THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th August, 1972.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. A. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.). (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of this Honourable House for the 4th July, 1972 and the 18th July, 1972 are before you for confirmation. If there are no objections, the Minutes will be confirmed *(Pause)*. There being no objections, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

Being laid at this time are the Reports on the results of the examination of the Accounts of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1969.

Also being laid at this time are Accounts and Statements for the month of September, 1970, as prepared by the Accountant-General.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have been commanded by the Cabinet to lay the following documents:

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders as at 31.5.72.

Also Statement showing money Order transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the month of May, 1972.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister,

The Local Government (Pensions) (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1972.

Also Barbados Training Report for the year 1st April to 31st March, 1972.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of:

A Resolution to grant the sum of $449,642 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972–73 Part 1 – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972–73 No. 8 which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Also Resolution to grant the sum of $15,950 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972–73 Part 1 – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates

1972–73 No. 11 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a:–

Resolution to grant the sum of $332,380 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972–73 Part 11 – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972–73 No. 9 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice of a :–

Resolution to grant the sum of $300,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972–73, Part 11 – Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972–73 No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I seek permission to take this Resolution through all its stages today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, we have two additional Resolutions, and I am asking for permission to deal with all of these Resolutions of which notice has been given today in all of their stages at this sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, leave will be granted. *(Pause.)* There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Minister of Education:–

Is the Minister aware that a certificate issued to school-leavers by the department of Education from 1928-1944 as a "Merit" certificate; and from 1944-1965 as the school-leaving certificate, had a fair and reasonable employment value both at home and abroad?

2. Is the Minister aware that with requests from abroad still reaching the Ministry of Education for this latter certificate evidences the fact of its continuing employment value, particularly in the United States of America?

3. Will the Minister state if the New Barbados School-leaving certificate which has been issued since 1965 has any local employment value either in the Public Service or in industry?

4. How many new Barbados School Leaving certificates have been issued at the end of each of the academic years – 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972?

5. How many children took the exam in each of the years mentioned at No. 4 above?

6. Is it a fact that this New Barbados School Leaving certificate is not a graded certificate?

7. In view of the stipulations attached thereto, i.e., achievement in four (4) passes at one sitting with compulsory English Language and one Science subject, would Government set about to accord this certificate the same recognition as the L.C.C. (Intermediate) Level certificate?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:–

When will construction begin on the market at Speightstown, St. Peter, provision for which has been made in the Annual Estimates three years prior to 29th April, 1969 and for three years subsequent to that date?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:–

Have all the victims of the flood of October 2, 1970 had their claims processed? If not, why not?

2 How many claims were received from persons who lost their tools, whether masons, carpenters, joiners or other artisans?

3. How many have been given assistance to replace such tools as have been lost in the above mentioned flood, bearing in mind such was the means by which many earned a livelihood?

4. If the answer to No. 1 above is in the negative, will the Minister state what funds remain to satisfy any such claims?

To enquire of the Minister of Education, Sport & Community Development:–

Will the Minister take steps to establish a branch of the Housecraft Centre at Boscobel Girls' School, St. Peter to provide training in Home Economics for the several persons at Boscobel and the adjoining districts – Gays, Baltic, Mount, Castle, Diamond Corner, Moor Hill and Date Tree Hill, who are desirous of becoming proficient in this art?

2. Will the Minister use his good offices in the future to publicise the fact that the Home Economics training is available to both male and female members of the community?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:—

Is Government aware that the recent fare structure laid down by the Public Utilities Board for motor omibus travel on Routes 1, 1A, 1B, 1C, & 1F tends to reduce cash-customer-trading at shops, stores, supermarkets etc., at Speightstown, St. Peter?

2. Will Government give very active consideration to this matter bearing in mind the urgent necessity to develop Speightstown and, that any reduction in trade in Speightstown must scare away present and future capital investment, and must have very serious unemployment consequences for a number of workers who now earn a livelihood there?

12.15 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969, be now read a first time.

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

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

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members that the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act is now to hand. In order for hon. members to have a chance to study it, with your permission we will come back to this Report of the Select Committee later in the day.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak very briefly on Your Honour's suggestion, I wonder if Your Honour and other members of the Committee are aware that the enquiry which we instituted in connection with the Bank Holidays Act at the United Nations has today been answered by telegram, and it might conceivably have resulted in a different report. I wonder if the Minister in charge of the Bill would care to look at the telegram before presenting the report for possible further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you like to raise that when the report is presented?

Mr. ADAMS: The Minister has the text of the telegram. We cannot reveal what happened, but I wonder if when the Minister is considering the matter it could be looked at in that light?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the text of the reply we have received and for my part I do not think this would affect the report of Parliament.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 1, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is read for tabling.

Also, Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 3, asked by the same hon. member, is ready for tabling.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I should like to table Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 38, asked by the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 10, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15, asked by the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 26, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 31, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 33, asked by the Hon. member for Bridgetown.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 36, asked by the hon. member for Bridgetown.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 41, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 44, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 23, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph is ready.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that in so far as the Report of the Select Committee is concerned, we can probably deal with that after the recess for lunch, around 3 o'clock by which time it should be ready, and members should have copies in their hands.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, with great respect since there are so many questions for Oral Reply, I hope Government will not take Question Time or Private Members' Business time to deal with the report of the Select Committee, and I suggest that it be dealt with at 4.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

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, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on this side we are always willing to facilitate the discussion of the public business of this Island, but there reaches a stage where you have to say enough is enough. I have been inundated with most courteous notes and messages from the Leader of the House and from the Clerks of the House indicating that there are Resolutions which it is desired to pass through all their stages today. Many of the Resolutions bear the mark that their subject matter has been known for some four or five months, and I am suggesting to the House that we are making a joke with this business of late presentation of Resolutions. There are many Ministers who are sitting in the House for the first time, but they are not inexperienced Ministers and should know from previous administration of their departments that it is their duty to keep those responsible..... I cannot hear myself for hon. members taking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members should not be standing in the Gallery.

Mr. ADAMS: The Minister of Communications and Works must know that he cannot hang around the Gallery.
12.25 p.m.

Those responsible for preparing these resolutions should be made by their ministerial chiefs to present the resolutions to the House in good time. I have heard that the resolutions had notice given of them. I got the resolutions which it is desired to pass through all their stages in one day and of which notice has been given today before I got the resolutions of which notice was given earlier, for I got my House of Assembly papers only this morning.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a motion has been made that you do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Supply. This cannot be the subject of a debate, if the hon. member is objecting he should state his objection, but he cannot debate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing the objection.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am speaking on the motion that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee, and that the Committee be instructed to consider the resolutions, notice of which was given today, and if the hon. member for St. Michael West thinks he knows better than you what procedure is he should be in the Chair. It is only a person of exceptional ignorance who contradicts something he knows nothing about, I got my Order Paper this morning.

As it happens, the resolutions which it is sought to pass through all their stages today have been in my hands longer than the resolutions notice of which was given earlier, and it would be unfair for me to say that we should not deal with them. The other resolutions of which proper notice has been given, if I got my papers late that is a matter outside the House and they will have to be debated, but what I am suggesting is that the Leader of the House must try to pull the threads of procedure together. Hon. members I believe on both sides of the House deserve an opportunity to read the resolutions in proper time. There are a number of private members on the other side who speak all the time either against or for the resolutions presented by Government, and sometimes in the case of the hon. member for St. Michael West it is sometimes difficult to find out for which side he is speaking and all this could be avoided if a more uniform procedure is adopted. This resolution is for Supplementary Estimates

1972-73 No. 11 and it is my belief that out of the eleven supplementary Estimates no less than six of them have been presented at short notice, and that cannot be good enough when the House is meeting every fortnight. Some Department must be falling down in its proper presentation, and the public business of Barbados cannot be conducted in an expeditious manner if this is continued.

For the reasons I have set out I am not going to vote against the motion that we deal with these resolutions, notice of which was given today, but this is the last time I will agree to such.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I just want to get the record straight. The resolutions of which notice was given on the last occasion the House met and which appeared on the Order Paper were received by me on Saturday, so that I am very surprised to hear that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition only got his papers this morning, but be that as it may, the hon. member said he was objecting to what was given notice of on 1st August and not to those for which permission was given to deal with today. Over and above that, there are one or two others for which we have already got permission from Your Honour to deal with today, so we have permission to deal with all the resolutions and I was merely making a motion that Your Honour leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Supply and to remind Your Honour to give the necessary direction to the Chairman.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, as it happened I got the papers this morning and in front of witnesses I made a note of the time I received them. If hon. members think I will invent something like that, hon. members would have very devious minds themselves.

The question that the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the resolutions appearing on the Order Paper together with those for which permission has been given to deal with today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 6

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is for the sum of $19,573. Under Head 11 – Pensions the sum of $1,073 is required in order to pay pensions and allowances to Mr. G. H. Jackman and his dependants for the period 18th June, 1971 to 31st March, 1973. Mr. Jackman is an ex-service man who sustained injuries to his left knee during his military attachment to Trinidad and was granted a disability pension with effect from the year 1962. This pension has been subsequently reviewed every two years, and the object of this is to continue because in this case the Government has requested that in order to determine whether the pension should be continued investigations should be carried out by the Department of Health and Social Welfare in the United Kingdom, and they recommended that we continue paying this pension to Mr. Jackman and his dependants. I beg to move that Head 11 stand part.

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

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

Head 21 – Civil Aviation Department – $18,500 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 21 – Civil Aviation Department – Item 33 – Fixtures, Fittings and Equipment – $18,500, a further explanation is that the sum of $17,500 has been allocated in the 1971-72 Estimates to purchase a Land Rover and a Garbage Collector for the Civil Aviation Department. These were ordered through the Central Purchasing Department, and had been expected to arrive during the last Financial Year when funds were available. Unfortunately, a delay in shipment of the vehicles prevented them from arriving in time and, consequently, the funds were not disbursed. Both vehicles have now arrived, but no funds are available. It is now proposed to seek a re-vote of the provision made in the previous Financial Year, plus an additional $1,000 to cover the increased cost price, insurance, lettering, inspection and other minor charges.

I beg to move that Head 21 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire whether the original cost included insurance, lettering, inspection and other minor charges. I am trying to arrive at how the figure of $1,000 has now been tagged on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Sir, I cannot assist the hon. member with the precise amount for each particular item whether it is the cost price of the article, insurance, lettering, inspection or other minor things. I only know that the sum of $1,000 is needed, and I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member all of those details. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that $1,000 is a small amount of money, but I think that we have to watch the pennies and allow the pounds to take care of themselves. That is what we are trying to do at this end. We have here that, because of the delay in the delivery of the vehicles, there has been an increase in the cost. If a vehicle originally cost $5,000 and the delay brought an increase in the cost of it, one would very well know that the additional cost is $X which would have to be added to the original price. What we are concerning ourselves with is that included in this $1,000 we now see insurance, lettering and inspection. Why is it that lettering, insurance and inspection should be brought in at this stage?

Mr. Chairman, when the vehicle was first ordered it must have been known that it would have to be inspected, lettered, insured and so on, and all of this should have been taken into account at the time. The Minister should have some figure in his file to guide him in this matter. We would like to know how this $1,000 was arrived at. Why is it not $1,050, $1,500 or $950?

The question that Head 21 – Civil Aviation Department – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $19,573 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 7

A Resolution for the sum of $69,323 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution is for the sum of $69,323, and the Addendum clearly sets out the purpose for which this sum is required and, assuming that all hon. members have read the Addendum which is quite clear and specific, I beg to move that the sum of $69,323 be approved.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there are certain conditions in the Service which would lead to Post Office staff having to work overtime. I am concerned with postmen, and I should like to know from the Minister what is the maximum weight a postman should carry in his bag when he is delivering letters. My reason for asking that question is that we find mail that is posted locally on time for delivery during the course of the day is not always delivered during the course of the day. I have had cause to make inquiries only to learn that the postmen do not carry more weight than so much.

12.45 p.m.

I would like to hear from the Minister if he knows what is the maximum weight they carry and see what can be done because we do not expect like at Christmas time when there is an extraordinary amount of mail to carry for a postman to carry all that extra weight whilst making his rounds. He must have some reasonable assistance with him, and we are wondering if it is not necessary to increase the staff of the Post Office to the extent that it would reduce some of the overtime that the postmen are called upon to put in, and by increasing the staff it may expedite the dispatch of mail. I speak with reference to local mail.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will agree with me that apart from one or two matters, we have one of the best postal systems in the Caribbean, and compared with some that I have encountered abroad, we certainly have a system of which to be proud. I am glad to hear the hon. member showing some concern for the postmen, but I think he will know that his concern could never be greater than mine. He must have been born in Barbados and he must know that in carrying mail to the out districts of this country no postman would have more mail, unless they are parcels, than he can carry. Even in his constituency in the Baltic and Boscobelle, what overweight can you carry to Boscobelle through letters? Let him start being realistic. Where we find there is need to carry heavy mail packages, postal articles of a certain weight, we send them out by van, and there has been no complaints as far as my Ministry is concerned from any postman that he is saddled with too much weight on any occasion. At Christmas time we hire additional postmen and give more deliveries to alleviate that problem. I do not know how the hon. member for St. Peter can find anything in this Resolution to talk about. I cannot tell you whether they carry three or four pounds, but under this Government, postmen have motor cycles; so they are not carrying anything on their backs. It was this Government that mechanised the Post Office, and enabled postmen to get money to buy vehicles. It is this Government that gave postmen allowances for the upkeep of these vehicles, and only few postmen in the City do ride bicycles at all. When last have you seen a postman with a bag over his shoulder since this Government came into power? I do not think there is any merit in the argument.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to get into this because the postmen are organised and when politicians want to get in here and pretend that they are representing postmen, I want to say that the postmen do not thank you because you do not know anything about their affairs. The President of the Barbados Workers' Union is a postman; the Vice-President of the Barbados Workers' Union is a postman, and another person who is a postman is also a member of the Executive Council. We have three members of the postal service who are members of the Barbados Workers' Union Council, and they are quite capable of defending themselves. The Union is quite strong enough to deal with maximum weight or what they are carrying, and we feel they are quite strong enough that if we want to tell the Government what we want for postmen, we will tell the Government in no uncertain terms without being aided or abetted by anybody, because we feel we are strong enough in our own right to do our job independently of any member of the House of Assembly.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is very good to hear all this Trade Union jargon. What I am saying is this: The Minister must now get up and carry out investigations. I am telling the Minister that the postmen are already operating this system. In other words, the situation already obtains where a postman says he has enough in his bag and he is carrying no more, and the rest of the mail is remaining there whether it is local or other mail. (A VOICE: That is not true.) It is so, and let the Minister not get up in here because there may be two or three Trade Unionists to back him and talk whatever they feel to try to bear him out. I am stating that it is a fact. I have had cause quite recently, Mr. Chairman, and I was struck when I learned it. I thought that when the hon. member for St. Michael West got up that he was going to tell us that there is an agreement that the postmen should not carry more than so many pounds in their bags, and that is why I sat, because it is already operating in our postal services here, but the Minister knows absolutely nothing about what is going on in his Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is moonshine. As the Minister has said, when you talk about the weight of mail, what nonsense are you talking about? It has nothing to do with the question of weight because the determining factor is not only weight; a determining factor is size, and there are certain things a postman cannot carry no matter what the weight is. He cannot carry a box in his bag of a certain dimension. This has nothing to do with weight, but the hon. member for St. Peter has an anti-Trade Union bias and that is why he made that statement. I never said anything because whether it is Government...

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, it is not true to say that I have an anti-Trade Union bias. I do not even have an anti-bias where the hon. member is concerned. I am just not concerned with him.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am concerned with him because I am concerned with what he says about people I represent; but he is not the only person with an anti-Trade Union bias; so he is not alone. He is in company with a lot of people; so it is nothing he has to be ashamed about. What I am saying is that there is no point in trying to indict the postmen by saying that people are calling him up. Everybody in Barbados is always calling him up. We are talking about a big postal service that has been going for thousands of years, and everybody is always calling him up in this Island. We do not get them calling him up with all the vicious acts that are taking place in Barbados to inform him what is about to take place before it takes place so that he can inform the Police Department. Somebody has called him up and told him that the postmen are not carrying enough packages and the Minister does not know anything about it. You used that chat against the postmen in the election, that postmen were throwing away their manifestos and all that. The hon. member used an indictment against the postmen.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows that what he has just said is not true. I am not concerned about any party. (A VOICE: The Leader of your party said so.) Well let him talk with the Leader.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to accept this cross talk. Let us get back to the Resolution which is asking for a sum of $69,323. Either decide here and now to vote for this Resolution or vote against it. I am not going to accept any further cross talk on this Resolution.

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

12.55 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972–73
No. 8.

Head 5 – Judiciary – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Resolution, the first Head, Head 5, is for the sum of $30,000. The additional information which I had better give now is that of the amount of $38,400 provided under this Item to provide for the payment of Jurors and Marshals in criminal and civil cases, the sum of $31,000 had been spent at 30th June 1972, leaving a balance of $7,399 to

meet other payments for the remaining nine months of the financial year during which time three Assizes are due to be held.

This amount is evidently insufficient, and some of the factors which contributed to the extraordinary expenditure are the increase in fees payable to Marshals from 72c to $3.00 per day, the increase in fees payable to Special Marshals from $3.00 to $5.00 per day, the increase in fees payable to Jurors from $3.00 to $10.00 per day, and payment from the current provision of $9,700 for the January Assizes. Normally this would have been made from last year's provision, but the funds were insufficient and the length of the April 1972 Assizes which lasted until May 1972 incurred an expenditure of $20,212. This cost could not have been readily forecast as factors such as the number of cases and the number of witnesses, etc. will vary. It is recommended and we are seeking the sum of $30,000 to supplement this vote as this amount should be provided. I beg to move that Head 5 stand part.

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

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

Head 6 – Ministry of Legal Affairs – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, we are seeking a supplementary of $5,000. The position is that the proposal for modernising and updating the Laws of Barbados and the arrangements for the drafting of a new Companies Act for Barbados, and for taking part in a Commonwealth Caribbean regional project should conduct research in the Company Laws in operation in the Caribbean region with a view to making recommendations as to harmonisation and uniformity. These two proposals, although separate and distinct, call for separate decisions.

Sometime during 1968 the then Attorney General, now Minister of Communications and Works, established an administrative committee to examine the Laws of Barbados relating to the Companies Act to make recommendations as to what changes were desirable in the law. This committee has held several meetings and has gone a long way in preparing a report which would form the basis of instructions for drafting a new Companies Act. There is a long story attached to this. At one stage Mr. E. Martindale was assisting the committee in the preliminary work of drafting but he resigned from the Public Service. At a subsequent stage Mr. Waterman was assigned to assist the committee in its work especially in relation to the drafting provisions. Mr. Waterman resigned and secured appointment in the Bahamas. The position now is that Mr. Justice Williams is willing to undertake this work provided that an honorarium of $5,000 is paid to him after taxes have been deducted.

It was recommended by the CARIFTA Council of Ministers in October 1971 that a research on the company laws in operation in the Caribbean region with a view to eliminating existing differences as far as possible be carried out, and to review the legal problems to be overcome before harmonisation and uniformity can be achieved. We feel this is a good opportunity to get the Companies Act up to date and in keeping with other caribbean countries. This has nothing to do with the revision of the laws as such, but knowing that the question will be coming, the position as far as the revision is concerned is that the laws have been prepared and the final proof is expected by the end of this month and printed copies of the revised Laws of Barbados are expected to be ready early next year. I beg to move that Head 6 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: In 1967 or in 1968, and maybe in 1969, whatever the year was, Sir, a great hullabaloo was made in the Press on behalf of the then Attorney General, who now occupies the Ministry so long borne by Mr. Boxill, that the Attorney General was setting up a Law Reform Committee. There could not have been any member of this House who was not pleased to hear that, and every member of the Bar and the Solicitors profession was also pleased to hear it. So great was the confidence placed in the then Attorney General who was a member of the Other Place, that when a very sensible measure of law reform was made in certain proposals to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act were proposed in this House, the mere word of the Attorney General at the time was enough to frustrate the design of some of the laws of Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

I am astonished that a Resolution concerned with the amendment of the Companies legislation of Barbados could be introduced into this House without any mention being made of the unprecedentedly brilliant work done by its Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church West. I would like to call his name, Sir, but although he is an hon. member on this side I cannot call it. He, as Chairman of the Companies

Law Revision Committee, is in fact the person who has done more than all the Ex-Attorney Generals and, indeed, Judges although I speak in no way to denigrate the marvellous qualities of draftsmanship shown by Mr. Justice Williams during his years as Chief Parliamentary Counsel. He is one of the outstanding draftsmen in the entire area. I am not saying it to run down their work, but I am merely saying it to praise the work of the hon. member for Christ Church West.

Naturally, hon. members on this side are going to facilitate the passage into the law of new Companies legislation, but Companies legislation, Sir, does not necessarily deal with the life of the ordinary people. Companies legislation, about which the Government seem so keen at the moment, is legislation for big business, for those who have money to be protected in a company, for those who have activities to be carried on, and those who, no doubt, have funds to contribute to the Democratic Labour Party. *(Asides)* That is another thing altogether, Sir. Or the Barbados Labour Party. I thank the hon. member for St. Michael West; I wish he would tell some of the companies that, because we never see it. It never gets written off on our behalf out of uncollectable debts or whatever the situation was with the $63,000, but that is only by the way, Sir.

Companies legislation does not deal with the life of ordinary people. Now, later on today I was going to say something, Sir, and I will still say something about the necessity for the private members of this House on both sides - particularly I am including the hon. member for St. Lucy and the hon. member for St. Michael West – to start getting their names on to the Statute Book with a little of the work which we are expecting the Parliamentary Draftsmen and the Departments to do in full. Inside the House of Assembly is an ideal place, Sir. We are put here because we are men with ideas. You do not seek to have ideas because you sit on this side of the House. In fact, it is the other way around. Many people who appear to have ideas seem to me to be able to suppress them when they sit on the Government side. All of us in here should be keeping ourselves busy with the matter of law reform.

It seemed a good idea when the then Attorney General had a Committee of people who looked as though they could be interested in this subject. That has utterly failed, and I do not think that its failure was due solely to the personality of the former Attorney General. *(Asides)* Who was the Chairman? I hear that a very celebrated Judge was the Chairman. It betokens some shortage of commonsense to make a Judge who has to go on circuit to the Bahamas, British Honduras and Bermuda a Chairman of a Committee that should be meeting monthly in Barbados dealing with law reform! That is if there are the facts. If a Judge has to be on circuit in jurisdictions with an abundance of appeals – In 1969 Sir Clyde Archer was most certainly taking Bahamas' and Bermuda's appeals.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When I appointed Sir Clyde Archer he was not then a Judge of the Court of Appeal for British Honduras, the Bahamas and Bermuda. That turned up subsequent to his appointment.

Mr. ADAMS: I understand that, but I am sure the hon. member who has just sat down will agree with me that, once he had been appointed a Judge in these jurisdictions, it was meaningless for him to continue as Chairman of the Law Reform Committee. That is an obvious matter. You have the Law Reform Committee headed by a Judge; the Judicial Advisory Council containing all the Judges and so on. These Committees do not, in fact, meet. I understand that although there has been a crying need for Appeal Rules in Barbados – We have no Court of Appeal Rules in Barbados of our own; Rules relating to the Constitution and to the Civil Rights sections of the Constitution have to be dealt with. I understand that there has not been a meeting of the Judicial Advisory Committee for some years. There has been a total failure both in respect of the Committee whose duty it is to make Rules for the ordinary conduct of the Courts and the administration of justice in Barbados, and for Law Reform Committees which are charged with the duty of modernising and updating the laws of Barbados to meet.

I have some interest in this matter, Sir, as I am the convener of the Law Reform Sub-Committee of the Bar Counsel. I am endeavouring even now to get meetings held. As hon. members will know there are two pieces of legislation which are essentially law reform legislation but with a social content which stand in my name under Private Members' Business even now on the Order Paper, one of which, I hope, will be reached later on today. I have a rather deep and passionate interest, indeed, in this matter, Sir.

We see the criminal law being brought up to date in almost every aspect of its operation in Britain and in many other Commonwealth countries with which we are so closely associated in our legal systems. I, for one, do not by any means think that the updating of the criminal law of England takes proper account of modern, social conditions, but I am not turning this into a debate on reform of the criminal law. There are a lot of elementary and short form Acts which could be brought in dealing with this matter. It is true there

are certain things that on the one hand appear as law reform, but on the other hand have a social and sometimes a political content such as capital punishment which may not be the appropriate province of a Law Reform Committee.

I must inform the House, based upon what the Prime Minister said that by the next Estimates he would be prepared to support a new Homicide Bill or punishment for homicide and so on, that before the end of this year if such a Bill is not introduced by the Government it will be introduced by the Opposition and give the Prime Minister a chance, as they say, to put his money where his mouth lies. All of these things, in my view, need to be done at the present time. If I were going to quarrel with this Resolution, which I understand is exclusively to provide an honorarium for Mr. Justice Williams – I want to be corrected on this if I am wrong – to oversee the drafting. It can only be to oversee the drafting, since to my knowledge most of the work is done already in connection with the Companies Act. It can only be to oversee it, because a comprehensive Report setting out the wording of the provisions which are desired to be passed into law have already, for the main part, been settled by the Companies Law Revision Committee. If, as I understand it, this is all this Resolution is dealing with, then the honorarium is too small.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member will give way, I should like to make it doubly clear that the Attorney General has approached Mr. Justice Williams in the matter, and he has expressed his willingness to draft a new Companies Act as a special assignment.
1.15 p.m.

He has expressed his willingness to draft the new Companies' Act as a special consignment. Mr. Justice Williams is asking for a remuneration of a sum which would give him a net amount of $5,000 when tax incident is taken into consideration. It is estimated that the amount would be some $10,000 through a period of two years and the Attorney General considers this remuneration to be reasonable having regard to the amounts being paid currently for the drafting of special legislation both in the Caribbean and in the rest of the Commonwealth.

Mr. ADAMS: $5,000 for drafting a Bill of 200 clauses is not unreasonable. I do not believe you could get independent Parliamentary Counsel in London to draft 200 sections for that. What I am just questioning slightly and indeed the amount may be arrived at is whether the Minister is fully aware that the outline of the work has for the main part already been settled by the Committee presided over by the hon. member for Christ Church West, (A VOICE: Considerations of the draft.) indicating the very models in some cases which the draughtsman must put up, indicating sections which the draughtsman must copy from particular legislation, but I do not believe you would get a Companies Act drafted for $2,000 from Parliamentary Counsel in London. I am satisfied about that; so I do not think that Mr. Justice Williams is being overpaid by any means by this amount of $5,000. I would not for a minute say that, but I want to be clear that this is all apparently the Government is contemplating doing about law reform. What about dealing with talk of criminal conduct at Assizes? Judges are tired crying out in Barbados for something to be done so that the prisoner who chooses not to give a sworn testimony the Judge can make a comment on that. This is something continually being said from the Bench. It is considered by many authorities in the field of criminal law that it is a farce that the proper investigation of a criminal trial can be hampered because defence counsel do not wish to lose the right to speak last by calling a witness. This has been done in nearly every country in the world except Barbados. There is an Act in London called the Right of the Last Word in Criminal Cases. All these are based on the work that can be done by a Standing Law Reform Committee and can be done by members of the Opposition. I do not think there are any private members on the other side who are members of the legal profession, but I am not for that reason going to refuse to enlist the help of the hon. members for St. Lucy and St. Michael West. They must expect to get a call from me saying I want their support in connection with X, Y and Z. Now they will not be members of my Committee, but I will have to depend upon members of the House. If the Bar Council's Reform Committee has brought anything, I will have to depend upon members of the House to support what is brought before the House by members, not as members of the Opposition, but as private members of the House, because this is the basis upon which I believe private members should be trying to do something. All of us have something to contribute. There are only 24 of us in here and many of us may be better able to introduce Bills such as this that hon. members have among their papers.

I would not want it to be lost sight of because apparently it has been lost sight of both by the hon. member for Bridgetown and Mr. Speaker that the Government does not change the law. Parliament changes the law. I see there is a Resolution down in the name of the hon. member for Bridgetown which calls upon the Government to amend the Affiliation Proceedings Act and the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act.

The Government cannot amend these Acts. It can only be done by Parliament. The House of Assembly can do it with the assistance of the Senate and the Governor General. I regret that the hon. member for Bridgetown should have made that error in drafting his Resolution and that the Clerk and the Speaker should have allowed it to pass, for I cannot consider that Resolution is in order. I pursue this point because I want to fore-warn the House that they will be dealing with this and I appeal to the House not to deal with it on a partisan basis. I do not see how the right of the last word in criminal cases can every be a matter of the Democratic labour Party against the Barbados Labour Party. People may have different views about it, but I do not see that it can become the subject of a partisan approach by Parliament, nor do I see for example as the former Attorney General now the Minister of Communications and Works said that it is for the Judges to make law either, because speaking as a barrister member of this House, I would stand up fair and square and look at any Judge in the world and tell him that as far as I am concerned we are the qualified people to make the law and he has been put there to administer the law, not to make it, because upon an earlier occasion when we were dealing with law reform the totally specious and ignorant excuse was produced that the Chief Justice did not approve what Sir Theodore Brancker, Mr. Garfield Sargeant, the hon. member for the City and I had proposed in connection with something. It is not for the Chief Justice to approve it; it is for the Chief Justice to administer it, and if as a matter of courtesy the Judges are informed by the Bar Council or Law Reform Committee or Law Reform Commissioner and their comments invited, it is a different thing altogether from saying that the Judges have to approve the laws of Barbados. The people put us here to make the laws.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it absolutely clear at the start that no Judge has been consulted about the Infants Act which I am introducing nor the Marriage Act. They are matters of social policy within the competence of the elected representatives of the people to determine, and they are being introduced in the House and there will be other matters introduced on that basis in the fullness of time; so I am going to appeal to the House in this matter of law reform to come down the right side stepping neither on partisanship on the road or on administrative control by Civil Servants whether judicial servants or other servants on the left, and let us go through to our aims. If we know what we want, let us take steps to put it into action.

Mr. Chairman, it is many years since private members of this House have, I think, entirely pulled their weight in a legislative programme, and we have got accustomed to leaning on the Government as such and expect them to govern and do everything, the Government says this and the Government says that. We in the House of Assembly cannot by passing a Resolution make the Government spend money, make the Government set up a housing area, but no more can the Government by saying the law is to be so and so make it the law. The Government has its functions and we have our functions, and that is what I will ask hon. members to consider.

Sir, I repeat that my final and ultimate comment upon this particular Head is that the Government should not be abrogating its responsibility to investigate the whole field of up-dating the laws of Barbados. The Addendum is very vague. When I read the Addendum I expected a much more meaty explanation than we have got from the Leader of the House. I am disappointed that the only purpose of this particular supplementary is to deal with the Companies Act. Other than that we in the Opposition support the principle of the idea.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not joining in the part with the Leader of the Opposition because the Law Reform was going on so far as I am concerned so long in Barbados that I am beginning to wonder what is the productivity of lawyers. I do not think that there is enough work for them, and I believe that the Community itself places too much importance on what they do, and for that reason they have been overpaid for what they do.

1.25 p.m.

Unfortunately the Deputy Prime Minister said something today which is going to create a lot of danger. When you agree in principle to pay a Judge or anybody else a fee but you state the net fee payable it means that you are going to pay the person a fee depending on what the person's total emoluments are going to be before they receive that fee. To a Judge who is receiving $14,000 per year a net fee of $5,000 will not mean the same thing to a person who is receiving another emolument, so it is not the same thing in every case. I do not think that the Judge is going to be operating in Barbados and his total emoluments for taxable purposes would only be the salary he is receiving from the Government of Barbados unless he is a complete idiot. I know what is going to happen after this, you are going to find many people willing to work for you if you are prepared to pay them the fee they ask for, so it is no point having these precedents thrown about where they are going to come back at you like a boomerang.

The question that Head 6 – Ministry of Legal Affairs – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 7 – Registration Office – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 7 - Registration Office for the sum of $2,560, the whole information is as follows. The sum approved in the current Estimates of Expenditure for 1972–73 is $2,500, and at 24th June 1972 the sum of $1,669.23 was spent leaving a balance of $830.77 which is considered inadequate for the efficient service of the Department. An amount of $1,784.35 in respect of arrears from the last financial year has been spent from this year's provision and at present water rates totalling $236.80 still remain to be paid. Towards the end of the last financial year a similar request was made to supplement the above item of expenditure, but due to the proximity of the close of the financial year it was withdrawn at the request of the Attorney General. This has resulted in having to make payments of arrears from the current year's vote.

I would like to draw attention to these facts. In January of 1970 an air conditioning unit was installed in the Registration Office together with the introduction of the Xerox machine copying system. Also, the Xerox machine is a high powered machine and has a relatively high electricity consumption rate. The whole Xerox system comprises a Xerox 914 copier, a microfilm reader and a microfilm machine. In June 1971 a soft drink machine, coin operated, was installed resulting in additional use of electricity. In addition to the above it is envisaged that the proposed installation of another air conditioning unit in the office of the Registrar will cause a greater consumption of electricity, and for this reason we are asking that this Item be supplemented to the tune of $2,560. I beg to move that Head 7 stand part.

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

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

Head 9 – Ministry of Finance (4) Central Purchasing Department – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In moving the passing of Head 9, Sir, the first item is for the sum of $1,235. The full explanation is that from the provision of $3,563 in this year's Estimates, actual expenditure to 30th June 1972 was $1,058.27. Committments totalling $1,015.34 leaving an uncommitted balance of $1,489.39 for the remainder of the financial year. This reflects an average rate of monthly expenditure of approximitaly $352. This sum will prove to be inadequate, and an additional amount is required under this Item for the following reasons. No funds have been provided to meet the cost of special stationery for a photo-copier which will be required as a result of a decision to mechanise the accounts of the Department. An amount of $950.37 incurred during the last financial year for payment for supplies remained unpaid at the end of the financial year, and the recent decision to channel all Indents through the Crown Agents has increased the monthly expenditure for postage and an additional amount of $120 is required to meet this expenditure.

1.35 p.m.

A full explanation in respect of furniture and equipment is as follows: The Central Purchasing Department has been experiencing difficulties and delays in affecting speedy payment to the suppliers of articles and in billing Government Departments. In order to expedite payment and also the billing of the various Departments, it has been decided that the accounting procedure of the Departments should be mechanised. In addition to the mechanisation of the accounts, it has been proposed that, in billing the various Departments, copies of bills relating to the monthly statement should accompany the statement.

In order to put the proposals into effect, provision has already been included in the Capital Estimates in 1972–73 to purchase a N.C.R. Accounting Machine; however, provision has not been made for other ancillary equipment which is now required as follows:

(a)	A photo–copier	$2,300
(b)	A table for photo–copier	150
(c)	Tray and Trolley to hold ledger cards	234
	Total	$2,684

I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if one were to look at the entire presentation of these Supplementary Estimates, one must come to the conclusion that the various Departments of Government seem geared towards the use of photo-copying machines whether it is the Xerox Machine or the I.B.M. They are all making full use of this type of machine. The explanation given by the Hon. Minister in each proves that the machines are expensive ones. The

stationery required for them is also expensive. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are going ahead swiftly in trying to meet the demands of the various Departments by the use of these machines for copying documents for circulation. What about our stenographers and steno–typists in the service of the Government? Is it that we are trying to displace them? What about their productivity? Has any attempt been made to upgrade them, if they are not meeting the needs of the Government? Has an attempt been made to give them in-service training in order to improve the quality of their work?

Mr. Chairman, I have been making inquiries from one of the Departments that is asking for one of these photo-copiers, and I must say that the reply is that the type of work some of the typists produce is so faulty and they take so long to do the work that when they make a good copy very much effort has been expended. In the circumstances, it would be easier to put a good copy into the photo-copying machine. It would seem to us that an entire assessment has to be carried out in this machine.

Our stenographers will have to be encouraged to improve themselves. In some Departments there are stenographers who will tell you that they are overworked. If that is the case, then there are several others who are in training at all times and who can be drafted into the Service. It must be admitted that they enter the Service at about $140 a month and this is no encouragement to such people today. It must be admitted that if you are going to encourage a young man or young woman to study and qualify himself or herself to enter the Service at $140 a month, then you must know what to expect.

Mr. Chairman, all of these things must be looked into. Every Department is now asking for photo-copying machines. These Departments are using different types of photo-copying machines, and you will find that one machine will be more expensive than the other when it has to do the same amount of work. You will find that you have to pay more for electricity in one Department than in the other for machines that are doing the same amount of work. Let us endeavour to get something better for the amount of money we are spending. I do not for a single moment oppose the passing of anything in this Resolution, but we must look and see what we are doing.

With regard to Item 18 – Furniture and Equipment – $2,700, we have provided a photo-copier, a tray and trolley to hold ledger cards. According to this Resolution, we are not now buying ledger cards. I should like to ask the Minister whether we have ledger cards at the moment. You are making provision for all of these things only to learn in two or three months' time that the Departments did not include money in the Resolution to buy ledger cards.
1.45 p.m.

The administration seems to be breaking down at some point somewhere and there is room I am sure, Mr. Chairman, for a general checking up. At Item 16 – Office Expenses – subparagraph (c) of the note says that the monthly expenditure for postage has increased as a result of a recent decision to channel all indents through the Crown Agents. As soon as I saw that, it reminded me of a debate which went on here I think at the very last sitting of this House, and here we find that the Government has a good example on how trade in this country has been operating. Here it is that the Government is using the Crown Agents as a sort of confirming house. When mention is made that all indents are channelled through the Crown Agents, it means that if a motor lorry or ten motor trucks were to come from Leyland for the Scavenging Department or else, the order that has been placed with Leyland is of no value unless it has the confirmation of the Crown Agents. In other words, the Crown Agents Act as a confirming House for the Government of Barbados. That is exactly how trade goes, and as soon as I saw it, it brought home to my mind something that we have been referring to at an earlier date.

I would just like to see, Mr. Chairman, that Government try to tidy itself up with all these payrolls as in the Ministry of Agriculture where they have this old pay sheet system. The Data Processing Unit, I understand, is carrying out a very considerable amount of data work by using a code number which is reducing a lot of paper work that was carried out in the past. How is it that the Data Processing Unit can be rendering such yeoman service to these departments and the necessity still arises with these other departments for photo-copying. It calls for an examination one way or another as to how we should try and conserve when it comes to the spending of taxpayers' money.

The question that Head 9 – Ministry of Finance – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 35 – Ministry of Education – (14) Youth Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 35, Item 15 is a new

item in respect of the Girl Guides Association. The note to this item is quite full. It is the policy of the Government wherever possible, feasible and subject to the availability of funds to assist organisations to participate at international level in activities relating to their particular interest. The Girl Guides Association during their recent 21st World Conference of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts was admitted as a full member of that Association. I think this is a very good advancement, and I hope that this Association by bringing the Girl Guides Association here into the main stream of this International Movement will make for the greater assistance of the youth of this country.

In respect of the grant to the Barbados Olympic Association to permit it to send a team to the Olympic Games in Munich, I wish to state that the grant of $21,031 is made up on the basis of meeting half the cost for the officials, and these include a team, general manager, manager for athletics, one for cycling, one for rifle shooting, one for weightlifting together with a team doctor, and the meeting for those competitors who have reached a qualifying standard, and these include three cyclists, two marksmen as well as a relay team. Special provision was also made for one of the outstanding lifters of this country, Mr. A. "Mango" Phillips.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to say any more on this particular Head. The amount provided in the Estimates has proved insufficient in respect of the grant to the Olympic Association, and in the case of the Girl Guides Association it is necessary to provide a new item under which the grant can be made.

I beg to move that Head 35 – Ministry of Education (14) Youth Affairs – stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister spoke on this matter of the Olympic Association. I have some strong views on the Olympic Association. There are occasions that when a Government comes to the assistance of a national organisation, you have to examine it. I am a very strong nationalist and in certain areas you have to take the lead on behalf of people and if organisations are going to be associated with International Organisations, then there must be a clear understanding of where the national of the country stand in relation to these. There can be no pussyfooting about this question of colour and the attitude of Rhodesia and South Africa, and I feel that when it comes to public funds being associated with any organisation that is going to be involved in these matters, it must be clearly stated what is the Government's policy in relation to these matters and not only their policy in relation to the Olympic Association, because the Government here is not a member of the Olympic Association. The Government is not a member of the International Olympic Association; it is the Barbados Local Government that is a member.

Now if the Barbados Olympic Association was even sending a team and I as a citizen felt that this was something you should do, I would say so in my own right as a citizen as I have said on another occasion when I felt that one of our famous cricketers should not have gone to South Africa to play, and it did not matter to me what Government said about that matter because I do not seek ministerial approval on matters which I as a person have my fundamental right to express. I have no desire even to go on a mission to South Africa to prove anything, nor do I have any desire to go to Rhodesia at this stage to prove anything. If it were on another mission where you were going on a mission to give the Africans their rights and I had to be involved, I would have no desire to do that since I am past the age of embarking on any military work. But I am a bit concerned now that some of the Governments had expressed their views about this matter. I am sure that Barbadians must begin to get into the main stream of life and realise what is happening. I know that if Barbados had produced a man like what the Ethiopians have produced in a marathon manner and he was in Germany, they would find it very difficult to recall him. The Ethiopian Government recalled the whole delegation as a matter of protest against Rhodesia.
1.55 p.m.

I am not saying that the Barbados Government should not aid people, because organisations like the Olympic Association should be assisted, and I will speak about this because I had the misfortune to be associated with Olympics in the early days and my interest began as far back as 1932 in the days of Adolf Hitler, and that is history now. I do not know what the attitude of the local Olympic Association is towards the whole question of the Rhodesian matter, but they are taking a very open and strong line and I feel that without in any way saying that they should not send a team,.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am aware that we have not suspended any Standing Orders for today's sitting because we started early and we have ample time for the Government and the Opposition to deal with these matters *ad lib.* It is now 2 o'clock and it is difficult for members and officers to have a proper lunch in half hour, so I am inviting the Leader of the Opposition and

members to suspend Order No. 5 so that we can have a longer time than half hour for lunch.

Mr. ADAMS: I see no objection to moving that at 2.40 the House be suspended for a further half hour. I really believe that if the House says without any dissenting voice that we suspend now for an hour for lunch that it will go like that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: According to the Standing Orders, we are entitled to half hour for lunch, but I thought I would just make it clear what I had in mind before I asked to move the suspension of the Standing Order. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

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

On resumption -

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 12 which stands in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Will the Minister take early steps to put in hand the paving of the road which leads from Shop Hill to Cane Garden via Vaucluse Tenantry and Ham Pond in the parish of St. Thomas?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, estimates of cost of construction of this road and the installation of water services are being prepared with a view to assessing its priority for inclusion in the Ministry's Works Programme.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to thank the Ministry for the opportunity which it afforded me and which they afforded themselves in making an inspection of that road last Saturday morning for the very purpose which the Minister has in mind. If I can pursue a supplementary question, the Minister has mentioned water services, can the Minister say if work has already been put in hand or has been commissioned in respect of these water services, because some doubt has arisen in respect of an amount of money said to have been spent in connection with water piping in the area.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I know no work has been put in hand, but it is the policy of the Ministry not to fix roads unless water has been installed, and once we have set the works programme we will send on the water first in order to save money.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 15 in the name of the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will ask the question for the hon. member for Bridgetown who is on leave.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the road leading to the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill, has inadequate street lighting?

2. Will the Minister give instructions to have the appropriate lights installed?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to that question is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Steps are being taken to install the necessary street lighting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 26 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph who is not now in his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning the hon. member for St. Joseph communicated with me and asked me to deal with this question.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Now that Cambridge, St. Joseph has hit the limelight as the film location for the shooting of the film "Black Snake", would the Government cause to be installed as soon as possible, a public telephone box and street lights in the area?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Light and Power Co. Ltd. has during the past two years installed 140 street lights in the parish of St. Joseph in the following areas approved by the Ministry:

Joes River Tenantry	3
Bonwell	15
Horse Hill Area	34
St. Elizabeth	47
Airy Hill, Coffee Gully	35
Blackmans Tenantry	6
	140

Proposals for the installation of fifty four (54) more lamps in the Chimborazo, Sugar Hill and Melvin Hill Area are under consideration. As Cambridge is at present without electricity lines the Company is not in a position to install street lights in the area.

The Barbados Telephone Company Limited is unable to install a public telephone in the area at the present time.

Mr. ADAMS: Will the Minister say if any street lights have been installed in St. Joseph since the bye-election of 1970?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I cannot tell the hon. member if or how many have been installed since the bye-election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 31 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: To enquire of the Minister of Health and Welfare:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the black poisonous smoke and fumes emitted from vehicular traffic, particularly heavy duty vehicles, constitute a serious health hazard to the country?

2. Will the Minister institute immediate and effective measures to protect the community from this danger?

3.10 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know whether the question itself did specify whether it was the Ministry of Health and Welfare that was expected to answer. When hon. members ask the appropriate Minister then, of course, there can be some overlapping especially in a question of this nature since it affects roads and health. The answer to that question is:

"1. Government is keeping a close look at the problem with a view to minimising any effect it may have on the health of the community.

2. Steps are being taken to ensure that Government-owned vehicles and those of the Transport Board comply with existing legislation."

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate the nature of the steps which are being taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as the Government are concerned, we have ordered a piece of equipment from the United Kingdom to the value of nearly $15,000, as advised, to take care of the smoke emitting from the Government vehicles, and this piece of equipment will be installed at the Ministry of Communications and Works. It should be here at any time. In the meantime, we are training mechanics in the use of these fuel injector pumps and other related matters to minimise this health hazard.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister can state precisely what is really going to be done to offenders from the private sector.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, a driver should not permit sparks, smoke or visible vapour of any avoidable nature which would cause annoyance or danger to the public to come from any motor in his charge on or near any public road and shall take proper precautions to prevent the unnecessary discharge of lubricating oil on any road.

The enforcement of breaches of the Road Traffic Act is a matter for the Police and not the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems as if the onus is on the driver of the vehicle. I am wondering whether the onus should not be shifted on the owner of the vehicle. It is true that the Police would obviously have to prosecute.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am still to hear the question!

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking if some specific instruction or some specific law could not be implemented which would make owners of vehicles and not the drivers realise the responsibility which they have to the community to ensure that the vehicles do not emit this poisonous smoke to the extent that they are now emitting it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a new Road Traffic Act is being drafted which I hope to bring to Parliament toward the end of the year, and the matter raised by the hon. member could be drafted in that piece of legislation.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister not aware of the new Regulations making it an offence for owners of these vehicles to permit the expulsion of diesel fumes are already in existence?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The question asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is the placing of the burden of the responsibility and not a question of stopping the emission of fumes.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking the Minister if it is not a fact that his Ministry has recently made Regulations placing the burden on the owner.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they have been made, I have not signed them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time now being 3.15; this brings us to the end of Question Time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are, obviously, so many questions that the Ministers would like to get off. Would it be in order for me to ask the Leader of the House to give us an extention for 15 minutes?

I move that Question Time be extended for a period not exceeding half an hour.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 33 stands in the name of the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

NEED FOR PROPER DRAINS AND/OR GUTTERS IN NEW ORLEANS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister, on behalf of the hon. member for Bridgetown:

(i) Is the Minister aware of the need for proper drains and/or gutters in the New Orleans area of Bridgetown?

(ii) Will the Minister state what steps will the Government take to remedy this lack of drains and/or gutters in the above mentioned area?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker,

"No provision was made for proper drains and/or gutters at the time when the New Orleans area of Bridgetown was subdivided and sold. The Government has initiated a drainage study with the assistance of the British Government and remedial action will be taken in due course."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 36 standing in the name of the same hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

NEED FOR STREET LIGHTS AT CHEPSTOW AND QUEEN STREETS, ETC.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister

(i) Is the Minister aware that there is need for streetlights (a) at the corner of Chepstow and Queen Streets (b) on King William Street between the junction of King William Street and River Road?

(ii) Will the Minister take the steps to remedy this situation?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer is:

"On 22nd March the Government Electrical Engineer was given instructions to draw up a programme for improvement of the lighting in Bridgetown including the two areas mentioned. Further consideration will be given to the matter as soon as the Government Electrical Engineer's report is received."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 41 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

REQUEST FOR INSTALLATION OF PAY PHONES IN ST. LUCY

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware that St. Lucy is the most poorly served parish in the Island in terms of telephone installations?

And is the Minister aware that, unlike the other parishes in Barbados, not one single pay phone has been installed anywhere in the parish of St. Lucy?

Will the Minister take appropriate steps to see that the service is upgraded and that pay phones are installed at the following places:– Pie Corner, Josey Hill, Crab Hill and Half Moon Forte?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Telephone Company Limited have been requested by my Ministry to undertake a survey of the areas mentioned in the question in connection with their programme for the provision of pay telephones throughout the Island. Appropriate steps will be taken on the report of any problems from the Telephone Company.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister is aware that already the Telephone Company has said that it cannot extend the services to the Pie Corner area and particularly have a pay phone in that area because it is not an engineering possibility.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a question. Question No. 44 stands in the name of the same hon. member for St. Lucy.

REQUEST FOR ELECTRICITY AND STREET LIGHTS IN ST. LUCY

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware that there is no electricity in Harrises District in St. Lucy?

Is the Minister aware that this is causing considerable inconvenience to the residents of this district?

Will the Minister take appropriate action to ensure that the electricity services are extended to this area and also that street lights are installed?

3.20 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Harrises District in St. Lucy is not included in the rural development programme of the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited for the year 1972-73. The need of the area for street lights will be taken into consideration when mains are installed by the Company.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if I am correct in understanding that Harrises District would not be getting any electricity until 1974.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Quite possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because everybody cannot get at one time and some will have to get before the others.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a supplementary, I would like to find out why is it that over one year ago the district was measured up and indications were that electricity would be coming into the area in the not too distant future, and here it is we are now hearing that no electricity will be going to that area until 1974.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as long as I am in the Ministry of Communications and Works, my job is to give the maximum to the maximum number of people and if it turns out that his district has less than a district four times it size, the hon. member will have to wait until I can get around to that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask if the Minister is aware that from the point of view of the number of houses in this particular district, this is a district which is almost, as it were, self-contained and I am sure is no smaller than any other district in which the Electric Company has been putting up extensions, and it leaves me to wonder what is happening with this thing. I am totally dissatisfied.

QUESTION *re* USE OF DISTRICT "A" MAGISTRATES' COURT CELLARS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 23 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

(a) Is the Minister aware that quite recently the cellars of the District "A" Magistrates' Court are being used as a store room by the Ministry of Communications and Works?

(b) That as a result of such use, there is a great increase in the activities of heavy vehicles moving through the Court yard to and from the said cellars thereby increasing the amount of noise in all the courts?

In view of the above, would the Minister take all necessary steps to regulate the use of the said cellars so as to remove the annoyance now caused by the lorries and the loading and/or discharge of material at the cellars when the courts are sitting?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, the replies are as follows:

(a) Vehicles of the Ministry of Communications and Works have been using the cellar beneath the District "A" Magistrates' Court for a number of years. These vehicles now deliver materials there about twice weekly, before Court sessions commence.

(b) The passage of traffic using the Court yard either as a through-way or car park contributes to the noise in the area of the Courts. Steps are being taken to rectify the situation. Motorists will be prevented from using the compound as a through-way and the area beside the north-western wall of the Magistrates' Court will be made into a "No Parking" area.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of Question Time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, more notices were given than those. It is true I do not see No. 10 on the Order Paper, but No. 10 was introduced. What about the reply to the question about an inmate of the Mental Asylum who slept in a pig sty? Was that not given?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All the replies that have been given notice of have been asked.

Mr. ADAMS: Questions Nos. 10 and 15, I am told, were given notice of.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no No. 10 on the Order Paper and all the other Questions have been laid.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business time.

When Private Members' Business expired on the last occasion the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking. He may continue if he so desires.

Mr. ADAMS: That, Sir, was on a Resolution. With respect, since then a Bill to be read a first time was introduced, and I believe that the Rules state that this takes priority. This is Item 8 under Private Members' Business. This is the only business that is ready for second reading, and Bills take priority over the other matters of Private Members' Business.

THE MINORS ACT, 1972

Mr. ADAMS: I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill to urge upon hon. members some of the considerations which I mentioned at an earlier stage when we were discussing law reform. As hon. members will recall, on 14th December, 1971, the House passed a Resolution in favour of the reduction of the age of majority in Barbados from 21 years to 18 years, and this Bill which is now before us standing in my name seeks to amend the Infants Act, 1958, in order to give effect to this Resolution.

I just want to say one or two things about it before I go into detail, and there are a number of other matters to which I am going to draw hon. members' attention before moving for a Select Committee if the second reading is given. As briefly outlined earlier, it is my view that private members can assist this House greatly and assist the people of Barbados, relieve some of the load on departments and particularly the Parliamentary draughtsmen, if they will interest themselves in the matters which they bring before the House to the extent of actually doing something about them. On the order Paper we have a question asking for the Government to bring a new Family Law Bill before the House. We have a Resolution asking for the Government to increase the amount of money payable under the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act and in cases of Affiliation. Now although both these matters have been raised by members of my Party, I want to go on record and say that I do not think that the Questions and Resolutions are the correct way of going about such matters. Subject to something I will say later about the necessary limitations, I believe that if a member thinks that legislation ought to be amended it is his duty, not just his right – we all know it is his right – to introduce a Private Members' Bill to amend it. If members think that Family Law needs revising, get such assistance as they require and bring in if it is a simple matter. There are obviously some matters too complex for that, but such legislation as they want to produce can be brought, and that is why I have taken the opportunity of introducing this Act which I am seeking to call the Minors Act to deal with the

Resolution that the House quite readily passed in December 1971, which according to my information the Government has not yet taken up with the Parliamentary draughtsmen.
3.30 p.m.

I am not going to blame the Government, I believe the draftsmen had a lot of other work to do. I cannot tell the Government that they must just because the House passes a resolution immediately put it in the draftsmen's hand. As will be heard later on, the effect of the passage of a resolution in the House is not by any means to make law, a resolution can be put down and passed in this House and be ignored altogether, and it is not always ignored because you want to ignore it, it is ignored sometimes because you do not have the time to reach it, and this may very well have been the case with the Minors' Act.

Before passing on again to the substance of the Bill, I want to say this. In Barbados we are very ill served by the Press. I have seen signs from time to time – and I am sorry the Minister of Information is not in his chair at the moment, because I do not think he gets very much praise for the operations of CBC, and I think that the particular operation needs a little praise now – I have seen signs from time to time that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is prepared to take responsibility of giving an overall picture of what is happening in Barbados more seriously than the *Advocate* newspaper, which is the only newspaper at the moment. The *Advocate* newspaper seems to be better fitted to report what happens in Trinidad in the Malik trial, what happens in Britain and Ireland, indeed what happens in Jamaica than what happens in Barbados. How can this Hon. House feel, Sir, when on the 14th December it passes a resolution calling for the reduction of the age of majority from 21 to 18, the *Advocate* ignores it at the time, it ignores the subsequent developments, but it reports that in Jamaica the Jamaican Leader of the Opposition is considering the introduction of a Bill. My Bill had already been introduced in here without notice from the Press, but the Jamaican Leader of the Opposition's intention to do something can get into the *Advocate* newspaper.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is not true. He had already introduced the Bill, and I saw a copy of the Bill introduced by Mr. Shearer in the House of Representatives. I saw the various 18 Acts amended by the Schedule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would appreciate it if the hon. member would indicate what he is rising on when he rises to speak in future.

Mr. ADAMS: I appreciate that. The Bill has been laid, Sir, but the hon. member is not aware of the stage at which the *Advocate* reported it. He must be careful, I have not said that Bill has not been laid, the *Advocate* has reported it on three separate occasions, one when it was an intention, one when it was laid and one when the Government reduced the age of voting from 21 to 18, and the Leader of the Opposition then said it had not gone far enough. It has been three times in the *Advocate* newspaper. Great events are discussed in here – I do not want to digress too much – but I recall during the Estimates the Prime Minister came in here – let us give Jack his jacket – he dealt with every department of expenditure in a way that no other hon. member could quarrel with, he set out great issues of policy, he talked about a lot of important things, and the *Advocate* newspaper could not report one, and that is the Prime Minister, I am not complaining about myself alone. It is a disgrace to the House and to the country that the Press that we now have cannot report a debate in which the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition talked about capital punishment, in which we talked about airport development – one of the most important things in Barbados – which was canvassed extensively, and unnoticed in the columns of the so-called Press at the present time. It is a commonplace thing that *Reuters News Agency* in Barbados picks up a news story from Barbados, sends it to Trinidad, it appears in the *Express* and it appears in the *Advocate* the day after, and you will hear some excuse about deadlines, their deadlines are different from ours. This is commonplace, Sir, the poor state of news reporting which the *Advocate* is giving to its readers at the present time. No country can long be secure without a free Press and a Press is not free where it does not carry out its responsibility. It is as free as if the Government told it not to publish it. If something is not published, that is as evil in the newspaper not to publish what is going on in this country at any level as it would be for the Government to tell them what to publish. We have here evidently news by press conference, if a Minister wants something to get into the newspaper he has to call a press conference.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to....

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am just wondering if we are debating a resolution on the newspapers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was just referring the hon. member back to the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was just mentioning this by the way. As

far as the Bill is concerned, the Bill and the provisions in the Bill are largely taken from the English Family Law (Amendment) Act of 1970 with one or two modifications and will be dealt with in detail at a later stage. Section 3 of the Infants Act of 1958 at present says that the age of majority shall be 21 years and I am seeking to introduce a new Section 3 which will reduce that to 18. Certain consequential amendments will follow, Sir. There is an extension in what I am proposing as the new subsections (4) and (5), there is a necessary repeal by section 5 of this Bill, section 6(1) is definitional – I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is not now in his place – but here he is, and I have not gone quite so far as the Leader of the Opposition in Jamaica, I am not amending 18 Bills, it is only necessary to amend this number, but of course the Select Committee will deal with that if the Bill is given a second reading in due course.

The effect of this will be to allow persons to marry at the age of 18 without the consent of their parents, to own land, to enter into hire purchase agreements, to buy and sell motor cars and the other incidents of young working life, to enter into contracts, to allow people who enter contracts with young men to have some security, perhaps it may not be too generally known that if a person at the present time of 20 years 11 months enters into a contract he can repudiate it and do not pay the money under it even though he has fooled the people that he is over 21. He may be liable to criminal penalty, but at least he can get the article and avoid paying for it. At least this will now be reduced to 17 years 11 months if it goes through.

I should tell the House in respect of one or two matters that certain representations have been made to me, and the Minister of Health may be interested in this. The Senior Consultant Surgeon at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has got in touch with me to ask if the Bill could be amended to lower the age of consent at which a person can give permission for an operation to be carried out on them. I considered putting this matter into the Bill, I cannot tell now what considerations impelled me to leave it out, but obviously it was a mistake since I understand that the Ministry of Health has had requests for over three years for the age of consent to be lowered. A girl of 16 years can go into the hospital now with a child and give consent for an operation to be performed on that child but she cannot give permission for an operation to be carried out on herself. I mention this at this stage so that members may be forewarned of a further amendment in due course.

I have taken the opportunity to repeal certain totally outdated offences relating to fraudulent marriages and the abduction of heiresses. Before 1898 in Barbados or 1881 in England, if you married a woman half her property became yours, and it was therefore a criminal offence of fraudlently taking a girl up to the age of 21 out of the possession of her father with a view to marrying her if the girl had property. It has long since been outmoded in England, Sir, and since 1898 also in Barbados, but due to one of these accidents it survived only to be a vehicle for the political persecution of a member of this Hon. House some years ago, who I believe was the subject of the only prosecution ever brought under this Act, and I call it a political prosecution if there was ever one.
3.40 p.m.

I think that all hon. members would like to see the offence of fraudulent marriage abolished as well as abduction of heiresses. It is meaningless in circumstances where a woman does not lose her property merely by becoming married. Part III of the Infants Act is of no avail, if the age of majority is 18.

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

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this Bill be now referred, as the Rules require, to a Select Committee. I would ask, in view of the amendment relating to the age of consent for operations which I understand is sought to be and usually fixed at 16, that when the members on the other side are nominating their representatives the Minister of Health be placed on the Committee. As far as this side is concerned, I would move that the hon. member for St. James and the hon. member for St. Thomas be members of the Select Committee, which will consist of the Speaker and 5 persons. *(Asides)* Three others?

Sir, I will move that the hon. member for St. Michael South West; the hon. member for St. James and the hon. member for St. Thomas be members of the Select Committee and, perhaps, the Leader of the House will select two others along with Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker to preside.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare; the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs, and the Hon. Minister of Labour, Housing, etc.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those members, as mentioned by the Leader of the House, will form the Select Committee on this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I thank hon. members for their kind reception, Sir. I move that Item 5 be the next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION *re.* THE SPEAKER'S RULING GIVEN ON 4th JULY, 1972

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business expired. He may continue, if he so desires.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I was indicating upon the last occasion that, to select a phrase of one of our political opponents has not exactly coined but has applied to this situation, I was speaking more in sorrow than in anger about this Resolution and the circumstances that have given rise to it. I really believe that this is a matter of inexperience rather than any deliberate attempt to curb the rights of hon. members be they on the Government's side or on the Opposition's side.

I would remind all hon. members of the sentiments which I put forward, if I may say so, really in favour of Mr. Speaker. If we in this House choose an inexperienced Speaker, we have to live with it. That is the situation, but I am urging hon. members to let us try, in the interest of both sides, to choose a path relating to the Chair, the administration of the Chair, and the matters which are canvassed in the Resolution of the hon. member for St. James that will let us go through our Parliamentary business without undue heat, anger, or otherwise.

This is what I suggest to hon. members. Let us have this matter talked out, and I hope to convince hon. members that Mr. Speaker's Ruling is quite hopelessly wrong. Nonetheless, do not at this stage let us put ourselves in a situation of having to censure anybody. All of us make mistakes in the Rules at different times; all of us want the Rules bent at different times. It is fortunate at the present time that Mr. Speaker has shown a sufficient flexibility, just occasionally, to allow us some hope that, in the future, such mistakes will not again be made.

I would refer hon. members to an early occasion when I rose in my place upon the Adjournment, and Mr. Speaker stopped me from speaking. The Prime Minister, very kindly, rose and indicated that the adjournment was an occasion for the discussion of certain things, and Mr. Speaker allowed me to continue. I can remind hon. members of yet another occasion when, I think, Mr. Speaker was right the first time and not quite so right the second when he gave a Ruling and the hon. member for St. Andrew invited him at length to reconsider it and Mr. Speaker reconsidered his Ruling and admitted that he had been wrong. I am not aware, so far, that Mr. Speaker has considered any Rulings on the representations of members on this side of the House. Let us hope that this may turn out in the long run, after the heat has abated, to be such an occasion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also want to remind hon. members that it has always been a convention in this as in other Houses that, no matter how much Mr. Speaker thinks he knows, he takes advice from the Clerks. It is still my belief, and I tell hon. members that sincerely I cannot say more than belief, because I have not questioned the Clerks or the hon. member for St. James on this point. It is my belief, looking at the two Resolutions in question, that these Resolutions were drawn not by the hon. member for St. James but by the Clerks. My feeling is that the subject matter of the Resolutions was conveyed to the Clerks, and the Clerks put the Resolutions, with their experience and the precedents before them, into proper Parliamentary language which, if true, would make it all the more remarkable that Mr. Speaker would decide casually, if I may say so, to exercise a power which it appears to be in some doubt that he at all has. Although the Rules say that the Speaker can Rule questions out of order, there is nothing saying that he can Rule Resolutions out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have searched the authorities and discovered that in Canada it used to be held that the Speaker had no power to Rule a Resolution out of order, and he now has power by a specific Rule which extends to Resolutions the same power which he has over questions. I gather, Sir, to read these Resolutions out, that the first Resolution, the enacting part, states:

"Be it resolved that this House request the Government to consider raising old age pensions from $5 to $15 a week."

Now, Sir, the only two persons I know, who in my hearing and with any appearance of sincerity have said that this is an infringment of the Constitutional Rule and the Standing Orders are

Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for St. Michael North West. It is unfortunate that they are two lawyers, albeit extremely inexperienced ones, who should lend their authority to such a proposition. 3.50 p.m.

At every conceivable level it does not seem that this could be offensive. The hon. member for St. Michael North West is paying a great deal of attention to the constitution. I remember when he introduced the Citizenship Bill it was in clear contravention of the Constitution and when it was pointed out to him he was by no means such an upholder of it. Since then the Parliamentary Draughtsmen have tried to make the Citizenship Bill a little more constitutional and I believe have succeeded, but I am glad that we have a recent convert to constitutionality in the hon. member for St. Michael North West, the Minister of Labour.

The Standing Order say that –

"Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet the House –

(a) shall not proceed on any Bill (including any amendment to a Bill) which makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing or increasing any charge on the revenue or other funds of the Colony or for compounding or remitting any debt due to the Colony; and

(b) shall not proceed on any motion, the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

The Constitution says broadly the same thing. Article 54 sub-clause 3 reads:

"Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet signified by a Minister, the House of Assembly shall not –

(a) proceed upon any Bill (including any amendment to a Bill) which, in the opinion of the person presiding, makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing any charge on the Consolidated Fund or any other public fund or altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it or for compounding or remitting any debt to Barbados; or

(b) proceed upon any motion (including any amendment to a motion) the effect of which, in the opinion of the person, presiding, is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

Now it is a very difficult point to argue this one because where something has been done for 300 years in every Parliament of the Commonwealth, where it has been done by many hon. members on both sides of the House without question and without thought, without the slightest interruption when that rule has existed and the rule which preceded it and the Speaker says it has been done wrong, how can you argue against that? Suppose somebody says you are not a man, how can you argue "yes you are a man." You show him you are a man and he says "no, that does not make you a man", what more can you say? It has been true from time immemorial in all Parliaments of which I am aware that have a ministerial system that only a Minister can initiate a vote of public money. This has always been true. It is true in the House of Commons, in every Parliament in the Commonwealth, and yet Resolutions such as these have been brought over and over again.

I thought of bringing the English Hansard and laying them here so that I can show you time after time English Leaders of the Opposition say taxes should be reduced in a particular respect. Motions to that effect are moved. Here in this House people call for a raise in old age pension. What was the great debate in December 1961 when these rules were in force led by Mr. Tudor, the Hon. Leader of the House, the Deputy Prime Minister and the hon. member for St. Michael West? What was the great debate? To raise old age pensions on a Resolution such as this. That was the debate of 1961. The Speaker then let it pass. Mr. Speaker Brancker has let repeated Resolutions like that go through, and now the current Mr. Speaker, a man who has never sat inside this Chamber before he became Speaker has decided that every Speaker who has ever sat in a Parliament is wrong and he is right. What kind of business is this?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, when the hon. member says that His Honour the Speaker has never sat in here, does he mean as a member? If so, he may be correct; but if he says he has never sat in the Chamber, I would like a clarification on that. He never sat as a member, but not that he never sat in the Gallery.

Mr. ADAMS: I am informed that on some occasion Mr. Speaker before he was a member entered here wearing a hat and was ordered out of the Gallery. So it may be untrue to say he has never sat in here. He has only once sat covered in here. There are hon. members who have been in this House before. I see that some of them are saving themselves the embarrassment of having to agree perhaps with the arguments that are being put forward. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the hon. member for St. John, the hon.

member for St. Michael West are perhaps avoiding the occasion of having to agree with the Leader of the Opposition. He has moved so many of these Resolutions himself, he could not stay here and say that this Resolution is out of order. That is precedent. Precedent is very powerful. It has always been done. I am not saying that because something has always been done that it is right, but where Speakers in history allow it to be done, there is some difficulty in believing that a man not yet twelve months in a Legislative Assembly has come to a correct decision where all the other Speakers in history have been wrong. There is some difficulty in my accepting that. It is possible, but it is a difficulty in my acceptance. This is why I do not want to see a party vote in here, and I know it is very hard for you all – I am using that phrase advisedly because I believe you are still a member of a party – to vote against the Speaker in a small House, and therefore I do not want to see any embarrassment caused either of the conscience of hon. members who must be voting against their conscience when they have themselves done the same thing in the past, or any embarrassment caused to Mr. Speaker when in fact only the debate may be all that is called for.

Now that is precedent. We are dealing now with principal. I beg your pardon. The other one I was not even dealing with. I can tell hon. members what the other Resolution that Mr. Speaker held was out of order was. What are the enacting words?

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to make it compulsory that all concessionaires in public transport services provide the same facilities for all old age pensioners."

That has nothing whatsoever to do with Government money, and Mr. Speaker ruled that out of order on the ground that it would be a charge on the revenue. That has nothing to do with Government money; that has to do with concessions of public transport services. I do not believe that any hon. member, even the hon. member for St. Michael North West could defend that. This is a Resolution saying that all old age pensioners should ride free on the private buses. It does not cost the Government anything, and Mr. Speaker says that is out of order as tending to impose a charge on the Consolidated Fund. I have not dealt with that because that particular one is beneath consideration.

If Mr. Speaker were to come forward in here now and say that he is right in ruling that out of order, Sir, we would have to say he is a very stubborn man, because we could not think he is serious; we could not have such a low opinion of Mr. Speaker's intellect as to think he could be serious, and now maintain that a Resolution saying that the Government should make it possible for old pensions to ride free on private buses is a charge on public money; so I am not going to press that. That is just a mistake. I remember Mr. Lloyd Smith in here dealing with the former Mr. Speaker upon an occasion when Sir Theodore was thoroughly wrong, and Mr. Lloyd Smith said "he is my friend but your boyfriend can slip", and as he put it "but he aint slip he fall down." It would take a Lloyd Smith to do justice to a ruling such as this one in respect of the second Resolution; so I will come back to the first.

4.00 p.m.

The words of the Standing Orders are practically the same as the words of the Constitution, and I should point out to the hon. member for St. Michael North West that if our Standing Orders told us that we were to do something contrary to the Constitution we would have to do it. The Courts could say that we were wrong, but we are bound by our Standing Orders, not by the Constitution. If our Standing Orders are in conflict with the Constitution, a higher authority outside Parliament would have to resolve it. The Speaker can only administer the Standing Orders, he does not have any copy of the Constitution there in his lap, so although the two are identical let us get it clear that there is no magic in the word "Constitution". I have already pointed out to the hon. member in connection with certain amendments to the Standing Orders that amendments are proposed which are unconstitutional and his answer to that was not that we had to follow the amendments, we would amend the Constitution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I deny ever having said such a thing. I know – and you do not have to be a lawyer to know this, I know this from my legal training – that when a matter is in conflict with the Constitution the Constitution must at all times take precedence, and if it is a matter which is in conflict with the Constitution and we want it to stand as the law then we will amend the Constitution.

Mr. ADAMS: He knows perfectly well that since the Committee to which I am referring has not yet reported that I cannot constitutionally say what passed between him and me and therefore he feels free to deny that statement which he knows he made. I am dealing with the hon. member for St. Michael North West who has led Mr. Speaker astray. It is hard enough for lawyers who go in Court every day to be sure they have a correct interpretation of a form of words, but Mr. Speaker evidently has no doubt that in the face of all the precedents that his view must be the one that must

prevail, as encouraged by the hon. member for St. Michael North West. I wish the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was in his seat, because the arguments against Mr. Speaker's ruling have never been put so forcibly as they were by him, succinctly, in a few words. He analysed, better than I can do – and there are very few things he can do better than I can do, Sir – he analysed the words of this Standing Order better than I can analyse them. I admired hearing him, he talked about provision, he said "a resolution of the House does not make provision for anything." I adopt his words, that is not the way I would put it, he has put it a better way, " a resolution of the House on a private member's Bill calling on the Government to consider raising the old age pension is not a provision." Suppose the resolution is passed, will the old age pensioners get a penny more? Resolutions are passed in here but they do not have the force of law, only one thing can raise the old age pension, an amendment to the Old Age Pension Act of 1937 to delete the word "five" and insert the word "fifteen". There is not another motion that can raise the old age pension but that. Even if we sought to appropriate money in here, if a Minister got up and asked us to appropriate $10 million more for old age pensions they could not get $15 per week because the Old Age Pensions Act says they are to get $5, so even a motion duly passed in Committee of Supply to appropriate the necessary money could not raise the old age pensions and could not be a charge on the Consolidated Fund because it could not make provision, the only provision in connection with the old age pensioners is an amendment to the Old Age Pensions Act of 1937. So how can a private member asking the Government to consider raising.....What are we hearing in this day and age? There cannot be an hon. member opposite who upon a mature consideration of this matter in his heart can really feel that Mr. Speaker was right in these circumstances, and I would most sincerely regret hearing any arguments from any hon. members opposite to defend the indefensible.

We have to taste all sorts of bitter bread that we would rather not eat upon certain occasions, but you do not have to defend the indefensible in the House of Assembly of Barbados when a quiet word to the wise would create a more satisfactory situation. Sir, there is hardly any resolution which could be brought to this House that does not eventually bear upon the revenue. When you bring down a resolution calling for a new housing scheme that tends to bear on the revenue because houses can only be built with money. When you bring down a resolution saying that drainage is bad and asking the Government to do something about it, I believe the Government can only do something about drainage with money. What resolution can be brought down – a few can be brought down, I am not saying it is impossible – but the ordinary everyday resolutions that come before the House involve money. Look at Item No. 2.

> 2. To move the passing of a Resolution calling upon the Government immediately to take steps to provide proper housing and an environment to improve the standard of living of the residents in Barbados.

Why did Mr. Speaker not rule that out of order? That eventually if the Government accepts it will cost money. No. 3.

> 3. To move the passing of the Resolution requesting the Government to consider approaching estate and private owners of land commonly used inland wide by the youth, for leases or gifts of the said bits and parcels of land, so that better amenities and facilities can be added to bring happiness and more comfort to the same users.

To take a public officer's time to ask an estate for land is to spend money because the time that he is spending doing that presumably will have to be compensated for at cost somewhere else. What is there you can ask the Government to do that does not eventually cost money? Buy Nicholas Abbey to provide a safari park; there is no objection to that, I think a safari park is a first-class idea, but hon. members wanted to talk, and I am glad to say that from recent reports I have got, I understand that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central has been thoroughly convinced of the need of a safari park and is now actively supporting such a proposal, but that is obviously irrelvent, Sir.

The hon. member for Christ Church West has a resolution here which reads:

> To move the passing of a Resolution requesting the Government to consider the establishment of a Housing Area, a Community Centre and a Day Nursery at Bonnetts, Brittons Hill, Clapham, Club Morgan and Forde's Road area.

Even myself, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to the age of majority. I believe there may very well be certain fees accruing to the Government in connection for example with the giving of consent, the applications to the Court to give consent to illegitimate children under the age of 21 getting married. The Government will lose the fees of those from 18 to 21 if they pass my Bill, but nobody is objecting on the grounds

that my Bill is going to be a charge on the revenue. In a roundabout way the Government will lose a little money, perhaps $20 a year, but nobody objects to that because it is totally and desperately a misunderstanding of the effect of a resolution of the House of Assembly. It is a misunderstanding of the constitutional position of each House of Parliament and of each member in it. A resolution of the House of Assembly does not normally have the force of law. Over a very limited area indeed, whose extent I could not even dream of attempting to canvass, a few resolutions may have the effect of law, and financial resolutions passed to appropriate money for the Public Service of this island do not have the effect of law, but they have the effect of giving legal authorisation for the payment of that money but they are not law because nobody can put the Government in Court to spend the money that has been appropriated.
4.10 p.m.

No citizen can sue the Government for money the House of Assembly has passed. You do not have to spend it at all. Even the Resolution in Committee of Supply you may very plausibly argue does not really enforce a charge on the revenue. Even the money we have appropriated today does not have to be spent – it is not a necessary charge on the revenue. A Resolution of the House of Assembly can never, in my submission, be in the words of the Standing Order: "a motion the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

The Government can ignore any Resolution passed by the House. We could pass a Resolution calling for old age pensions to be raised, but the Government does not have to take it on. I know that the Prime Minister is not a man who is afraid to come in here and snatch the Resolution from the lion's mouth, because he feels the money should not be spent. It cannot be doubted that if a certain Resolution, which the Prime Minister halted in this House a few months ago, had been passed, it could have been ignored. He has the final word even though the matter was introduced by a Minister and it resulted in the spending of money, and the person concerned, in my view, could not have any legal redress against the Government, if the salary were not passed. I refer to the staff of the House of Assembly. So how can a Resolution suddenly by decree of the present Mr. Speaker become "a motion the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid?"

Now, suppose the hon. member for St. James motion was passed. I repeat to hon. members that no old age pensioner in the whole of Barbados could get a cent more. Suppose we had said $7.50 instead of $15? *(asides)* The hon. member for St. Michael West is giving me the same assistance as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central gave in connection with this matter. They know that the Speaker is wrong. This is why I do not wish the House to take any drastic step in this matter. *(Asides)* The House can remove anybody.

I do not know if the hon. member for St. Michael West was in here two weeks ago when I read out some Canadian precedents, when Mr. Speaker did not even know how it happened, but he found himself in a crossfire between the Government and the two Opposition Parties. Before it ended Mr. Speaker's Ruling had been appealed and defeated three times. Even when he Ruled that there was no right of appeal, they appealed the Ruling that there could be no appeal and defeated him. What happened? There was constitutional turmoil in Canada; there was a lot of bitterness; there was a lot of unpleasantness; great regret on the Speaker, and he resigned. We do not want that to happen here at this stage. *(Asides)*

I do not think that Mr. Speaker's resignation, if it comes, will be in such a form as will permit his appointment to any other post in the Public Service of this Island. Let us retreat from that road; I have gone a little bit too far even when I say that.

Sir, I want to read something to the House which gave me great pain when I read it originally. I know it gave my father a great deal of pain. He marked the particular volume from which I am now about to read, but I am hoping that we will never have a situation where it is said of Barbados – *(Asides)* There is a book by Professor Morley Ayearst called *The British West Indies: The Research For Self-Government,* and he referred to the Speaker in Guyana who, when he did not want Dr. Jagan to pass his Budget, named the majority of Government members and allowed Mr. Burnham and others to vote out the Budget. He did that by naming the Prime Minister and four other Ministers thereby putting them out for one day and giving Mr. Burnham the majority. He never brought a liable action although it appeared in print – a clear suggestion that he was partisan, by removing Dr. Jagan and four of his Ministers from the House in order to give Mr. Burnham and the Opposition a majority. We have never had anything like that, thank God, in Barbados.

This is what Morley Ayearst said generally about the Speakers:

> West Indian Speakers seem prone to inject remarks into debates and at times almost to enter the debate themselves. They exchange badinage with Members and indulge in argument. In general they do not keep very good order. Loud conversations during

> debates are permitted and a degree of laxity in speech which would not be tolerated in the House of Commons. It must be remembered that neither Speaker nor Members have been trained in the traditions of parliamentary behaviour, nor are they as familiar as they might be with the Standing Orders or the British precedents. The rough language of the hustings is likely to be echoed in the legislature in moments of stress and the exchange of personal insults sometimes goes far beyond anything that would be permitted at Westminister.

Having said a lot of very unfair things, and certainly in the case of Barbados quite definitely untrue, he went on to say one true thing:

"The West Indian Speaker has, in some ways, a more difficult job than his English counterpart."

I will have to accept that. Let us not make the job of our Speaker any more difficult than it must be by encouraging him in wrong doing. Where he is wrong, he has friends and his friends must whisper into his ears: "we do not think that could be right." It is a disgrace to any House where the Clerks of the House, as I believe – I am sure the hon. member for St. James will interrupt me if I am wrong. He can testify that I have not yet asked him about this, but I believe the Clerks assisted in the preparation of this. It is a disgrace to the House that just like that, arbitrarily, Mr. Speaker decides that Resolutions which have been allowed from time immemorial are suddenly to be ruled out of order when the Rules have remained the same.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that there have been no personal reflections on the Speaker in my speech which would give him any pain, and if there have been I apologise for them. I believe that he is not by any means beyond repair. I remember after Dr. Johnson was saying a few hard things about Scotsmen; how in England oats are given to horses, but in Scotland they formed the staple diet of the people, and Boswell said: "Is there no good to be found in a Scotsman then?" Dr. Johnson replied: "Yes, if you catch them young." Well, Mr. Speaker is young enough to learn, and a man of his age must be flexible enough, faced with the stresses of this type of life that he will now be meeting when he enters the hurly–burly of Parliamentary contest, to allow him to bend, to recover, and see again what he saw wrong the first time. The same courtesy which he extended to the Prime Minister when he took up cudgels for me, the same courtesy which he extended to the hon. member for St. Andrew when he allowed him a long speech and changed his mind, I think wrongly. I think he was right and the hon. member for St. Andrew was wrong. He allowed him a long speech on a point of order and changed his mind. It was a very marginal point anyhow and not one– *(Asides)* He had never changed his mind for Frank, but he has changed his mind on other occasions. I would not put it in the language which the hon. member for St. Michael has chosen by saying that even when the Speaker was right he did not know he was right. I myself would not choose that language. *(Asides)* If hon. members find themselves unable to take part in this debate and prefer to have a spokesman to express some of the dissatisfaction which we have been undergoing, then I can take it all on my shoulders. That is one of the reasons why the Opposition in here. The Opposition is here to oppose and to point out what is wrong.

4.20 p.m.

Anyhow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that other hon. members might wish to say something. As far as I am concerned I would like to close now. You and I must know in our hearts that requesting a Government to consider a raise of old age pensions is not making provision for a charge on the revenue. Those words can never amount to provision. Provision, that is the operative word that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was so kind as to draw to my attention. Make provision, the effect of which provision shall be made. This Resolution if passed, could not make provision for anything, therefore it cannot be out of order. That is my submission.

The burden of the Resolution is that Mr. Speaker's ruling be expunged from the records and that the hon. member for St. James be permitted to give notice of the Resolution. I would hope that this debate will amount to the cleaning of the slate and the drawing of the sponge, that the debate itself, the issues that have been canvassed will in themselves show to future generations what view could be put forward, was put forward and was the correct view in respect of Mr. Speaker's ruling, for the *Official Gazette* after all is a continuance document as the Leader of the House pointed out, and something that is wrong one week you can see it put right in the next week if you are a steady reader of it. I believe there are many persons who are steady readers. I believe that that could amount to an expungement without the formal passage of the Resolution, and I would hope that when next the hon. member for St. James seeks to raise the question of old age pension that he, the Clerk and Mr. Speaker can find some form of words, face saving perhaps, to permit the Resolution to be debated as hon. members want to debate it without any accusation that hon. members are being choked and suppressed and censored. I don't say it is in it, but all that could be considered to be in it. As far as the other part of the Resolution is concerned, Mr. Speaker was clearly treating the whole thing as one matter. He could not seriously have thought that the call for old age pensioners to

ride free on the private buses could be offensive. I do not think that is in question at all, and with those sentiments, I beg to second the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....*(Asides)* Am I to be heckled?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not by me or anyone.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the debate which has gone on so far on this Resolution is going to serve very little good when it is all finished. My reason for saying so is that you may punish a child for a reason and the child may react in such a way as to eventually make you to feel that it regrets its former action; but if we were to cast our thoughts back on what was said when His Honour was elected to office, I am sure that everything that could have been said for him to make him a good Speaker was said. If he wanted to be a good Speaker, he could have been a good Speaker as from that very day. I am willing to admit that each and every hon. member who enters this Chamber is subject to making mistakes. We are all human beings, but we have seen the danger from time to time of arming people with authority, and as in the case of our Speaker, we cannot say that he was armed with more authority than with ability with which to carry it out, because I remember the Minister of State now the Deputy Prime Minister, in giving us the reasons why he should be elected Speaker said so much that he left nothing to be said if it were the day on which he was to be buried; but it was the Leader of the Opposition who gave us one or two points which we should follow. I remember him saying that the unusual was taking place. It was unusual in the sense that our present Speaker was entering the House on that particular day as a member for the first time and was being elected Speaker, and reference was made to the precedent which had been created in 1948 when Mr. K. N. R. Husbands had done likewise. I have since learned that our Speaker made precedent because Mr. Husbands had been in the House before. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also remember the Leader of the Opposition telling the House that the winning of the Barbados Scholarship was not to be taken as a guideline or indication as necessarily fitting one for higher things. These were pointers which we are saying that our Speaker could have taken to heart and could very well have listened to and kept before his mind and acted on. What do we find? We appreciate the fact that in any Speaker the interpretation of the Standing Orders is of the utmost importance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the time is now 4.30 p.m. which brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The instant order of the day is now Government Business, and it is to resume Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the suspension was taken the hon. member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair. He may continue.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the point I was making was that when it comes to voting money for olympic games, etc. a national situation is involved. The Olympic Association can take the money and go wherever they want to go, but when you are taking public funds and assisting these organisations to participate in any games or activities, then it is within the public's purview to examine what is taking place, and the public is likely to query it. As I said this morning, it was only this morning that the Ethiopian Government recalled their delegation from Munich – and one of the Ethopians won the last marathon – and if that Government which won a gold medal could recall their delegation, Barbados could do the same. I would like to see Barbados win a gold medal, but Barbados is so far from winning a gold medal that I will be dead and gone by the time they do this, so this is only a gesture. It is a good exposure for your young athletes, but what I am concerned about is that this is a national matter which is becoming an international matter. The attitude of Rhodesia is known throughout the world, the attitude of South Africa is known throughout the world, and it is no point in taking up public funds to aid and abet organisations unless you are satisfied that these things mean nothing to you, but if they mean something to you you should help them.

My view is that Barbadians cannot go on living in any paradise, thinking that they are living in an area where everybody else is living differently, and where the majority of black people like us are allowing petty officials to identify themselves with things because they are afraid that if you are at the brink of going to the Olympic Games you should send a delegation to the Games. They will say that Trinidad is sending a delegation, other countries are sending delegations, so therefore Barbados should send a delegation as well. It is time that these officials awake to these national issues too. If they are afraid in their Association to say what some associations have said, they are not going to be associated with the Olympic Games if this is the position. Mr. Anthony Brundige can do

whatever he likes, he is a millionaire, he ran when he was 17 or 18, but we have too many Brundiges in the world. Too many people when they get on top seem to believe that the world is not the same place it used to be when they were at the bottom. It is critical when you are at the bottom but when you are on top it is very different. I want to say this, I am not striving for anything but I am no different from what I always was, I have always been a black man, and I feel that the time has come when in some small corner of the world we have to make officials understand that we have to observe national and international issues that affect people.

I have nothing against the people going to the Games, they are doing some good work in their various sports, but what I would like to say to the Minister before I sit down is that if you are going to spend public funds you should try to beautify this place. I passed by the Stadium yesterday and it is beginning to look very disgraceful. If you cannot see that the people who run the Stadium have enough imagination to beautify the place, you should get somebody else to do it. There are some signs beginning to go up there, I noticed BWIA advertising at one point and Barclays Bank on the other side, but nothing showing whose stadium it is. You have people who are so money oriented that somebody will soon start putting up signs outside the House of Assembly too. You should try to beautify the grounds outside so that it will enhance the Stadium and not have people putting up all the various bogus signs.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reply briefly and say that this Government is second to none in its efforts to ensure that the cause of the black man and those who fight for the cause of human justice throughout the world is advanced at every corner. I think it is for this reason that we have not recognised the so-called republican Government of Rhodesia and have no diplomatic or consular relations with that country. The National Olympic Committee extended an invitation to the National Committee of Rhodesia on its statement in accordance with its statutes, and it is my information from the Barbados Olympic Association – I met with them on Friday last and I discussed this matter with them – that the Rhodesian team was competing under the flag and using the National Anthem of the United Kingdom, in other words, under the same conditions which operated in 1964 at the Olympics in that particular year. I made it quite clear that it is not the position of this Government to give any aid or comfort in any way to the racist regime of Rhodesia, and the representatives of the Barbados Olympic Association understood that position and accepts that position. If it ever becomes necessary for this Government to issue any instructions for the team not to participate arising out of develoments in Munich itself, this Government will certainly not hesitate to do so, but I would like to assure this Hon. Chamber that this Government will do nothing which may be contrary to any resolutions which we supported at the United Nations or to give any aid or comfort to the regime in Rhodesia.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I listened quite carefully to the Minister of Sport, and I listened to the member for St. Michael West. I followed the member for St. Michael West quite well, but somehow I was at a loss to follow the Minister. I think we will have to see the member for St. Michael West in his true colours this evening, because if he is opposed to the regime of Rhodesia being represented at the Munich Games and he is not supporting any money to be spent by Government for this, he will have to vote contrary to Government's policy on this occasion.

4.40 p.m.

Since it is Government funds and he is so strong against the regime of Rhodesia, he will have to vote contrary to Government's policy on this occasion, which I know he is quite capable of doing. It is true that the hon. member for St. John has made it quite clear on several occasions that Ian Smith is a lawyer and Smith knows what he is about. Be that as it may, I have said in here repeatedly that when it comes to any sporting activities, either on a territorial or international level, I am prepared to support it. It is regrettable that you have Rhodesia taking things out of its standard and pretending to be competing under the British Flag. Why not say that it is a British – Rhodesia Olympic Team? That is what it would have to be.

As far as the hon. member for St. Michael West is concerned, as I understand it, he says that he recognises the fact that the Cycle Union and the Olympic Association are trying their best. I am not saying that they are doing a good job because I am close to them. This money is to give somebody a freeness. I always feel that you will hear about Gary Sobers before you will hear about any sort of Barrow. You can go any part of the Commonwealth and ask anybody if he has heard about Gary Sobers and he will know about him. He is an international figure, despite what the hon. member for St. Michael West said about him in the Senate some years ago. He said that he was either a glorified idiot or something like that to have gone.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir. I have never made any derogatory statement about the

gentleman. All I have said is that I disagreed with him for going to South Africa to play cricket. His personal life never came into my speech at all – it was not necessary.

Mr. CRAIG: In the interview you also went on to say that he must either be a double breasted or glorified idiot. I remember that very well, because I even tried to shake the Minister of Education by using that statement in the Bay Land, but I did not succeed. If the Government are not going to support the regime of Rhodesia at the Olympic, and they are not, according to the member for St. Michael West – he would not support the Resolution because Rhodesia is taking part, then you cannot fly the Barbados standard there. Now if the Olympic Association or the Seventh Day Association or whatever it is sends a team from here, when the Barbados standard is flown it is recognised that Barbados is competing whether this Government pay the money or not. You must either support the Resolution, or you must not support it. We know what is happening in Southern Rhodesia. I am going to support the Resolution, because wherever there are sporting activities in any country I will support the young people in this area.

As far as the Stadium is concerned – the hon. member mentioned it, and I wanted to draw it to the Minister's attention. I observed some sort of soft paint outside B.O.A.C., or B.W.I.A.: "Friendly Faces Going Places." I will bet you anything Mr. Chairman, that they will hardly contribute anything to the advertisements out there. It lends absolutely nothing to the place; it looks cheap, and the policy of the Government where the organisation of sport is concerned is a cheap one. I will repeat it now to the Minister of Education. I remember a friend of mine once saying that the Minister of Education should have been in the Ministry of Public Works. You are putting up buildings, but you have not changed your curriculum. It is the same old thing.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Let the Chairman interrupt me. What is wrong with you? We are in Committee and you can talk later.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has risen on a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: He is sitting down, Sir. He has nothing to say and he has finished. I am supporting the Resolution and I, at this stage, would like to wish the Barbados Olympic Association, the Cycle Union and all of the people who are going to compete up there the best of luck. I am aware of the fact that some of the competitors are just bordering on the Olympic times, but it will be an advertisement for Barbados, and we will be recognised at international level. I am sure that my colleagues on this side are going to support the Resolution. I look forward, however, to the hon. member for St. Michael West voting against it, Sir.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, you permitted the hon. member to make a reference about the educational system of this country in very derogatory terms. If the hon. member is unaware of what is taking place inside the education system, I should like to inform him that curriculum changes have, in fact, been taking place over the past years and that within the past 10 years we have introduced a new Curriculum Guide & Syllabuses in the main subjects in the Educational System. He is totally unaware of the development taking place in the Educational System. If he wants to speak on sport, he can do so, but do not venture into those matters on which he has no knowledge. He should inform himself first.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should also like to tell the hon. member that the day I have to vote I would not need any advice from any member on that side. Moreover, I do not need advice from any member on that side on how to vote, or what my political behaviour should be. It has never been at his behest to know what my political behaviour should be. The day I have to seek any advice from him, it will be very poor indeed.

Mr. ADAMS: I never wanted to become involved in this Rhodesia affair, Sir, like so many of the front bench speakers on the other side, it is obviously a tricky question. I think it is a trickier question than the hon. member for St. Michael West imagines. Things are turned upside down. My impression of the Olympic–Rhodesia issue was that one of the greatest humiliations ever inflicted on the Smith Government was inflicted by the Olympic Association when it said that no team could come from Rhodesia and it would have to come from the British Colony of Southern Rhodesia under the Union Jack and with British Passports.

Sir, nothing that the Ethiopian Government, a Government in which democracy is entirely non–existent, led by people seeking to fool the others by external adventures, by pretending to be radical in external adventures so as to turn away from the minds of the Ethiopian man in the street his miserable conditions at home. Nothing that the Ethiopian Government has said will make me view

the whole Southern Rhodesian incident – you cannot call it Rhodesia – as other than a grave humiliation for Mr. Smith. I do not think that since Smith has declared his so–called Independence that any International Body has been able to force Rhodesian representatives abroad to forgo their so–called flags, so–called Anthem and their so–called name "Rhodesia", and appear once again as a British Colony. I think that the remarks of the hon. member for St. Michael West are as misplaced as those of the Ethiopian aristocrats who, for years, have been keeping down one of the largest but at the same time most miserable countries in Africa.

4.50 p.m.

On this side I have not the slightest intention of harming sport in Barbados by voting against this money. This money has to get my vote because I know it is going to young people for a good cause and for the cause of representing Barbados and giving a few youngsters a chance to fulfil their aspirations abroad.

The question that Head 35 – Ministry of Education (14) Youth Affairs – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 37 – Ministry of Health and Welfare (1) General Administration – was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, there are certain items here I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members. There are Item 22 – Temporary Staff and Substitutes, Item 23 – Overtime, Item 33 Coordinated Applied Nutrition Programme, Item 50 – Transport Allowances and Item 12 – Laundry Allowance.

Under Item 22 – Temporary Staff, it is practically impossible to determine the amount of money that can be used from year to year. In an institution like Hospitals where staff coming from all parts of the world at some time with higher prices for transportation from certain places rather than others, it is uncertain how much money will be needed. The sum of $250,000 was provided in this year's Estimates for persons acting for holders of posts in the Ministry's Headquarters, Health Centres, Maternity Hospitals, Lazaretto, District Hospitals and District Medical Services who are on leave. There is also a training programme for nursing staff at the Tercentenary School of nursing, and substitutes have to be obtained very often at salaries above the minimum of the nursing assistants rate owing to their qualifications.

It should also be noted, Mr. Chairman, that apart from the regular annual leave certain members of the nursing staff have been proceeding on overseas leave and then remaining on half pay, and often funds have to be provided for the substitutes at higher pay as well as for the continuation of half pay in some of these instances. During the first two months of this year the expenditure averaged approximately averaged approximately $50,000 per month, with an aggregate of $99,489 at the 29th May this year. On this basis it is considered that the sum of $350,000 would adequately supplement this item for the remainder of the year.

Under Item 23 – Overtime – the amount voted under this Item in the current Estimates was $240 and provides for the payment of $5 per month to each of four messengers attached to the Ministry. The Chief Establishments Officer's Circular No. 1/1972 provides that these rates be revised to $8 per month with effect from 1st April, 1971, and consequent on this the amount required to make these payments for the current financial year together with arrears for 1971–72 would be $528. The deficit of $288 is therefore requested to supplement this Item.

Under Item 33 – Coordinated Applied Nutrition Programme – when the Estimates for the current year were being prepared, it was considered that would have been deceleration of the Applied Nutrition Programme owing to the fact that it was proposed to open the National Nutrition Centre in October this year. As a result of this only the sum of $15,000 was provided in the current Estimates for the period April to September, 1972, but expenditure at 28th June amounted to $11,535 which realises a monthly average of approximately $3,845. It should be pointed out that another Agricultural Assistant was appointed to act with effect from 1st April, 1972, at a salary of $3,600 per annum, and owing to an expansion of the programme in the northern parishes, allowances paid in respect of travelling have also increased. Two training courses sponsored by UNICEF and held at this Ministry in April 1972, were also subsidised from funds provided under this Item.

Another reason for the increase in expenditure is the fact that motor vans attached to the unit have been involved in two additional weighing programmes in the north as well as the following up of cases of child malnutrition by means of house to house visits. The following is a break–down of the $8,000 required. Unexpended balance at 28th June $3,465, and the amount required is $8,000; salaries for three months July to September $10,005; office expenses $600, travelling allowances $525, upkeep of vehicles $300, contingencies $35 which make it $11,465.

Under Item 50, the amount requested to supplement this Head to the end of the financial year would be $16,760. This is due, Mr. Chairman, to the increase in the allowance for Public Health Inspectors for travelling. These rates were increased and this is the reason for asking for a supplementary vote under this Item.

Under Item 12 – Laundry Allowance, the sum of $19,000 is required to supplement the item.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 37 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, one could hardly believe that a National Nutrition Programme, that is what this Coordinated Applied Nutrition Programme is, could really have any significant meaning for us if the anticipated expenditure for the period stipulated by the Minister amounts to a mere $23,000 covering that period.
5.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, this is not a programme for feeding all the people who are under-nourished in Barbados, it is a programme to investigate the nutritional needs. Before you do an assessment of the nutritional needs, say, of school children, you must have money in order to carry out that survey. This is not a glorified school meals programme extended to the whole population, if it were I would agree with the hon. member. I thought the hon. member would be complimenting the Government on getting the investigatory part of the work done at such a low cost.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member for St. John has risen because he would like to stop me as early as possible, he does not want me to develop my argument. The point is this, it is not a question as the Minister would have us believe of getting the work done at such a low cost, let the Minister tell us how many people are in the field to carry out these investigations, how many cases of malnutrition they have come across, and at what speed are they expecting to progress during this same period that we are making calculations for now. We agree that it is not a glorified school meals programme for the whole island, but when we look at some of the steps the Government is supposed to have taken, the appointment of personnel for mere political reasons, people who have no interest whatsoever in seeing the scheme come to any sort of success, I really do not want to go into these things, I am begging the Minister not to say anything about it. The Prime Minister knows what I am saying. You appoint people merely because they toe the party line.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I must take up the hon. member on this point. No Minister in this Government has appointed or is even remotely connected with the appointment of persons who are working in the nutritional programme. Certainly it has never come to Cabinet and therefore it has never been delegated to any Minister, and any Minister far less a back bencher who is appointing such persons will be doing so without legal authority. What I can promise the hon. member is this, that if he can send me a list of the persons who have been politically appointed I would be pleased to relieve them of their jobs, so there is no point in his going on talking any more and we will save the whole $23,000. I am inviting the hon. member to send to my office tomorrow or as early as possible a list of the persons who have been politically appointed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said neither he nor any of his Ministers is responsible for making any political appointments, but it is so strange, Mr. Chairman, that people who can be picked up and sent on courses and the like are people who have washed the pots of some of the Ministers – I want to put it in that type of language – people who have been washing the pots, preparing meals and feeding Ministers. I want to put it in that type of language, and if you ask me to bring proof I will bring it. I mean what I say, and there are a lot of people who have been doing a stroke of work as if to show that they have any interest.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again on a point of order, Sir, I must take very strong objection to statements like that made by the hon. member. In the first place, I would just like statistically to explain something to him. Let us say that 56% of the voters in Barbados voted for the Government, it is inevitable that there must be somebody working somewhere in Barbados, in the Public Service and outside it, who voted for all of us here, and it would be ridiculous to suggest that the Public Service Commission in selecting people to go on courses – although I am Training Officer and I say what training should be done, because I know what we require as a Government – but the selection for courses is done by the Public Service Commission, and until recently a member of the Opposition was a member of the Public Service Commission and has boasted about it. It is inevitable in a country like Barbados. Let us say that only 51% of the people voted for the Government, the Public Service Commission

cannot say that the hon. member for St. Peter does not like anybody who voted for the Government to go on a course so they should be eliminated, so if somebody who voted for the Government goes on a course it does not prove anything, it only proves that he has a chance. When we came into office with the old Public Service Commission you did not have any chance at all to go, it was not even on a basis, let us say, of 50% of the Opposition and 50% of the Government. Apparently the Commission in those days used to enquire who supported the Governnment, who was so misguided as to put us in the Government in 1961, and up at the Public Works Department and all over the place they used to tell you to go and ask Mr. Talma or Mr. Tudor or Mr. Barrow when anything went wrong, or go and vote for them as if that was some kind of crime, but if it is a crime now it has been compounded three times.

Mr. HINDS: What kind of point of order is that, Mr. Chairman?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is a point of order when you make ridiculous statements like that. The general public does not know that the Public Service Commission selects people, do you want everybody who voted for the Government to be disqualified from everything, even speaking in the House now?

Mr. HINDS: I am glad he has completed his point of order. I am glad to hear that whoever have been sent on training courses, Public Service courses, had a chance. I sincerely hope that the work of investigations for the benefit of the programme will also have a chance and that those parents whose children have need of this type of work – and it is here that I say I am glad to see that something like this is being conducted, but where fear must possess me is when we happen to know what type of inveigling that has gone on behind the scenes. If people have had a chance, let them enjoy it at the taxpayers' expense. How long is too long for all this?
5.10 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am waiting on the hon. member to continue his address.

Mr. HINDS: That is what I am doing, Sir, because you do not listen to asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From neither side.

Mr. HINDS: It is certain, Mr. Chairman, that this programme will call for a very concerted effort on behalf of any staff that is appointed to carry out this type of work. Investigations must be carried out, and that is why we have to be very careful about this matter. The investigations have to be carried out by people who are free and unattached, say, as free as nurses who will approach the problems of mothers with their improperly fed children – people who will approach them in a different manner from people who are politicians or people from a political party. You should have people who will approach them as counsellors without any political attachment or association whatsoever. These are the things that must worry us. We have had our experiences time and time again when work of this nature has to be put into effect that the net result has not been what we expected initially because of the personnel appointed to these choice posts. That is where our fear lies, and I certainly hope that the Ministry will have no problems in this particular respect.

Now, the programme has been extended to the Northern parishes. We now understand that it is a sort of sample programme, and we are certain that the Minister would be in a position to tell us how equipped his team is for carrying the programme into effect. These are important matters for us.

We have no complaint whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, about the transport allowances for the Public Health Inspectors. In our view we should have more than fifty Public Health Inspectors receiving these allowances for the upkeep of their vehicles. We would certainly like to see the number increased, and the sooner this can be attended to the better it would be for the health of the people in the entire community.

There was at Item 22 – Temporary Staff and Substitutes, and the Minister told us how impossible it was to determine what it would cost us to pay the staff for the running of these Institutions for any given period. All the Minister has to do is to carry out an assessment of his present requirements and relate it to what has gone on for some given period in the past. He would then be able to discover whether or not his Institutions are having to cater to a more rapid intake as in the case of the Mental Hospital.

Sir, people do not seem to know this, but the population at the Mental Hospital is growing and has been growing very rapidly during the past seven to ten years. There is a rapid increase in the population in the Mental Hospital and, particularly, amongst young people. These are matters which ought to be investigated. We should know the reasons for all of these things. We should know what is responsible for the break-down in the health of our young people. Do not let us sit here and smile at these things, because they must be a

definite reason for all of them. I think that the Minister should look into these matters.

We are sure that the question of having to employ substitutes very often at a higher cost than what is paid to the holder of the substantive post is something that we will never be able to get rid off. It will continue for as long as our services last. All the Minister can do is to make sure that these Institutions are properly staffed. We are sure that there is enough unemployment in our midst that some of our people could be trained, and some are willing to be trained, if we can try to accommodate them on the basis of the qualifications that our schools in this Island offer.*(Laughter)* I hear a Minister laughing at this.

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

Mr. HINDS: I am addressing nobody else, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see a Minister in the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: I will tell the Chair what I am observing, and I think I am well within my right to do so. The Chair will then have to take into account anything which I observe while I am addressing the Chair. Mr. Chairman, in our own country in our schools, according to questions I have tabled here today, the Assessment Certificates given to school leavers have no employment value in any branch or Department of the Service today. 5.20 p.m.

There are some Heads of Departments who entered the service on the strength of these certificates and are giving satisfactory service, and they head some of these same Departments that we are now discussing. Heads of these departments entered the service with these certificates and it is that that we are asking the Government to give consideration to.

The question that Head 37 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – stand part, 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 $449,642 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO. 11

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $15,950. The Addendum sets out the true position in so far as the Treasury is concerned. It has been decided by the Accountant General that a certain amount of overtime work is necessary, and a crash programme is being instituted for overtime work at the Treasury for a period of eight weeks to clear outstanding accounting arrears in that Department. It is proposed that the programme of overtime work should be undertaken on the under-mentioned basis:

(a) The Treasury staff should work overtime for thirteen extra hours weekly and they will be working two hours each of three days, Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., four hours on Saturday afternoons from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m., and also three hours on Sunday mornings from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. It is felt that unless this overtime work is undertaken at this time to clear up outstanding arrears, a certain amount of difficulties might be experienced when the functions which are presently performed by the Treasury are being transferred to the Central Bank which has recently been established. The idea is to clear up all these arrears which will enable them to hand over certain functions which are now to be performed by the Central Bank.

Under Item 23 – Safes, an attempt is being made to maintain a level of security and efficiency at the Treasury and it is considered that an additional security cabinet is necessary.

With respect to Item 27 – Furniture and Equipment, the sum of $4,950 is required for the reason set out in the Addendum.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see this Resolution, and I am also glad that the Prime Minister is here because this comes directly under his portfolio. I am pleased to see that under this Resolution you are going to have a crash programme, how long it is going to last, and I do not know whom you are going to crash in on; but I am not going to surprise him because I think he is aware of it, that the Treasury is in bad need of this sort of thing. I must say in fairness to some of the officers that have been appointed that they

are aware of it, but the Committee would be surprised to know that my own organisation has been the recipient of bad dealings and I am glad the Minister of Communications is here, because I would like the Prime Minister and other Ministers to understand that the public departments are the greatest sinners in Barbados against legislation that has been passed by the Government itself. Government Departments owe the Government through National Insurance more money than all the employers in Barbados put together as defaulters, and the biggest defaulting department in this country is the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member if he is saying that the National Insurance Board of which he is a member is a defaulter, because that is not the report I got from the Auditor General. As a matter of fact, the Ministries have been in default in submitting returns to the National Insurance Board, but whatever one may say about two bodies associated with Government – one is the Housing Authority; I do not agree with the Housing Authority's policies, I want to make that clear, and the Minister is working on that now; they have not built communities, they have built a lot of houses and we want to change that – they have a lot of people who are not even qualified to sell stamps in the post office, but they have a good accountant and a good manager, and the National Insurance Board has been impeccable in the keeping of its accounts, and I have to supervise the whole investment portfolio of the National Insurance Board, and unless I misunderstand the member, he as a member of the Board is saying that the National Insurance Board is in default. If that is not what he means, he had better clear it up.

I know that the hon. member thinks very rapidly in front of his speech. It happens to me sometimes too, that I would forget what I am speaking because I am 3½ million light years away from the last sentence I made in advance, and the hon. member suffers from that unfortunate defect too because he thinks too quickly. But I want him to clear it up because I am responsible for the National Insurance Board and he is a member of the Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: Just as the Hon. Prime Minister has said, I would not come in the House to indict a Board I am on, because that indictment would have to take place at the Board. I said that the Ministry of Communications and Works is a defaulter in this respect and the Minister was ready, but the Ministers can speak because I am nothing to do with the Ministers. The Ministers are responsible for their departments, and I am telling them that they have these things.

I should like to thank the Minister of Education for the replies he gave me in the earlier debate, and he must forgive me for not doing so before, but I had to answer a point by the hon. member for St. James which prevented me from thanking him. I had to deal then with remarks which were not important but were slightly off beat.

The point I am making is that the Ministry of Communications and Works is by law committed to submit and take out stamps for national insurance on a prescribed form on behalf of the Government people who work there. What I am saying is that the National Insurance will send you stamps or will sell out all their stamps. There would be no problem if you do not send a stamp, but if you were to buy stamps from the National Insurance today, it is no reflection on the National Insurance that you do not buy today, because they have the reverse. There are some people who would stupidly sometimes go and buy more stamps than they should buy, keep them in their place and sometimes people steal them, but the insurance has been paid for them. All that is happening now is that somebody else would be selling insurance stamps other than the National Insurance body alongside national insurance and then some people will think they are getting stamps on the cheap and would not buy.

5.30 p.m.

The point I am making in connection with the Ministry of Communications and Works is that it is a big Department, and I will give an example. They should send money into the Treasury to be paid to the Barbados Workers' Union as dues collected from the workers. The Barbados Workers' Union cannot sue the Government, but there is over $10,000 owing to us, because this bad arrangement one way creates a bad arrangement another way, because when I check with my Accountants they say they cannot get the money from the Treasury, and the men come quarrelling to me saying they have taken out their money but when they ask at the Treasury the money has not got there yet, and they go back to M.C.W., and it is like sending the fool further and further. I think the Ministry of Communications and Works is one of the biggest Departments in the Public Service and that is a problem.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister said that sometimes I speak quickly, I do and I think quickly, but I am going to think slowly now and say what I am saying because it is a serious statement I am making. It does not apply to the Government, it applies to private industry. If financial departments all around do not get serious in this matter we will find ourselves in serious

trouble, because too many of the young entrants are not taking their jobs seriously. You can have Matthew as the Accountant in charge of the Treasury, there are some young people entering into private employment today and regardless of who you have as Accountant they are sitting down and mapping out a plan that wherever they begin to put on marching orders on you and the Accountant comes around $10,000 is missing. They are not hitting you for any small pieces, these are not the days when you are getting any lashes for $200, and the fellows know that there is nothing happening over the other side because by the time these cases come up and the lawyers start to cross-examine, the jury feel that if you have so much money that people can carry away they are correct in carrying it away because you should know how to protect it properly, and therefore you are not getting anywhere, but when you come to public funds that is a serious matter. If $10,000 is to come our way – and I do not know how much it is, this is a small organisation which can be regarded as the microscopic mosquito on the rhinoceros, but to us it means a substantial amount – and I am pleased that this resolution is here, and I would like to see that whatever is done on this matter is taken seriously. We have to take our responsibility very seriously, because the personal approach that you get in the Government Service is likely to lead to a lot of problems. If there is any problem with a Minister or any problem with a politician, people are right and willing to say the person is corrupt and therefore accuse him of corruption, but when it comes to Public Servants people try to white-wash these matters.

I believe the Government is losing a lot of money on a basis like this, because where checking cannot be effectively carried out frequently people believe that they can take a chance, and we have had instances where the Government has found out things, but after the money was gone. I do not want anybody to believe it is only happening in Government, it is happening in the private industry too. I have known of cases where it has happened at the banks too, but some banks cannot afford to go to Court to make it appear as if the people are carrying away all the money. As I said in this Chamber already, there may be some families where people think that it would be a total disgrace on the whole family and rather than bringing the whole family down for this little black sheep – and it can happen in the best regulated family – they quash it. I believe that some of these Departments are overloaded with mediocrity, and I would like to see a brutal appraisal made about the people entering the Public Service and a rigid training programme so that we can get the maximum from the people who have to work in the Public Service so that the country would gain more from their services.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just want to make it clear I did not get a specific assurance from the hon. member who has just sat down, but listening to him this is what I managed to eke out of his dissertation, but not that the National Insurance Board is at fault in any of its collections but that the Government Departments are not putting the stamps on the workers' books and some of them are hopelessly in arrear. Sometimes they do not give any explanation, and if anybody wants to deny that I can tell them that it is true. The Ministry of Communications and Works, no matter what Minister you have there, are the worse offenders. They buy more stamps than they need to buy and they do not stick them in the books, so you have no way of reconciling the amount of stamps which has been put in the books – which is the employers' responsibility and not the employees' responsibility, the employer keeps the book and when the worker changes his job he is entitled to call for his book, or if he is not changing his job, from time to time since his money is being deducted to pay 50% of the cost of the stamp the worker should demand at the time he gets his pay that the book be stamped up in front of him, which most of them are not really concerned with. When they do get concerned is when they go on sick leave and they expect the little 60% and then the National Insurance people say they have not paid any contributions for 18 months, but the money was being deducted.

I am aware of that, and no Minister is going to deny that that is so because every Minister knows that it is a fact. I asked eight years ago for 56 qualified Accounts in the Government Service and I had about 17 who went to Trinidad on courses. That is what we needed eight years ago. I also asked for overseas assistance in employing two certified Public Accountants, preferably from Canada. I wrote to the United States Government Department of Inland Revenue and asked them to send me down two people who would just roam around the Government Service looking at all the Departments which needed to be checked out. The Customs Department needs checking out too; eleven refrigerators went out through the gate the other day and nobody knows where they have gone. You can understand two tins of condensed milk, but how can you get eleven refrigerators out through the gate of the Customs? All of them must be in collusion, and this was not even at Christmas time when the place is jammed up. A lot of these Government Departments need investigating, but it is not our job to play detective. I am Minister of Finance and I would like to have a little flying squad with me to descend on some of these Ministries. I discovered that the Head of the Treasury had not held a staff meeting for eight years, and he only knew the names of about three

people in the office. When I asked about it he said that they change the people in there so fast he does not have a chance to know them, so how can you send somebody straight from Glendairy, having served time for embezzlement, in the Treasury and the Head of Department would not know? It is as bad as that, and that is why we are trying to clear it up, because the Central Bank is not going to take on any backlog of work or work that is in error, that is certain, because the Central Bank is not going to inherit any of the sins even on to the first generation of those people who have been doing as they like in there.

When we talk about the quality of the Service, the former Clerk of the House called me just Saturday night and said he went into a Government Department and as soon as he swung in the door the youngster behind the desk told him he could not help him.
5.40 p.m.

He said: "I am a lawyer; I have come here on business, and I should know what Department I have come to work in." The youngster called one of the other clerks and said: "See what you can do with this fellow; he looks as though he is lost." That is the kind of attitude that you have in the Service today. A member of the public goes into the Department, and before he opens his mouth he is told: "I cannot help you." They do not say : "Good morning, Sir, what can I do for you?" Some of them know who I am and they have never told me that they cannot help me, but some of them look at me as though I came for outer space. Some of the youngsters in offices are really not interested in anything. This is really a question of supervision that we need. The people who should be supervising are not doing the supervision, and a lot of them refuse to accept that the activity of the Government has expanded in the past ten years out of all the projections that anyone would have made at the time when we came into office.

When I became the Minister of Finance the Budget of this country was $24.6 million. Last year's Estimates was over $100 million – 400% increase, but the staffing has not increased to that extent. In so far as staffing is concerned, a man who is trained to be an Inspector in the Commissioner of Inland Revenue Office is sent to M.C.W. to be a Personnel Officer. In the same National Insurance Department which the hon. member is talking about, where we had built up a group of highly, technically-skilled persons, they are now bringing persons from outside who do not even know what a National Insurance stamp looks like and cannot tell the difference between that stamp and the commemorative stamp for Queen Victoria's Jubilee and putting them to work there. I am merely giving you illustrations. They will bring somebody from an unusual place like plumbing in the Waterworks Department and put him as Executive Officer in the National Insurance Department. I do not want to be personal, but I can name other outlandish cases. This is what we have to put up with from the Public Service Commissions! They do not relate the employment in the Service to the requirements of the society that is paying the Government Officers.

For instance, it may be felt that it is time that somebody's old aunt should be an Administrative Assistant. The person may have been working as housekeeper in a Children's Home or something like that, and the person is sent to a Department like the Ministry of External Affairs, where you are dealing with foreign powers, straight from a Children's Home because the person's salary has to be boosted up. I am not saying this is what motivates them, but this is what the Officers feel is happening; therefore, you get a lot of frustration.

It is a very bad state of affairs when you have a Head of a Department and out of 93 people in the Department he only knows the names of 3 of them. A Head of a Department should be like a Headmaster who should not only know the names of all the pupils in the school, but should know their first names; who has come from a broken home; who has marriage problems and so on. That is his job, and he must know his people. If you find a man in charge of a Department; he does not hold staff meetings and is not concerned with the quality of the personnel, you will get the kind of confusion we have been having in the Treasury. I have had to move the Head of the Data Processing Unit back to the Treasury, and two people from the Ministry of Finance back to the Treasury, in order to try to clear up the confusion existing there. What is clear is that the Central Bank is not going to take on any of this mess, and I do not blame it.

In so far as the National Insurance Board are concerned, the only thing I am dissatisfied with and they are dissatisfied with is that people get moved into the National Insurance Board who have not helped to build up the very efficient organisation that it is. I should like to see the Income Tax Department, the Customs, the Treasury, the National Insurance Board and so on turned into specialists organisations. When an officer goes in there he goes in as a specialist career, and not to play musical chairs between there, the Post Office, and the Law Courts.

Mr. CRAIG: I have listened to the member for St. Michael West and the member for St. John very attentively, and I think the last statement made by the Prime Minister is one which has really

struck me. Sometime ago during this session, I pointed out to the Government that there were Departments which should be considered as specialised Departments. I referred to the Inland Revenue Department, the Customs and the Treasury, and the hon. member for St. Michael West said that he could not agree with that because the country was too small and the Departments were too small to have people working in specialised posts. He also said that if a man came from M.C.W. by way of promotion, he would have to stay in the Department where money was there. We said that we did not agree with this. Today we have heard a different view from the Prime Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir. I did not say that the Departments were too small. I said that there was not sufficient within the Departments for a man to move on. If nobody moved in the Department in which he was working, then he would be there for life and he should be given an opportunity of moving in order to get promotion. That was the point I was stressing about making all Departments specialised Departments. He would not have a career in the Public Service, and he would be stultified. If a young man was in front of him, then how could he move?

Mr. CRAIG: Now, since Government must be the guide to the country's affairs; the member for St. John is the Head of the Government and you are a member of the Governing Party, then where are we going?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I agree that there are problems in this matter. When it comes to my being the head of the Government, a Permanent Secretary told a businessman the other day when he was discussing something about an industry and pointed out that the Prime Minister said he would like the matter expedited because people would be employed, the Permanent Secretary told the man: "The Prime Minister does not run this." So if the hon. member thinks I am running it, he is making a mistake.

Mr. CRAIG: I think the Permanent Secretary is right in saying that, because you said that you are only the Prime Minister on Thursdays when you are the Chairman of the Cabinet. After that any civil servant can say that you are only in charge on Thursdays. You can see the kind of double talk you get on that side. You do not know where you are going and you are in confusion. What is the whole policy? The member for St. John is only the head of Government on Thursdays when he is the Chairman of the Cabinet. After that he knocks off, so there is no Prime Minister after Thursday in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am the Minister of Finance on the other days.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: There is no finance to this; it could be fine ants. However, I want to take a different view on this overtime. I think we are all aware of the fact that the end of the school year for some children has just finished and I have seen quite a number of school leavers with four and five "O" Level certificates looking around for jobs. They have come to me and asked if I could assist them. *(Asides)* I am telling you what I have seen. They have applied to the Service Commissions who say that they have nothing right now, and I have had to call there repeatedly asking a gentleman if he could possibly assist me.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I am also in charge of Establishments, and I have told this House over a year ago that there were 440 vacancies in the Public Service, not all of them for clerical officers and that I had decided to lower the entry qualification for most of the jobs to one certificate, and I would like to assure him that there is not a single school leaver that I know with three certificates who cannot get into the Public Service. It is true that the people with one are not getting in now because we have had a rush of people with three. Before the entrance was five and then it was four, and now we have reduced it to one, we are getting a lot of people with two, three and four; but there are no people with four or even three certificates that I know about who are walking about looking for jobs in Barbados, unless one of the subjects was Religious Knowledge, the other is Scripture and the third is Life of Christ.

Mr. CRAIG: If this is the case, why teach them in schools. If one is Religious Knowledge, one is Domestic Science and the other Scripture, do you mean they are to get nothing? That is your argument. I feel, Sir, that since the Government is asking this House to vote this sum of $15,000 by way of overtime that some of these school leavers should be employed in the Department as a means of a crash programme. That is my view of a crash programme, where you bring in extra people to have the work expedited; but in this case what you are actually saying is that you are asking a number of Civil Servants to work overtime, and you have even made it clear that it will be for approximately thirteen hours a week over a period of eight weeks. I must say that from what we have heard today of the Civil Servants' attitude that it is going to take much longer than the time you have stated in the

Addendum. We have heard from that side that the Civil Service is an army of occupation, they do not work, they do not know anybody, and even the Permanent Secretary himself does not know who is in his office after eight years, and the Prime Minister himself has said that he walks into his office a morning and sees people he does not know; but now he has told us how he transferred a person from a Department to another Department. This is the double talk you get from the Government side. You do not know where you are going; you have nothing to say, you are empty. I would have thought that with so many people leaving school you would have been able to bring them in and assist them in earning a piece of change while you are getting this backlog cleared off.

As far as Item 23 is concerned, the Leader of the House did say this was for a cabinet, but this calls for a safe so as to maintain a level of security. We had this argument in here already as to whether it is a safe or a cabinet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, there are many kinds. You have a filing cabinet, and you have a cabinet looking like a filing cabinet but it has a combination lock, and the correct definition or title should be a cabinet safe; so it is both. We call it a security cabinet, and our Government Security Officer has been around to several Government Departments and recommended that an ordinary Roneo safe or one of these things with four doors is not secure enough and they should have some with combination locks.

While I am on my feet I wonder if I understand the hon. member correctly that he is suggesting that we recruit some of these people with three or four certificates and take them in the Accountant General's office to reconcile Bank Statements when they have not been exposed to Treasury training. You have to take experienced people to do that job. Naturally if we could get it done by some young school leavers, we would have had it done six or seven years ago, but the point is that in the Treasury you have all skilled officers who in my opinion should be trained accountants. That is what we are trying to do now – establish courses of training whether it be by correspendence, or by going to Trinidad or to the University of the West Indies to get all the officers trained, but we cannot take raw recruits and put them inside there, and you cannot take Treasury people or accountants from other departments which are already short staffed to go there to do the work; so I would like to assure the hon. member that the only way to do it is to work overtime. There is no other way it can be done.

Mr. CRAIG: I think the hon. member has explained Item 23 about the safes in his own way, but I still feel that since you have this backlog of work over a period of time, you should employ some school leavers. We have not heard why you have this backlog of work. We understand that the Central Bank is not going to take up any backlog and therefore I am wondering if you would not have more than 13 hours overtime a week over a period of eight weeks, and to make sure that the Central Bank picks it up at the time they are hoping to get it you should be able to bring in school leavers to assist you. I am aware of the fact that it is a specialised department, but they may be in a position to help with the small work rather than asking the trained staff to come and do the smaller job so as to expedite it, otherwise you are going to come back here and ask for extra money for the same overtime.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to get it clear. We would not come here with a Resolution for overtime if we could employ more people on a temporary basis. If you brought in some of these young people which we have tried to accommodate in every possible way even during vacation time by giving them temporary jobs, they would only create more confusion and we would never be able to get the Treasury sorted out if we brought them in, and then the people in there had to spend their time telling them the difference between a ledger entry and a voucher, or telling them what a Bank Statement looks like or how to work the accounting machines, and that is why we have to have it done by overtime by the officers who have been working there and know people's handwriting, can check vouchers and reconcile Bank Statements. There is a big discrepancy in our reconciliation account just because the work has not been done. We say that te Bank owes us money and the Bank says we owe them money, and we cannot bring in recruits to do that kind of work. Maybe we owe some Banks and other Banks owe us, but we have to reconcile all these accounts because people have been moved out of the Treasury, some have been sent to goal, some charged and got off, and so we are trying to clean up the Augean stables that we have inherited.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972–73 No. 9

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I wish to state that in respect of item 4 – Extensions to Secondary Comprehensive Schools the sum of

$210,000 provided in the Estimates has proved insufficient, and therefore supplementary provision is required. This is to meet outstanding bills in respect of the construction of phase 1 of the secondary school at St. Lucy where bills amount to $32,000, as well as $7,190.08 in respect of the provision of a drawing office providing space where technical drawings can be done in better conditions at this particular school.
6.00 p.m.

These two amounts constitute the figure. The $32,000 to which I made reference was in respect of the amount required to complete the access road at the Ellerslie School. For some years now the access to this school has been in very bad condition, and members of staff as well as members of the public have been concerned and expressed that concern about the access. I am happy to announce to this House that through the Ministry of Communications and Works that access is now almost completed, and the students for the start of the new term will have access to the school. There are three items included, one is for meeting outstanding bills in respect of phase one of the secondary school at St. Lucy, the completion of the access road to the Ellerslie Secondary School and the provision of a drawing office at the Parkinson School.

In addition funds are required to carry out and complete phase two of the extension to the St. Lucy Secondary School. This is now underway, and the work there is being carried out at the tendered price of $329,015.

In respect of the second Item, Item 7, the additional provision of $322,318 is to supplement the sums already provided at the last sitting of this Chamber. A token provision of $1.00 was provided in order for consultant services in respect of the development of the Barbados Community College to be obtained. I state again in repetition that this Government has approached the Inter American Development Bank for loans in respect of development of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic on new premises, as well as the Barbados Community College, and we are also considering making an approach for student loans to make funds more accessible for students wanting to pursue higher education, and the amount of money provided here is being requested by this vote to make provision for the staff to look after and process these particular items.

As far as administrative staff is concerned, on a temporary basis and by special assignment, the provision of a Senior Assistant Secretary, a Stenographer–Typist, as well as a number of Draughtsmen, consultant services in respect of quantity surveying, structural, mechanical and electrical as well as sanitary engineering. We therefore are seeking this particular provision to meet all these costs.

I would like to state that the Inter American Development Bank team which I informed the House, I believe at its last sitting, would be arriving has in fact arrived, and their task will be to evaluate the work which we are hoping to be able to present to the Executive Board which meets some time in November, and hopefully for the approval of the loan. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of points I would like to make on this resolution. I would say that this is the first opportunity that I have got a play, as it were, in St. Lucy, but I just want to remind the Minister that when he was in St. Lucy recently it was pointed out to him that there is no playing area, and particularly since there is no provision at present of a playing field, and until such facilities are developed that something should be done to make a playing area for the children at the school.

I also want to point out whilst on this question of the access road which has been provided at the Ellerslie School, that I noticed – and I do not want the hon. member for St. James to think I am representing his constituency – but maybe something could be done to the access road at Good Shepherd.

Moving on to the Community College, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we recognise that the Community College is a new concept in education in Barbados, and we would like to think that it is going to be making an additional contribution to the whole concept of education in this country. I would therefore like us at this early stage – and it is still relatively early – in its development to place some emphasis on the community aspect of the concept. I know that it would be a tendency for the College to move into the slot of the academic type of educational institution, and whereas we know that the College is widening its involvement there are still one or two areas I think we should try to point out that the College should be involved in if it is to make the kind of contribution to education we think it should make.

We have a situation where every encouragement is being given to small businessmen to open businesses. We have the Development Bank which makes loans to these businessmen, but no attention is being given at present to providing

some kind of exposure to these people so that they can organise their businesses in a manner which would enable them to make it a going concern and to really understand what it is all about, and I think it would be a waste of time to be given as it were these loans and then no kind of opportunity being taken to ensure that these loans are utilised in the best possible manner. I would therefore like to suggest that some attention be paid to the development of courses which would enable small businessmen to profit from this kind of exposure, and of course one would probably say that the Institute of Management and Productivity is there, but it seems to me that the type of courses which are being offered there are being offered for people who are already in management.

The point I should like to emphasise is that some attention be given to this aspect of the College programme, because the College has got to be involved in this problem to assist the community. 6.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been hearing so much about the new concept on education in Barbados that I want just a small point clarified by the Hon. Minister. Item 4 says: "Extensions to Secondary Comprehensive Schools." I want to hear from the Minister if this is a correct designation of his schools, and if we have Comprehensive Schools that are not Secondary Schools. What is the true position? Are some of them on the primary level or the tertiary level?

For instance, I see in the Addendum here that reference is now made to the Parkinson Secondary School. Is it no longer the Parkinson Comprehensive School? We will soon be told that we passed a Resolution here and accepted this and that on such and such an occasion. Let us have a proper designation of all of these schools. If there has been a change, then let us know. We are not saying anything against the voting of this money. The money must be supplied, because these services are very necessary. I know that the hon. member for St. James has been asking for some time to have the entrance to the Good Shepherd School attended to. I do feel, as he feels about it, that there has been preference given to some areas and the ear of neglect given to others. Nevertheless, we must provide money for the services mentioned in the Resolution. We want to hear from the Minister if some of our Comprehensive Schools are offering education at a secondary level and others at a primary or some other level.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not have to answer me. I want to say that the extension to the Secondary Comprehensive School is a Resolution that I think all of us will agree with. The hon. member has just asked a question, and therefore the Minister will answer it. I would not ask that question. I should like to state that these Schools are doing such a wonderful job for this country, that we have to ask the Minister to get on with the job as quickly as possible. All of this nonsense that has been said about these Schools is moonshine. These are going to be the Schools that this country will have to reside on in the future. We have to understand that all of these petty 175 Schools will have to become educational memories. They will be closed down by the law of attrition. The other Schools have to be expanded; the bus system must be changed and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I went to Ellerslie and it is a School which can take care of 1,500 children. Now any schools that can take care of 1,500 children, the Minister must realise that such Schools are going to be the Schools of the future. We are not going to have any more Schools accommodating. 170 children and have people calling the school master by his name. Those days are over. The hon. member should know what is happening in our Schools. The Secondary Comprehensive Schools are not getting the cream of the students. The cream will generally go to the Grammar Schools and they will get the rest. These Schools are doing a good job, because everybody knows that all children do not develop the same way. To believe that some children will sit an examination at the age of 11 and when they reach 16 they will be bright is not necessarily the case. Some children are bright at the age of 4 or 5, and others develop as they go along.

I should like the Minister to make room within the compound of some of these Comprehensive Schools. I understand that there was an error made at Ellerslie. I am not one of these believers in any constituency area, because there is nobody with any constituency now that can hold 1,500 children. I find that the architects and the builders should make more use of the space we have. I think Barbadian architects and builders like to spread out buildings and they do not go up. Young people can climb a staircase, so let us make greater use of the space in the air and provide greater facilities for the children of Barbados. I think that when members in here grow old enough to see the products from the Comprehensive Schools, then the talk that was made about Comprehensive Schools would no longer be made because the children would be out of those Schools. Our technicians, builders and the majority of the people who are going to work in this Island in the future will be coming from those Schools.

I am very pleased to hear that the Minister is doing the roads leading to these Schools. I think that all schools should have decent roads leading to them. I hope the hon. member for St. Peter has been able to get them to put a decent road leading to the Coleridge/Parry because a proper road was needed there for many years.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the query raised by the hon. member for St. Peter, the answer is quite simple. There are Secondary Schools; some of them are Private Schools; some of them are the older Grammar Schools; and others are the newer Comprehensive Schools. I wish to repeat here what I said earlier. I would hope that when we get our new Education Bill that the distinction between Comprehensive and Grammar Schools will be dropped entirely, and we would be speaking of Secondary Schools as they are spoken of, let us say, in the United States and in Canada. These are Secondary Schools; they accept children at the age of 11; they follow a Secondary School Programme which is suitable to the varying needs of the children who attend these Schools. Some go on to do the academic subjects in G.C.E.; some follow a technical programme; others follow a general education programme and so on. The whole idea is to provide education for children up to the limit of their abilities.

I am happy to say that the School at St. George is progressing. I am not certain if my colleague the Minister of Communications and Works will hand it over to me for September. *(Asides.)* I am speaking about 1972. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you have a very keen interest in this School. I must thank the member for St. Michael West as well as the member for St. Lucy for the comments they have made. Unlike certain other members, they do demonstrate a grasp of what is happening and what needs to happen in the field of education.

The question that a Resolution for the sum of $382,380 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.20 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO. 10

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in fact a revote of funds that lapsed at the end of the last financial year. In the 1971-72 Capital Estimates a sum was voted for buildings other than the office block which Government plans to put up at Fairchild Street. At that time a sum exceeding $335,000 lapsed at the end of the financial year. The building at Fairchild Street is being constructed on contract and work is going ahead using private consultants, and this sum of money is required to pay those consultants for the preliminary design work that they have been doing on the building. We hope that before the year is ended we will be able to show some form of progress in that the construction will at that time commence. *(Asides)* I have heard a query, Mr. Chairman, as to what this building will house. I thought this was all settled, because I believe this sum was voted by this Chamber some time ago when I was not a member of the House, and I thought it was well known all the offices which will occupy this building. This building will house the National Insurance Office, the Barbados Development Bank, the Government Savings Bank, the Ministry of Housing and Labour and the Central Bank among other institutions.

The sum required is $300,000 to make payment in respect of preliminary work that has been done, and I commend it to this Chamber.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, while it is true that we may have passed the money and at the time when we passed it we heard what it will be used for, we get a little forgetful. The Government spends so much money, the things we hear Government is spending money on, the buildings, the purposes to which money will be put and all that, that sometimes defeat us a little bit. What I am going to suggest is this: why doesn't the Minister bring the plans into the House? I know this is not land acquisition, but bring the sketch so that we can see what the building is going to look like. There must be a front elevation the Minister can let us see. We are paying $300,000 to the consultants; do you mean the consultants have not given the Minister an elevation. Why can't the House see the elevation? I suppose the Central Bank will be on the ground floor and so on. We in the House before we vote this money might like to see if it is a nice looking building. We have had a lot of mistakes with buildings in Barbados. I do not believe that the building of the Treasury Building was a satisfactory exercise from the point of view of Government for the amount of money it eventually cost. I personally would agree with the hon. member for St. Michael West that if some hon. members had seen some sketches of the Airport they might have been able to make some suggestions, – the design was apparently so bad it was changed right away. It is just possible that some of us might be able to make suggestions. We are not . -experts in everything, but in a small place like this everybody finds himself seeing a plan occasionally and so on. *(Asides)*

Sir, does the hon. member for St. Michael South Central want me to talk about him? Is he asking why did I leave them out? I believe he would have a contribution to make on a sketch plan of a building. Bridgetown really is not a good

looking city. The English in there colonial days never laid out cities nicely or never built cities particularly nicely, and we should be looking to put down a building that can be part of a unified design, we should be looking to lay out some squares, and we should be looking to make sure that no building that we put down is going to be a disgrace at some future stage of development. The Minister should not be ashamed, and the public wants to see too. This is something that should be in the papers. If the Minister wants something, produce a sketch plan and make it available to the *Advocate*. A proper report on a Resolution such as this would be in the newspaper, a sketch plan of the building, a picture of the Minister perhaps, and a little explanation of the use of the building and so on. This is giving the Minister of Information a little suggestion as he can influence the private press. I am sure there are hon. members on that side who are unfamiliar with all these things. We like to see what is being done in our name, Mr. Chairman. A sum of $300,000 is not peanuts, it is a lot of money.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there is not very much to reply to. I think I have indicated to the hon. member that I do not have in my possession or maybe even in the office to the best of my knowledge a sketch plan. I have seen a sketch plan of the building, but I have not had it in my possession so that I could let the hon. member see it. Clearly at other times we have to come for additional funds for this building. I am not accusing the hon. member who has spoken on this Resolution that this is what he will do, but I want to make it quite clear that when we come for additional funds, I do not want to be told that the money was voted in 1972-73 as a Supplementary Estimate, because this is only for preliminary work. We do not estimate that we will exceed the expenditure of $300,000 by the end of the 1972-73 financial year, and therefore we have not included any further sum. We are not yet absolutely certain how much the building will cost, but among our consultants we do carry quantity surveyors as consultants in this regard, and the type of building I have been speaking about is going to cost millions. We have already spent $27,000; so I want to make it clear that from time to time I will be approaching the Legislature for funds for the construction of this building.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this, but I think the Minister should have made it clear. I do not know what was said in this Chamber before. I am a member of the National Insurance Board. The National Insurance Board wanted to put up a building to house the National Insurance Office because we feel that an office like that should have an institution in keeping with what it is doing and with the dignity of the office and so forth. It was subsequently agreed that the Government was going to have an area of land that might have been too big for the National Insurance Board, and rather than the National Insurance building being on one side and the Government building on the other, it was felt better to have a building with that sort of dignity going up in the city. I like the hon. member would say that the Minister owes it to the Chamber and the public with a building of this magnitude that the Government intends to erect to give the assurance at some time of what is going to be done. I do not know what was said here, but I understand it is going to be an eight storey building which is going to run into millions of dollars, and as the hon. member says, I hope that architecturally it will look better than the Treasury Building. I will say that your architects are as good as you can afford to pay for. Let us be quite frank. We have passed the stage of bringing in all that you can, and I think the hon. member is right. Barbados is a hurricane country and when anybody wants to build anything for you he wants to build some huge solid walls four square, and after that is put up, he thinks that he has done a good job for you.

The problem that we all find is to ask anybody to design something for you because we have not produced architects unfortunately in Barbados in large numbers and we have to rely on people from outside. I think that the Hon. Minister will in process of time tell hon. members of the Chamber the whole expanse of this. I believe it is going to be something that will go down to the credit of this country if we get the building. The Minister is also Minister for the other Departments, and I hope by then the Government will reach an arrangement where it can, because for my way of thinking I am satified that the National Insurance office will require a very big office for the future, because I cannot see National Insurance occupying any cubby-hole in any building. A place like the National Insurance office would have to occupy three or four floors of any eight storey building in this country because of the space and the security they require, and I hope they will get the sort of office that is in keeping with the work they are doing.

6.30 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: The member who has just spoken was referring to some architects. What is the name of the firm?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are four sets of consultants who have been appointed, including architects. Mr. George Harrison, an architect for building, Miles Rothwell Associates, Consulting Engineers; Ferdinand, Hart

and Leonard, Quantity Surveyors; and Messrs. Attas Defour and Associates are the Electrical and Mechanical Consultants.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Item on the Order Paper under Government Business is in the name of the Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, 1969. I am asking for leave to deal with this in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has been granted.

STATUTORY BOARDS (PENSIONS) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, 1969 to provide for cases where compensation is payable to an officer from more than one source. In considering participation by Government in the proposed Employment Injury Scheme of the National Insurance Board, Cabinet at its meeting of 22nd December, 1971 agreed that provision should be made for the additional pension payable when such injury was sustained in the actual performance of a person's duties, and that this should be reduced by the amount of any pension payable under the provisions of section 14 of the National Insurance and Social Security Act. The Crown Law Officers advised that it is not necessary to amend the various pensions enactments as provision already exists in law for such additional pensions to be paid if the pensioner is entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943 or any Act amending or replacing that Act.

The relevant legislation is (1) Regulation 23 of the Pensions Regulations, 1947, (2) Regulation 11 of the Public Employees Pensions Regulations, 1961, (3) Regulation 22 of the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Regulations, 1962 and (4) section 23 of the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, 1969.

In January, 1971 the provisions of the National Insurance and Social Security Act of 1966 relating to the compensation replaced and repealed the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1943. The Director of National Insurance pointed out that the benefits payable under section 14 of the Act for the whole range of employment injury benefits, i.e., injury disablement, medical expenses, funeral grant, and it was also agreed that disablement pensions should be paid. The object of this amendment is to carry out a Cabinet decision that the additional payment to Government employees as compensation in respect of injuries sustained on the job be reduced in proportion only to the injury benefit and disablement pension paid under section 14 of the National Insurance Act and the amendment of this Act.

The object of this amendment is to make the necessary amendment to the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, 1969 for compensation to be paid to an officer receiving pensions from more than one source. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

6.40 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

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

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ACT, 1968

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have here the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly appointed to consider and report on Clause 3 of a Bill to amend the Public Holidays Act, 1968.

The Report reads as follows:

"The Select Committee appointed by the Honourable the House of Assembly to consider and report on Clause 3 of a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1968 have the honour to present the following Report:

The Committee met on the following dates:

28th July, 1972
11th August, 1972.

The Committee decided to recommend that Clause 3 of the Bill to amend the Public Holidays Act, 1968 should proceed without amendment."

That being the case, Sir, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part. *(Asides)* I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume in Committee on the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, small things sometimes, it appears, should be glossed over and forgotten, but in my view.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member will be able to speak after the Report has been read. I understand that we should first accept the Report.

Mr. ADAMS: I will speak on the motion to accept the Report, Sir. Let a motion be moved to accept the Report, and I will speak on that, Sir.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, a Select Committee reports to the House. I have not heard any motion that the Report be accepted, and I do not see how you are going to return to Committee unless you report that the Report as such has been accepted. I can be corrected on this, because it is not a very familiar procedure, but I do not think that the Leader of the House is any more familiar with it than I am. Let us have the correct procedure; let us have a motion on which I can speak.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report be adopted.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, first of all, on a point of order. Rule 58 says:

"3. Any Member may, after giving notice as required by these Standing Orders, move that the report be adopted.

4. A Bill reported from a Select Committee, together with a report on the Bill, shall be ordered to lie upon the Table without question put, and the report shall be ordered to be taken into consideration upon such day as the Member in charge of the Bill shall appoint. On the order for consideration of the report being read, any Member may move that the report be adopted and, if that motion is agreed to, the Bill shall thereupon be ordered to be read the third time,....."

We will not have to go back to Committee on this anyhow. I am not going to urge the House now to meet on another day for the report. The Opposition is quite happy to waive whatever notice is required and to deal with it here and now.

I was saying that small things sometimes are thought not worth pursuing, but I really want to pursue this. I must repeat the arguments which I believe have convinced many hon. members that the correct day for a bank holiday is a Monday. Now, the Committee has reported and, therefore, we can talk about what went on. The Committee's Report is before the House. What went on, Sir, was that in principle it appeared that members accepted the idea that Monday is the best day for a Bank Holiday, but the Minister of Education said that if United Nations Day as such was going to be celebrated all over the world on that day, then Barbados should not be out of line. We asked the Minister to be kind enough to get External Services to send off a Savingram to the United Nations to enquire whether anyway besides Barbados would be celebrating United Nations Day, upon the basis that, if we had received an answer indicating that October 22 was the day which was celebrated, we would conform. No answer arrived and, therefore,

the Committee just abandoned any further enquiry and reported in the form which now appears before the House. But since then an answer has arrived showing that, just as I suggested...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry for the interruption; there is too much talking on the Government Benches. Speak in undertones, please.

Mr. ADAMS: I said that you would find very few countries doing that. It turns out that one country, Zambia, that moved the Resolution in the United Nations has changed its own National Day to October 22, and they have a joint U.N. Holiday and National Day on October 22. No other country, according to the savingram which I was so kindly shown, has apparently adopted this procedure. The first words in the savingram said: "It is at the discretion of individual countries when they will celebrate United Nations Day."

Sir, I am urging on hon. members even at this stage, do not just do something for the sake of doing it. People like a Monday Bank Holiday; they do not want Bank Holidays on a Saturday, which is what United Nations Day will be year after next; they do not, I believe, particularly like Bank Holidays on a Friday, because it means that sometimes they have to go out to work on the Saturday morning. Even a Thursday is an inconvenient day and we know this. There are certain immutable holidays that you cannot change. Even the Christian Churches recognised it with Easter, and I am sorry they did not recognise it with Christmas, too. Christmas should always be on a Sunday for my money, as far as I am concerned.

It turns out that there is no great mass communication of souls on October 22. We will be holding hands with the Zambians. Why are we changing from an accepted and old established Bank Holiday on a convenient day that Barbadians have always celebrated to choosing October 22 because some fancy idea that there was going to be a universal celebration on October 22 as United Nations Day. *(Asides)* I thank you; it is October 24. The savingram indicates that only Zambia - that is what I gathered from the reply from the U.N. Secretariat – has really got hold of this date, October 24.
6.50 p.m.

I urge on hon. members; they know in their hearts that Monday is a convenient day. Find some formula even at this stage. We can do it here in the House before we go away. Find a formula which even if you want to move the Bank Holiday from the first Monday in October it will at least keep it on a Monday still. This is not a hobby horse; this is commonsense. Help the people in Barbados to have a long week–end. This is not vote catching or anything; this is a matter of commonsense. Try to get a Monday Bank Holiday. Since the U.N. Secretariat's reply shows quite clearly that it is not a universal thing, that countries celebrate U.N. Day whenever they feel like, I am sure that the hon. member who has seconded this motion would support some move if you must celebrate U.N. Day so that it will be celebrated on the second Monday in October. Alter the wording here and now irrespective of the Select Committee's report. Reject it in fact. There is no disrespect meant to the members of the Select Committee. They did not have the information before them and so they could necessarily not reach the best decision facing a deadline of August 15 as the day by which they had to decide.

The original suggestion that I made was that we amend Section 3 by inserting the words between "the" and "twenty- fourth" "Monday preceding"; so instead of October 24 United Nations Day, you have the Monday preceding 24th October United Nations Day. I really urge this on hon. members. Do not at this stage of life create a mid–week Bank Holiday unless there is powerful reason for doing it, and the Savingram reveals there is no powerful reason. I urge on hon. members to send this back to a Committee, not a Select Committee, but a Committee of the whole House and put in the words "the Monday preceding October 24 if not a Monday." The Governor General will have power to do what he wants, but do not just for the sake of doing something create an inconvenience however minor for the public. Many people plan for a long week–end in October, and I urge the House to take a step such as this. I really make an appeal to the House.

The question that the Select Committee's Report be adopted, was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. LOWE; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE and Mr. WALCOTT – 11.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HINDS and Mr. CRAIG – 3.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members over there now are prepared to say redesignate the first Monday in October as United Nations Day. I believe that is the best solution. I first heard the hon. member for St. Michael North West with it. Why don't we do it? The Governor General cannot do that. The Governor General can say that it may not be celebrated on the 24th, it may be celebrated on the 7th, but he cannot redesignate a different day from the one we pass as a named holiday. He can say that Christmas may be celebrated on December 1, but he cannot say that that is Christmas Day. If this is how we feel, why don't we do it? If we feel we should redesignate the first Monday in October to pay respect to the United Nations at the same time as keep our Bank Holiday, do it. What is the difficulty about it. There is nothing to prevent you from amending the Bill now. There is not a word in the rules saying that you cannot amend the Bill on third reading. You cannot put anything into the Bill. You cannot talk about what should be in the Bill, but you can talk of what is in it. We are all big men. We know we do not want to disturb the Bank Holiday structure unless it is necessary. Recommit the Bill. *(Asides)*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understood that in Another Place it is likely that persons connected with the commercial interests are going to put up a plea for a Monday holiday because it is said to occasion very great inconvenience in business when you have a mid–week Bank Holiday involving work before and work after under the Shops Act. I do not know if the experts around the House can confirm that, but it is said to cause inconvenience. If we feel like that.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member will give way, I have attempted to accommodate the Leader of the Opposition in this matter. Since May this matter went to the Select Committee and they had two meetings and I had to urge them to get the Committee to report. It has reported on the grounds – they have not spelt it out but the Clerk detected this – that provision had already been made in the body of the Bill, and in Clause 2 which we have already passed for the Governor General to appoint any other day in any year to be a public holiday and he also has power in (b) if it appears to him to be inexpedient in any year that a day specified in the First Schedule should be a public holiday, declare that such day shall not be a public holiday, in that year and in lieu thereof appoint such other day in that year as appears to him to be expedient to be a public holiday.....

The fact is that the Governor General has power, and if in any particular year the 24th October does not fall on a Monday, he can appoint a Monday; so what is the object of wasting a lot of time in here. The House is going into recess and I must get this thing through. The view of the Government is that it should be 24th October except in exceptional cases where the Governor General wants to appoint a Monday if the Monday is not the 24th.

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. As I intimated on the last occasion, the House will be going into recess for a little more than six weeks, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 3rd October, 1972 at 2.30 in the afternoon.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I wonder if the Minister would accept an amendment, that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 24th October.

The question that the House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 3rd October, 1972 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.03 p.m.