of the big places in Bridgetown and inspecting the kind of facilities they have there, because I will tell you that I have been living back in this Island for about twenty years, and I do not know what any of the facilities they have in Broad Street look like, because I do not know if they exist or whether they would allow you to use them, because nowhere can you see a sign saying "Gents this way" and "Ladies this way" in any store in Broad Street at all. You go in a store and they are completely antiseptic in so far as providing sanitary facilities is concerned. They do not recognise such a condition existing among mankind and that metabolism is a word that does exist in the English language; so we must distinguish between area facilities, community and neighbourhood requirements and the requirements of the masses of people who have to transact business, catch buses and taxis and walk in the metropolitan area.

Now the real problem with this programme is a simple one. It was started by the last Government as a rural amenity, and I think that the President of the Caribbean Development Bank is the person whom the people living in the rural areas of Barbados would have to thank because if Dr. Lewis when he was Director of the Commonwealth Development Corporation had not pointed out that the Canadians were

literally stealing money from the sugar producing countries and got them to agree to give back \$ 1/2 million a year, - the Canadian Government was buying our sugar from the United Kingdom at a greater price than the United Kingdom was paying us for our sugar - we would not have had the Rural Amenities Fund set up, and then it was thought that all these facilities should not be provided out of General Revenue or the Consolidated Fund, but should be provided out of the Rural Amenities Fund. When we came into office we had a programme for the construction of 38 baths, but at that time the whole thing had been re-adjusted and there was no money coming into the Labour Welfare Fund literally which had to go to housing, or for the Rural Amenities Fund, and so there was a kind of slowing down in the activity until the Minister who is now the Leader of the House decided that we would have to vote money constructively out of the Consolidated Fund and not wait for the Rural Amenities Fund to increase or decrease as the case may be, because there does not appear to be much prospect of the Rural Amenities Fund receiving any more money from the sources from which it came before. We have now come and we are making this an item of Government expenditure not out of any special fund but as an item of expenditure out of general revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that they have reached St. John at last. You know we are suffering up there; but it is still our object to have water in every home wherever the people require it, and there will still be a demand in the rural areas for village and area facilities for the local inhabitants, and in the metropolitan area we need a lot more of these things.

Now let me say something about the standards. The average cost is around about \$30,000, and we have also had to wait because the Ministry of Communications and Works itself could not cope with the programme, and we have given these out to private contractors. We have got to ensure that anything that is constructed is not a kind of backyard operation like the Bridgetown City Council used to operate. Why we have not got more in Bridgetown was because these facilities were put up as a kind of political exercise and only people who voted for the conservatives could be put in charge of these facilities as some old family retainer. You did not get people given proper training and so on with the handling of the general public and the general standards that should prevail at facilities such as these; so you had one down opposite the City Hall, and you got one over by the theatre, and there is another in the New Orleans and one in Pond Side. I could name you all the attendants at these places, not by the frequency with which I visited them which was nil, but because there are old political people I knew when I was eight years old. There were Mrs. Manning and Mr. Wood up in the Pond Side. I believe one of the persons you now see on political platforms still was up in the New Orleans. I would not embarrass the gentleman, but Mr. Wood is dead and he used to work for my family, so I knew him. This was regarded as the kind of plum for somebody who had associated himself with the Bridgetown City Council.

Now let us face facts. The Bridgetown City Council has never carried out any sort of public programme on the basis of the requirements of the society. The Bridgetown City Council always operated on the basis of what was politically expedient for them and on the basis of patronage. They were not concerned about the standards which prevailed, so that you will find Queens Park was in a run down condition, and having given somebody a job it did not matter, and all the other things they were put in charge of whether it was the cemetery or the public baths, it was merely a question of having a key person in a particular job. It was never a question of putting up something which was aesthetically pleasing and functionally satisfying. We now have to get architectural plans. We have to have these things tiled from ceiling to floor and they must be located in places where they provide the greatest possible good to the greatest possible number of people. That is our programme. As far as the statement made by the Minister of Communications and Works is concerned, this is our policy in so far as every corporeal hereditament in this Island is concerned, but in so far as the metropolitan area is concerned, we have to realise that not everyone of us will be carrying about a key to a private thing like if it is a bank vault in his pocket like some of the managers in Bridgetown get on with.

I want to go just one step further and say that the facilities in some of the hotels in Barbados leave a lot to be desired, even in the new hotels, in so far as maintenance and perpetual supervision of them is concerned, and certainly where we put up facilities around the bus stands where they are adequate and and so on, they must be of the highest possible standard both architecturally and aesthetically and in so far as sanitation is concerned. When you say these things are not used, the statistics which I have here demonstrated that in each one of the 58 facilities provided by the Government in this Island that there are 11,000 users or an average of at least thirty or thirty-five persons per day using baths and facilities of that nature, and you will understand that these things are not being wasted on the public at all and will continue to be a requirement.

Before I sit down I just want to say this. I do not think that the Agricultural Society of Barbados ought to be allowed to use Queens Park for a two, three or four day Exhibition where you would get an average attendance of between 5,000 and 10,000 persons per day with only two or three lavatory facilities located in the back of Queens Park house. I think it is a disgrace and I hope the Ministry of Health will ensure that wherever public functions are being held not only do you have proper fire precautions enforced, but you will also make sure that you have proper sanitary provisions for all the people who may attend.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: There are only one or two points which I would like to make. The Hon. Prime Minister has more or less given my reply, but I would like to make it clear that since this Government has been in office, two such facilities have

been provided in the parish of St. James, one at Paynes Bay and the other at Upper Carlton. Another one is being provided at Baywoods in the parish of St. James. The hon. member is not in his place, but I have made special note of the point he raised. I know he has been pressing to try and get something done. We are interested in the people in Fitts Village as the hon. member is. For that matter, we are interested in the welfare of the people of Barbados generally, and Fitts Village itself will be considered 6.00 p.m.

but there are other facilities which we are now providing for the parish of St. James but Fitts Village will be dealt with as a priority. I do not think I can say any more.

The question that the sum of \$55,300 under Part II - Capital, Head 103 - Ministry of Health and Welfare stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North West be now taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WORKMANS, ST. GEORGE

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in your absence the House has dealt for such a long time with communal baths and latrines - as a matter of fact, it was the subject of the last Resolution - but I am afraid that we still have communal baths and latrines with us because this Resolution calls for the acquisition of some 4,000 square feet of land for the purpose of siting a communal bath and latrine there. This land, as the Schedule to the Resolution clearly indicates, is situated at Workmans in the parish of St. George and consists of 4,438 square feet. This is being acquired by the Government compulsorily not because there is any dispute between the present owners and the purchasers, but that the Government may have an indefeasible title to the property. The Government and the vendor are agreed on all material terms of the transaction including the purchase price which is very reasonable, at the rate of 30 cents per square foot, and I move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BLACK ROCK, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution again deals with acquisition of land but this time, happily, for a different purpose, also a communal purpose, education on this occasion. It is proposed to acquire 195,370 square feet of land situated at Black Rock in an area called Jones Land for the purpose of siting there a Comprehensive Secondary School for girls. This is to relieve the pressure that is put on the St. Leonard's School.

Up until very recently a two-shift system operated at St. Leonard's School, and only last week the Minister for Education opened new additions to the School so as to bring to an end the shift system. This land will now be used for constructing permanently a building in order to accommodate the spill over from St. Leonard's Girls' School. I regret to say that this land has been compulsorily acquired because there is a dispute over the purchase price. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say briefly that this school is meant to provide the facilities for the young people of this country to improve their educational attainments, and that it is in keeping with the goal of this Government of providing free secondary education for all the children of secondary school age. This particular school will provide places for some 1,200 children, and when the children are removed from the St. Leonard's compound additional places will therefore be available on that particular compound, and hence will be within the framework of the goal of providing additional places for our children in this country.
6.10 p.m.

I am very happy that, in keeping with our proposals to provide at least 5 new secondary schools during this particular term, one of the very earliest items to be dealt with in this new Session would be the provision of facilities to provide for more schools in this country.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next item on the Order Paper is Item No. 4 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North West. It is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Warrens, St. Michael.

RESOLUTION *re* ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WARRENS, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is the final Resolution dealing with the acquisition of land

on the Order Paper. Some time ago, I believe, this Hon. Chamber acquired an area of land situate at Warrens for the purpose of constructing a National Cemetery and Crematorium. All of the arguments were then at hand as to the need for this, and, in fact, members then and even now are pointing to the inadequacy of the remaining sites at Westbury Cemetery for the burial of the dead. The same thing prevails even to this day and the situation is even a bit worst. The purpose of this Resolution is to acquire approximately 28 1/2 acres of land at Warrens situate as the Schedule indicates in an area which is suited for this purpose.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next item on the Order Paper is Item No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister.

RESOLUTION *re* AMENDMENT OF NOTE TO ITEM 43 OF HEAD 44

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is merely to approve the amendment of the Note to Item 43 of Head 44 - Ministry of Trade, Community Development and Youth Affairs. The amendment is merely to amend the Item under Head 44 to read:

"Provision for the maintenance of furniture and equipment at playing fields and community centres. Also includes provision for equipment required for continuation of sports programme at Government-owned playing fields."

This is a simple amendment to the Note and it does not entail additional expenditure of any capital or any other sum.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 6 standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. It is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the amendment of the Note to Item 16 of Head 33 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

RESOLUTION *re* AMENDMENT TO NOTE TO ITEM 16 OF HEAD 33

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar amendment to the one which we have just passed. The Note to the Item No. 16 of Head 33 - Meteorological Office in Part I - Current of the Approved Estimates should be amended as follows:

Delete the existing note and substitute the following "Provides for the purchase and installation etc. of telecommunication and radar equipment."

You will see in the Addendum, Mr. Speaker, that earlier we had discussed the purchase of a Plan Position Indicator for the Radar installation at the Meteorological Office at Seawell Airport. The cost of the equipment is estimated at \$16,000, and we would like to finance this acquisition from funds which are uncommitted and available under Head 33 - Meteorological Office, plus an additional supplementary provision which was passed for \$4,000. In order to use the funds under Head 33, it is necessary to amend the note to include Radar Equipment which was not there before.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 7 on the Order Paper, standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. It is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to the advance of loans and the payment of travelling allowance to public officers required to travel for the due performance of their duties.

BILLS - SECOND READING

PUBLIC OFFICERS LOAN AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES ACT, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill. The objects and reasons have been set out, and it is merely to amend and consolidate the law relating to the advance of loans and the payment of travelling allowance to public officers required to travel for the due performance of their functions.

Clause 1, of course, is the citation.

Clause 2 - Interpretation.

Clause 3 merely gives the Minister power to direct that an officer who makes an application shall receive a loan from the Consolidated Fund.

Clause 4 gives the Minister power to make regulations, and these regulations are set out with the declaration that any public officer is eligible; secondly, to regulate the making of advances by way of loan, and prescribing the conditions for providing security in respect of and for the repayment of such advances; thirdly, to provide for the repayment of any money due by the officer on abatement of the officer's salary; fourthly, prescribing the rates and conditions of payment of travelling allowances; fifthly, generally for giving effect to the Act.

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill the Prime Minister will tell us is merely moving an amendment. It might be quite simple, but we have been legislating here this afternoon and everything, as in the case of this Bill, is something which has been thrust upon us less than 24 hours ago.
6.20 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think the hon. member is reading the same Bill.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member for St. Peter kindly take his seat?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is obviously not dealing with the same Bill that I am dealing with because notice of this Bill was given two weeks ago; it was not just thrust in the hand. I do not know what he means by the expression "thrust in the hand". This is not a Bill that we have asked leave to deal with in all its stages at today's sitting at all, and a normal period is one week, and two weeks is an act of supererogation on the part of the Government. If the hon. member would indicate that he wants an adjournment to consider the Bill because of the late receipt of it, that is another matter, but I am not a postman. I gave two weeks' notice of the Bill. If that is what the other side wants, I am not objecting. There is no need to make any big speech. There is no big thing about that at all; I do not get a penny out of it.

Mr. HINDS: Nobody is making a big speech. All I was trying to do was to draw to Your Honour's attention that hon. members only received this less than twenty-four hours ago. We are concerned that they were not circulated and we have not read them, and we do not like to be taking part in these proceedings when we are not familiar with what is going on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. member wants to preserve his right to speak, he would have to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th November, 1971, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I would like to enjoin hon. members that we will be circulating during the interval of time a Supplementary Estimate for independence celebra-

tions, and I hope to get leave of the House to deal with this Supplementary Estimate all the details of which will be set out. I hope to get it to hon. members by next Tuesday so that they would have a week to study the implications, and I will be asking leave to deal with this Supplementary Estimate in all its stages at the next sitting of the House.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th November, 1971, at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.24 p.m.