

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th July, 1972.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 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); Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: On behalf of all hon. members, I would like to thank the Acting Chaplain, the Reverend Roy Thompson, Vicar of St. Marks and St. Catherine's Churches for accepting the appointment to act as Chaplain of the Honourable the House of Assembly from July 18th, 1972 during the absence of Reverend Cayless.

Mr. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Statements and Accounts for the months of June, July and August, 1970, as prepared by the Accountant General.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Public Employees Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1972.

The Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1972.

The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1972.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following document:

The Statement relating to the cost of Electricity supply at the National Stadium.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following document:—

The Annual Report of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1970, and the Auditors' Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation at 31st December, 1970.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

- (1) Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of the payment of the principal sum of \$1,000,000 borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank by the issue of National Development Bonds, and of the interest thereon.

- (2) Resolution to grant the sum of \$59,278 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 4, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 2, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Hon. R. St.C. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 18, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

WHEREAS His Honour the Speaker ruled on the 4th day of July, 1972 that the following Resolutions moved by the Honourable Member for St. James were out of order namely:-

WHEREAS it is the constant complaint that food prices are steadily rising, and that the general cost of living has moved considerably upwards since contributions to old age pensioners have been increased;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to consider raising old age pensions from five to fifteen dollars per week.

WHEREAS the Government has attempted to keep pace with other progressive countries in providing its senior citizens with token privileges in honour of their previous contributions to the economy of the country;

AND WHEREAS old age pensioners in Barbados are now permitted to ride free of charge on Government's buses;

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.

AND WHEREAS by his said Ruling Mr. Speaker thereby prevented the Honourable Member for St. James from giving notice of the said Resolution;

AND WHEREAS the said Ruling was not warranted by the Standing Orders of this Honourable House; and is wrong;

BE IT RESOLVED that Mr. Speaker's said Ruling be expunged from the Records of this Honourable House and that the Honourable Member for St. James be permitted to give notice of the said Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Bridgetown, I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution on his behalf.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CRAIG: The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS there has been a steady rise in the cost of living since 1963;

AND WHEREAS the present maximum sum of five dollars per week which the putative father or the father of a child can be ordered to pay in respect of the maintenance of the said child under the Affiliation Proceedings Act 1963 (1963-29) and the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act 1950 (1950-51) as amended, is now inadequate;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government immediately to amend the Affiliation Proceedings Act 1963 (1963-29) and the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act 1950 (1950-51) as amended to provide that the maximum sum payable under the above mentioned be increased to ten dollars per week.

QUESTIONS

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Will the Minister state why those people entitled to carters pension, have not yet received the same?

Will the Minister do all in his power to have this money paid out to these people, some of whom are in dire need of it?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that most Motor Insurance Companies are not accepting new clients on Third Party Insurance; (b) that some Insurance

Companies are only insuring new cars; and (c) that some companies are not renewing Insurance Policies, although some clients might have completed ten or more years business with the same companies?

2. Is Government aware that this could cause a large number of cars to remain unlicensed after the current three months of grace expires?

3. Will the Government urgently consider examining the Motor Insurance Act with a view to removing this hardship on many citizens?

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:—

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 telephone 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 telephones are installed at the following places:—Pie Corner, Josey Hill, Crab Hill and Half Moon Forte?

Is the Minister aware of the difficulties which the residents of Husbands Village in St. Lucy have in reaching their homes, particularly when it is raining?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to see that the road in this district is put in a proper condition so as to alleviate the present difficulties? 2.40 p.m.

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:—

Is the Minister aware that there is no electricity in the 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?

To enquire of the Minister of Health and Welfare:

Is the Minister aware that there is no Parochial Medical Officer in St. Lucy?

Can the Minister state what attempts have been made to recruit one?

And can the Minister state what difficulties have been experienced and how the Ministry proposes to overcome such difficulties?

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I understood the hon. member correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER: What are you rising on?

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of privilege. I did not understand the hon. member well enough and I do not know if he said that this was in respect of the parish of St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point whatsoever, the hon. member is entirely out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. (i) Is the Minister aware that an inmate of the Mental Asylum slept in a pig sty on the night of Saturday, the 8th July, 1972?
- (ii) Will the Minister investigate this matter and state the reason for this situation?
- (iii) Will the Minister take steps to ensure that this situation does not arise again?
2. (i) Is the Minister aware that the well dug for taking waste water in Bannister Land has been choked up for about seven (7) weeks?
- (ii) Is the Minister aware that in spite of repeated requests by the residents of the area, nothing has been done to clear the well?
- (iii) Will the Minister take appropriate steps to have this situation remedied?

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF HEALTH

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make a statement on a matter of public importance. This statement is in regard to the Casualty Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

At about 11.00 p.m. on Thursday, 6th July, 1972, I received a report that there had been no doctor on duty in the Casualty Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. that evening and that a large number of patients had been awaiting medical attention in that Department for a lengthy period of time.

2. On receipt of this report, I immediately went to the Hospital to see the situation at first hand. On my arrival I found that the Consultant in charge of the Casualty was on duty and he reported that he had found twenty-three patients awaiting attention when he arrived at 10.00 p.m.

3. As a result of this incident, I requested the Hospital Director to forward a report to me on the background to the matter and this report was submitted to the Cabinet. I also consider the matter to be of such public importance as to merit a factual statement on the matter being made to honourable members.

4. The Hospital Director's report confirmed the fact that no doctor had been on duty in the Casualty during the period from 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. on the evening of 6th July, 1972. The report further stated that of the 23 patients found by the Consultant on his arrival at the Casualty at 10.00 p.m., 10 patients were admitted to the Hospital, 3 were treated and discharged and the remainder (10) were referred to out-patients' clinics. All 23 patients had been attended to by midnight, when another doctor reported for duty. Total attendances at the Casualty and general out-patients' departments on 6th July had amounted to about 150.

5. The absence of a doctor from duty in the Casualty had arisen from a misunderstanding which occurred as a result of the new assignments of medical staff which were initiated on 1st July, 1972. The doctor who was assigned to casualty on the night in question, having been scheduled to work on three nights (Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday) during that week in his own clinical department, was advised by the Registrar of his firm (Obstetrics and Gynaecology) not to work in Casualty on Thursday night. The doctor, accordingly, made a request for exemption from Casualty duty and assumed that it was granted. As a result, he did not turn up for duty.

6. Owing to shortages of medical staff within the last few years, patients have been inconvenienced by having to wait long periods at times.

7. There is a virtual worldwide deficiency of doctors in the public services of developing

countries such as those in the Caribbean area. As a result, there are occasionally shortages of medical staff in all departments of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, especially in the junior grades. The situation is, however, not static and can by no means be reasonably described as critical for significant periods in any one year.

8. Casualty, like all other departments, is suffering from the shortage of medical staff. There are currently in this department three full-time junior doctors and two part-time general practitioners. These cover the day period from 8.00 a.m. to 8.00 p.m. Doctors from other clinical departments cover the night period on an overtime basis for which they receive extra pay.

9. Some 120,000 persons annually utilise the out-patient services of the hospital. The pressure on the casualty is further aggravated by the fact that many cases appearing there are not genuine emergencies.

10. It is known that the ultimate solution to the casualty problem lies largely in a physical separation of the services catering to 'emergencies' from those which deliver general medical care and funds have, accordingly, been provided in the current budget for the construction of a general Out-patient Clinic, on lands adjacent to the hospital, which will cater to non-emergency cases. Plans for the building are in an advanced stage and construction is expected to commence at an early date.

11. Further plans to improve the services have already been implemented by the appointment of a consultant in the Casualty and by an arrangement for the performance of overtime duty by junior medical staff. Staffing proposals for both the Casualty and General Medical Out-patients' departments are also now being formulated with a view to strengthening the establishments of these units.

12. I would like to assure honourable members that my Ministry will, in collaboration with the Hospital Authorities, do everything possible to eliminate the factors which led to the occurrence of the situation in the Casualty on the evening of 6th July.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In view of that statement which the Minister said is on a matter of public importance, I wonder if copies could be cyclostyled and handed to members as soon as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be printed in due course.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that, but I rise at this stage in view of the fact that it is a matter of public importance and that we could get copies done on the photostat machine in the Clerk's office.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there could be any objection to that as such. I think the Minister did say that it was a matter of public importance, and the hon. member said openly that he had a similar matter to deal with concerning the same thing but he has not yet made a motion.

2.50 p.m.

In any case, there is no objection whatsoever; it will facilitate the hon. member and help him to, probably, state a case, if he has any.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that you have received a letter dated July 14th.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what point has the hon. member risen?

Mr. CRAIG: I am speaking on a Statement which was made....

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no! A Ministerial Statement must not be spoken on. You are out of order.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has agreed to make the Statement available to all hon. members.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not dealing with the Statement now, Mr. Speaker. Will you please listen to me? You must stop telling me about being out of order all the time, Sir. Just listen to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member withdraw those last remarks.

Mr. CRAIG: Stop shouting at me, Sir!

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, precisely.

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw the remarks. Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to you, in future, not to shout at me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat. The hon. member is out of order. A Ministerial Statement has been made, and there will be no debate or discussion on it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My colleague wrote a letter to you on July 14th asking that this matter.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order! The hon. member is quite out of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, may I ask you a question?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are quite out of order.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, subject to the usual proviso that Private Members may proceed with any matter which they consider important and which may be of public interest.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak to the motion that the several Standing Orders be suspended. The Leader of the House murmured something about "subject to" and then I heard something about "importance and the usual arrangements." That means we will have Private Members' Time at 4.30 p.m. I wonder if it would not be apposite at a time like this to ask the Leader of the House why he wishes to suspend each individual Standing Order. He should give a reason in each case. I do not want to be tedious on a matter like this. It seems to me that it is now three o'clock; we are going to have Private Members' Time until 4.30 p.m. anyhow, and it is unlikely that any great inconvenience could be afforded the public business of this Island if we took a break at seven o'clock or seven forty-five for dinner, if we reach so far, and come back after that; therefore, I wonder why the Minister wants to suspend Standing Order 5. The second Standing Order he wants to suspend is No. 14. Is that correct? Standing Order 14 deals with the manner of asking and answering questions. Again, in my view, either you have no questions ready for answering today, in which case you do not need to suspend Standing Order 14, or you have and you are going to answer them up to 3.15 p.m. in which case it is improper to suspend Standing Order 14. What is the next Standing Order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member knows this is customary. He is getting on as though he has just come in here for the first time. It is customary to suspend all of these Standing Orders in order to facilitate the work of Parliament. He has come here now to waste time and to try from the legal angle, probably, to examine points. We can all do that if we want to waste time. We are trying to expedite

the business of the public. If the hon. members had anything substantive, helpful or beneficial for the people of Barbados which was before the House, we would not have asked for any Standing Orders to be suspended. Private Members have nothing on the Order Paper, Sir. A lot of things are out of order. They cannot come here with any substantive, concrete or constructive thing for the benefit of the people of this country. They come here and try to discredit the Speaker; they try to make his rulings appear to be wrong, and they try to do things that are not beneficial to the community.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is on a point of order — just remember that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter into any debate as to whether the Speaker is to be discredited. I would have thought it was grossly irrelevant, and if it came from the Opposition we would have been stopped from mentioning it on a debate on the Standing Orders. I am not going to mention it any further, but I would really ask the Leader of the House — I am serious about this now, because it is just possible that I have barely enough intelligence to have thought out something about the expediting of the public business of this country — to look at the Standing Orders he is suspending and see if it is meaningful to suspend any of them. What is the point of suspending Standing Order 45 which deals with the procedure in Committee of a Bill? Do you know what goes through the window when you suspend Standing Order 45? It is that the Clerk should call the number of each clause in succession. If you suspend Standing Order 45, we in the Opposition can give informal notice of an amendment to every line of a Bill, if we felt like doing so, and really waste the time of the House. Standing Order 45 is there for the purpose of making sure that no time is wasted in Committee on Bills. What is the point of suspending it? Because something has always been done it does not mean that it is right.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that if you intend to have Question Time in the ordinary way and Private Members' Time in the ordinary way, then why bother to suspend the Standing Orders? Some years ago, before you were in here, Sir, I remember the Prime Minister coming in and questioning exactly that in Mr. Tudor's time. He does not see the point in suspending the Standing Orders. I am taking an opportunity to raise it now. What is the point of suspending them if, in fact, you are still going to adhere broadly to the time-table which they set down and if it is inappropriate to suspend some of them anyhow? I can never understand why we should suspend Standing Order 45!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the object of the suspension of these Standing Orders is, precisely, not to adhere to a time-table but to enable us, at this stage, whether it is three o'clock or five past three, to proceed with Government Business, and the hon. member knows that. If Private Members have anything which they consider to be of importance, it could then be considered and debated. It may well be that some hon. members feel that, if we get through Government Business, we may not remain and assist them in carrying through their programme. We are not like that; we will remain to form a quorum and listen to what is said. The idea is to expedite Government Business, because if we did not suspend certain Standing Orders we would have to deal with Question Time and Private Members' Business up to half-past four. Do not let the hon. member twist things. The main object is to expedite Government's Business.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, did not the Minister say that they would be suspended subject to the usual arrangements, and are not the usual arrangements to take Private Members' Business until 4.30 p.m.? We did it last time and the time before. They are what the usual arrangements are and the Leader of the House knows that too. They are the arrangements I have had with him since he has been Leader of the House and I have been Leader of the Opposition. Last time you will remember hon. members heard what I had to say and I suggested that you take Private Members' Business until 4.30 p.m. since Government Business was not likely to take more than an hour and hon. members should not complain of being here until 5.30 p.m. or 6 o'clock.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the practice in the suspension of the Standing Orders is to enable the Government to do Government Business first, and we usually give the assurance to the Opposition that if they have matters of importance which they want to deal with, we would give them time to deal with them. We on this side are not saying that in the suspension of the Standing Orders we are going to let the Opposition do Private Members' Business until 4.30 p.m.; what we say is that we will give them the appropriate amount of time when we have done our business. Last Tuesday there was an arrangement where the Leader of the Opposition suggested that we do Private Members' Business until 4.30 p.m., but that is not always the case because he knows that the practice is to give the Opposition time whether it be at 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock after the Government has done its business.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have been in here for the past six years now, and during that time it has never been done in that manner. What I do know is that there has always been an agreement between the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House that Private Members' Business be taken until 4.30 p.m. whether Government starts their Business at 4 o'clock or after, but now the Minister is claiming that the reason for suspending the Standing Orders is to allow the Government to do their business first and the Opposition to do theirs afterwards. We know only too well that if that happens, it is a very simple thing for the Government to walk out and not form a quorum; so the Minister should know he cannot talk that sort of nonsense. The shrimp debate is a classic example as well as the debate on C.B.C. The Government refused to form a quorum to debate these matters; so I do not see how the hon. member can say that the reason for suspending the Standing Orders is to allow the Government to do their business. This is something foreign to me unless they are going to use their forces to push it through, but might is not always right.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House.

The question that the Standing Orders be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Order Paper contains: Committee of Supply, a Resolution to amend the notes to Head 35, and the Bank Holidays Act. As I can see it, it is unlikely that Item No. 2 will take very long. Can the Leader of the House say what arrangements he is prepared to concede to hon. members in respect of debate; not at large, but on the items of Private Members' Business which are contained. How much time will he allow and what time does he anticipate the commencement of Private Members' Business? This is a little personal, but I can indicate that I cannot think for example there will be any opposition to Item 4 under Private Members' Business since the House has passed a Resolution dealing with the age of marriage. Presumably it would debate the Bill on second reading and refer it to a Select Committee as it is obliged to by the Rules although we have suspended the relevant Standing Orders. I do not know if the Government is

prepared to hear more on Item 1, but we would like to hear something from the Leader of the House on these particular matters.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, Government Business is not very long today, so I presume that subject to the length of speeches and knowing that we have no limitation on the length of speeches and how many members will speak, normally in two and a half hours Government Business will be concluded, and I take it that an equal amount of time or half the time will be allocated to Private Members' Business. My main object is to get Government Business finished, and if we spend two hours on Government Business, a similar time will be accorded to the members of the Opposition. Nobody is trying to stifle debate.

The question that Government Business be now taken 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.

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in here is extremely hot and I wonder if the air conditioning units are not working, whether you can have the windows open.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am told that when they are turned on, they are very noisy, but if hon. members want them turned on, I will have that done.

Mr. Clerk, instruct the Deputy Marshal to turn them on.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1972-73 No. 1

Head 22A (New) — Defence and Security Division — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is for the sum of \$15,555 to be granted

from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73 No. 1 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will recall, a Defence and Security Division of the Prime Minister's Department was established quite recently, and funds to provide for furniture, equipment, office supplies and miscellaneous expenses for the Division to function are necessary. The Division was created on 1st April, 1972 and has been assisted in meeting its obligations by the Chief Establishments Officer in respect of salaries and by the Central Purchasing Department in making equipment and office supplies available. The funds which are now being sought will be for the financial year 1972-73 which both the Establishments Division and the Central Purchasing Department must be reimbursed in order to prevent these Departments from seeking supplementary votes.

In addition to the post of Permanent Secretary, the Chief Establishments Officer has approved the creation of the Temporary staff listed below, and it is expected that there will be an additional Assistant Secretary who will be required to undertake the detailed preparation for the establishment of a Defence Force which is likely to include a Marine branch. The staff so far approved is as follows: One Assistant Secretary, one Secretary, one Clerical Officer and one Messenger. The Adjutant of the Barbados Regiment has proposed to provide maid and watchman services, and this will be a saving while the Division is in its present location at 35, St. Ann's Fort, Garrison, next to the Barbados Regiment Headquarters.

The amount required for the immediate equipping and operating of the Division is estimated to be \$11,500, and details of the proposed expenditure are as follows:

Furniture and equipment

Duplicating machine	\$800.00
One desk	\$297.00
Three desks @\$219 each	\$657.00
Conference table for 12	\$180.00

Twelve chairs, one book case, 2 side chairs, 4 four-drawer filing cabinets, one guillotine, 2 chairs, 2 carpets, one index cabinet and so on. Then you have a waiting area and the lunch room.

The office is being fully equipped and the total amount required is \$11,465.81, say \$11,500. I will not bore hon. members with any more details at the present time, but if there are any further questions I will answer them. I beg to move that Head 22A (New), Item 6 (New) - General Expenses stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are satisfied beyond the shadow of a doubt that having created a Department of Defence and Security, that adequate provision must now be made for furnishing the office and to provide the necessary wherewithal to get the Department functioning. What I may say at this point would certainly shock even the Leader of the House. I am of the opinion that the entertainment allowance for the Permanent Secretary, \$780, is not adequate under the circumstances, and my reason for saying so is not because I like to see the taxpayers' money given to Permanent Secretaries or people in this position, but having some knowledge of what Defence and Security entails, one has got to take into consideration the type of people an officer so placed, is likely to be meeting and entertaining. That is what we have to consider first.

We have got to bear in mind as well that we are dealing with our internal defence and security, and these must be bound up in very great measure with external defence and security and everything related thereto, however remote it might be. You cannot divorce one from the other, and for an officer so placed, it is going to be extremely difficult for him to function adequately and to have a measure of freedom that security in itself demands, if we are going to pin him down to the spending of \$780 as an entertainment allowance. I must admit that this is peace time, but one never knows and however one might look at it, all might be quiet at this end but the world is becoming smaller and smaller and it means therefore that as our friendly ties are extended and our business relationships expanded, we must become more and more concerned with everybody in every other part of the world. It is going to mean therefore, Mr. Chairman, that a Security or Defence Officer, for purposes of security and defence, will have time and again to be involved in measures which do not directly concern us at home but may concern our business neighbours. There are times I feel when a Permanent Secretary or a Security Officer will have to spend in a week \$780 to accomplish what he sets out to glean on behalf of some other nation. If it is in the interest of our neighbour, then it is in our own interest. We are very serious about this.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we agree that care has to be exercised in not upsetting the apple cart by giving a particular Permanent Secretary a bigger entertainment allowance than six, seven, eight or nine other Permanent Secretaries, but you must give an officer an allowance which bears some relation to the type of entertainment that he is expected to do. Mr. Chairman, you will know that the tourist resorts in Barbados are thrown open to the world, and we know that international crooks and gangsters are wending their way here and they can create security problems for us and others. Our Security Officers have to spend a lot of money, and they cannot entertain these people in Baxters Road. I am not suggesting that Baxter's Road could not provide adequate entertainment for them, but certain people have to be carried to the Hilton Hotel or to my parish in St. Peter. What we are saying is that we do not want to place a Security Officer in a position where he has to turn out the seams of his waistcoat in order to find money to pay for a drink, when mixing with those people who can throw about money.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister will tell us that an Officer will be instructed that, after he has spent this \$780, he can go further and render accounts or let the Hotel responsible for the service render accounts for what was served, but there are occasions when ready cash or cheques, must be available to a Security Officer. Then can carry him a long way in securing his goal. We are dealing with security and defence work, and we cannot let anything slip.

I understand that the Leader of the House gave a figure of over \$800 for the purchasing of a Duplicating Machine. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the experience we have had in the Debates Committee, should be passed on to other Government Departments, particularly the Registry, the Training Division, and other Departments that have a large volume of duplicating and copying work to be done. A Duplicating Machine for \$800 would be a cheap machine. Why buy a cheap Duplicating Machine, merely to learn that, in another year or two, it will have to be condemned by a Board of Survey? Rather than spending \$800 on this Duplicating Machine, you should spend \$500 more and obtain a more efficient machine. All of these things should be taken into consideration. The Organisation and Methods Department should be going into all of these things to see what can be done. We have to do what some people call "cutting and contriving". It is not a case of merely taking money and spending it. We have to spend the taxpayers' money in a manner in which we can obtain the best service possible, and that is a matter about which I want to caution this Government.

Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I do not see that we can say anything against the passing of this particular item. We have created the Division, and we must provide the necessary furniture and so on to get it off its feet. Mr. Chairman, I want it to be clearly understood that what I have said is in respect of Head 22, Item 6, only. I understand that we have not yet touched Head 37.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we are not opposing the provision of furniture for a new Division of Government and, indeed, we have not had the opportunity to say this with any precision before. It is only fair to say that Defence and Security may very well be better concentrated in one Department with trained personnel operating as a Department of its own in the conditions one meets with in Barbados. I do not conceive that Barbados needs the whole apparatus of military intelligence: MI5, MI6, MI11, MI17 and so on as exist in England along with other Service Intelligence Departments and the Special Branch of Scotland Yard and so on. As I conceive it, Security is a smaller and more unified problem in Barbados than it is in large countries with global responsibilities. Nonetheless, that does not mean that we can afford to do without trained personnel and a proper Security and Defence policy. I am not touching on Defence at all, because I conceive that Defence in this sense is Defence for internal security purposes.

3.30 p.m.

I do not anticipate that any fixed defence force so warmly advocated by the former gallant and present hon. member for Christ Church North Central and adopted also by the former gallant and now hon. member for St. John, the Prime Minister, is being put forward or is going to be put forward whether in a White Paper or otherwise as a means of protecting Barbados' shores against foreign aggression. I expect that all these are internal security matters; but I am very concerned about the calibre of training which has been given to security personnel in Barbados. These are matters which are in their nature secret, but we can look at the new Permanent Secretary and we can see that he is the sort of man who, given the proper training, can make a first-class security officer. He is exactly the sort of person who in any country in the world has the background and apparent aptitude for this type of work, but you cannot make a man a security officer and expect to train him in that position merely because he has done the sort of courses that were given to part-time or even full-time officers in colonial regiments by the British Government. I do not think anybody expects that the Colonial Office in its security directives to local regiments which might some day fall into the hands of the natives is going to give a

full and rounded picture of security techniques available to the British Government; nor do I think that reading the files of policemen whose real security training consists in going to political meetings and taking notes with greater or less efficiency or greater or less determination according to the political party which was holding the meetings, because again I have no doubt that, to put it crudely, our policemen might listen more closely to what they say and their policemen might listen more closely to what we say than otherwise. These are matters of realism. I do not believe that reading their files will help you in knowing what the security problems of a small island such as Barbados really are.

There must be such a volume of expertise available somewhere. We know in fact that in small islands only a very fragile shell sometimes lies between disorder and the rule of law, as I believe a former British Police Chief of Zanzibar who warned the Zanzibar Government, an island the size of Barbados with not many more people, in advance that there was going to be a revolution on a particular night, and they warned the police, and as he put it subsequently, despite all that, two hundred men with cutlasses were able to overthrow the Government that had stood for 500 years, because that is exactly what happened in Zanzibar. There are peculiar security problems which cannot be solved by tape-recording public meetings of the main political parties and listening to a little gossip here and a little gossip there, and collecting the names of the executive members of different political parties as is done at the present in Barbados.

I believe that the Minister who is no longer responsible for this matter, the hon. member for St. Michael North West could perhaps, if not prevented by the confidence of the Ministerial oath, but by consideration of national security, elucidate a little further on this; but I think that some serious effort should be made to train security personnel in modern security methods. Let them know what the problems are. There are a variety of programmes available through one of the agencies of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. There is a counter insurgency programme which is available to members of police forces. I believe that an offer has been made in respect of this; I do not know if I am correct or not. Perhaps the hon. member, to whom I have just made reference, will know. An offer has been made in connection with this by the particular agency of the United States Government to give training in these matters to policemen here. I do not know whether it has even been taken up. Certainly I have never seen any policemen go to the United States to be trained, but, Mr. Chairman, the Government

must recognise that there is a problem and now that we are voting money to set up a Department which will have no responsibility other than this problem, we would expect some sort of serious results and expect these results to bear fruit in the form of some Ministerial statement which necessarily skirting secret matters still can give hon. members of the House and the public the confidence that security matters in Barbados are being dealt with as they should. We would not want a repetition of the Trinidad situation where the Trinidad army was only prevented by the Trinidad navy from taking over the Trinidad Government. I do not think we want soldiers to protect us from ourselves in that sense or sailors to protect us from ourselves in that sense. We want to be sure that this Department is operating on a proper basis.

Now to get on to a little more detailed point very shortly. Ever so often, you hear conversation in Barbados about infringement of privacy and occasionally you hear allegations of telephone tapping. I do not know if telephones are tapped in Barbados at the Telephone Company, if they are tapped by policemen climbing up telephone poles and putting on a tap, or if they are tapped by telephone repair men coming to your home, unscrewing the bottom of your telephone and putting a bug inside. I just do not know. I know that when my late father was Prime Minister of the West Indies, one day in Trinidad he saw some technicians going up a pole outside the house and they told him they were repairing the line because he went and enquired, and he picked up the private telephone line that he had to the Governor-General and a young lady answered the phone in Dr. Williams' office. Subsequent to that the line was made more secure by burying over it more vulnerable points. I do not know if we are facing any of that in Barbados, but I suggest to the Government that they set people's minds at rest in this matter. This does not only concern security; it perhaps also concerns the war against crime although I do not think that crime is carried on over the telephone to any great extent. But the Government ought to lay down a policy on the basis of which these infringements of privacy will be allowed.

I have recently reliably been told by somebody with a greater legal knowledge of these matters than me that in fact it is not in the slightest against the law to tap somebody's telephone, that if I cared to tap the Prime Minister's telephone and could get it done, that is all right and there is not a thing wrong with it. There is not one thing to prevent it being done in Barbados. The officials of the Telephone Company can tap your telephone as much as they like and

make what use they wish of the information thereby obtained. Now I would suggest that this is a security matter that at an early stage should be referred to those in charge of this Department and let the Government lay down a policy about this, and bring in legislation if necessary to protect the right of privacy. We can no longer be bound in this or in anything else by the somewhat limited view of Government with which we are all reared in colonial times. This is something I say in this House repeatedly and I much regret that it seems to fall on deaf ears, and we have adopted wholesale the restricted attitude which for 300 years governed Barbados.

The people of England would never allow their liberties to be taken with themselves as people in the colonies allow to be taken. They gave themselves liberties at home in England which we in the colonies never had, and I have been saying this from the time I have come in here. It is time that we defined some of these liberties and not just leave them to words in a Constitution. All these are matters of security and appertaining to security and I would hope that we are going to get some action from this Department in return for the money which both sides of the House are joining today to vote for its efficient exercise.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, certain matters have been raised here which indeed should be answered by the Government side. I think I am in a position to answer some of the points raised certainly by the last speaker, the hon. member for St. Thomas, and I want to assure him, the whole Opposition and indeed to assure the country that at no time has the Government indulged in any tapping of telephones.
3.40 p.m.

I recall distinctly — and this was at the time of the constitutional talks in London in 1966 which led to Independence for Barbados — that the Prime Minister in my presence held discussions with the then Chairman of the Barbados Telephone Company, Mr. Leacock, who at that time assured him — because at the time when the Constitution was being debated, not every one was responsible for what he was saying and some allegations were made that the Government was tapping people's telephones, which proved to be untrue, and we wanted to be sure whether in fact this was possible and the Prime Minister held discussions with the Chairman — and he assured the Prime Minister that this could not be done.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of correction, I was present when a conversation took place in the presence of the hon. member, Mr. Leacock and the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister said that he

had held talks and had been told that you could not tap the telephones without the Telephone Company knowing, and I heard Mr. Leacock contradict the Prime Minister. The hon. member must recall it, because it was one of the few times that Mr. Leacock had anything to say.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that the hon. member was not present. These talks took place at the Prime Minister's invitation at Government Headquarters before we went to London. I am not going to deny that it is possible to tap telephones in Barbados, what I would deny is that the Government of Barbados has ever had anybody's telephone tapped. I have no reason to believe that the situation has changed since I no longer hold that Ministry, and I have held talks with the General Manager of the Barbados Telephone Company, this was long since Independence, who informed me that it was possible to tap telephones and I made it clear in the presence of my Permanent Secretary at that time that under no circumstances would the Government be permitting the tapping of any telephones in Barbados because we believe there are certain rights as laid down in the human rights provision of the Constitution and those rights are sacrosanct. I can agree with the hon. member for St. Thomas that those rights could be spelt out further, but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that I can only speak for the Government. It is possible for the Telephone Company and it is possible for any person dealing with telephones to tap telephones, but I must state that this is not part of the policy and practice of the Government, and has not been done certainly by this Government.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am rather sorry that the Minister saw fit to reply before I had made my speech. The question of security is one dear to my heart because I think it is one of those aspects of Government business that is shrouded with secrecy in the word "security", and it is one of those aspects of Government business that we must take the statements of Government at their face value. I do not accept those statements, and I know in Barbados there are cases of people's private telephone conversations being listened to regardless of security reasons or for short term political reasons, the point is some of us on this side have heard our telephone conversations repeated on platforms, and in my own case I have heard the very Prime Minister repeat statements that he could only have listened to from statements made on my private telephone.

One must make full disclosure of all security matters in this country to a body of Privy Councillors or people who are free from external conflict, and I cannot accept words being given

that everything is all right. I want to know what are the agreements between the Government of Barbados and the Barbados Telephone Company, and between the Government of Barbados and Cable and Wireless Limited giving them the right to listen in to people's telephone conversations, and if the Government is so sure about its ground on this matter, let us have an independent inquiry into the allegations that have been made. I have been disturbed from time to time about this and it cannot only be a figment of the imagination when these matters occur. I believe that in matters of this nature we must be prepared to make a full disclosure of all the evidence. That is why I would join the Leader of the Opposition in asking that we have legislation governing the right to privacy. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Chairman, if any member of this community is being subversive, any Government will reserve the right to get information about subversive activity, but there is a line to be drawn and I am not satisfied that we are being told the whole truth and nothing but the truth in these matters of security.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have to rise again but I have to repeat what I said earlier. No agreement has been entered into with the Telephone Company or with Cable and Wireless with regard to tapping people's telephones. The agreement is a negative one and it is that under no circumstances will the Government be listening in to other people's telephone conversations. I remember distinctly just under two years ago that some threats were made over the telephone to certain prominent persons and the Police at the time asked the permission of the General Manager to give to the Police the names of the people who were being threatened and the General Manager refused. He said it could only be done with the concurrence of the Minister, and when the General Manager came to me, I said the answer was no, because as I said earlier we pay due respect to the Constitution as regards freedom of expression and we have no intention of allowing listening in by anybody, whether it be by the Police or anybody else, to any person's telephone conversations.

3.50 p.m.

I stand here now, Mr. Chairman, denying completely and categorically any statements made by any member, particularly the hon. member who has just spoken, that any listening devices were attached to his telephone for the purpose of eavesdropping on his telephone conversations. I have taken up my telephone and I have heard people talking elsewhere. This sort of thing happens all the time. It happened to me quite recently. I remember one day in my office I took up my telephone and heard a telephone

conversation going on at the Police Department. I also took up my telephone very recently and I heard private people speaking on the telephone. This does not mean that there is any bugging or any listening devices attached to a telephone. It is simply a question of crossed lines. This has been going on for ages and it still continues. Since the Telephone Company has modernised its system, it is even worse now, Mr. Chairman. I think you know this, and I have no doubt that members on the other side know this as well. Because one can pick up a telephone and hear conversations on the other side, do not for one moment, imagine that the telephone is bugged. If it is bugged, I would suggest that they try their friends and find out who bugged it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that bothers me is that the Minister of Home Affairs has not yet risen to speak on this topic which falls under this portfolio. Am I to understand from the Minister who has just taken his seat that he said, first of all that there was, in fact, no agreement, and then he said that there was an agreement but it was a negative agreement? Why is it that the General Manager of the Telephone Company had to go to him as a Minister to ask his permission to give the number? There must have been some agreement existing between the Government and the Telephone Company that caused the General Manager, when approached by the Police to give a certain number, had to go to the then Minister of Home Affairs to find out whether he should give the number. This must be based upon some agreement between the two of them. The General Manager could not just, out of the blue, go to the Minister of Home Affairs to find out whether he should give the number to the Police.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like to inform the hon. member that I, as Minister of Home Affairs, am not responsible for bugging telephones.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate what the Minister has now said. As Minister of Home Affairs, he is not responsible for the bugging of the telephones. But the Minister did not say that the telephones are not being bugged. I appreciate that, and I think it is a more honest statement than the one made by the former Minister.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that I have made a dishonest statement to this Chamber? If he is saying that, then I will demand that he withdraws the statement. What I have stated is a question of fact, and I will have no imputations made as to dishonesty on my part.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not let us beat around the bush, Sir. I know for a fact....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before you.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that the statement be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Withdraw what, Sir? I will withdraw anything you want me to withdraw. I do not give any trouble in the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The imputation relative to the statement made by the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw the imputation that the statement made by the Minister is a dishonest statement, but it was certainly, nonetheless, a misleading statement, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I stand here denying categorically that I have made any misleading statement. I go further and say that there has been absolutely no agreement whatsoever made between the Government and the Telephone Company on the question of listening in to other people's telephone conversations. I say that categorically, and I will deny it on each and every occasion that the allegation is made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That does not bother me, Sir, because I know the Minister long enough to realise that he will continue to deny it, but because he denies it, does not mean that it is not true. That is an entirely different matter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. member searches his own mind, his own mentality and his own honesty. He should look beyond the mirror he is seeing and see the truth of what has transpired here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister can become as personal as he likes, because that does not make any difference. As I have said, when some people cannot win an argument or are losing an argument, they resort to that sort of petty mentality of attacking the character of other persons. I believe that I have passed beyond that stage.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, when he gets up and says that I am misleading this Chamber, I must take exception to that remark. I take grave exception to the remark when he says that I am misleading this Chamber. Are you going to tell me that that is not a reflection on my

character? Can I stand up here and deliberately mislead this Honourable Chamber?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should be glad to have this ruled on. Sometime ago the Prime Minister said that I was deliberately misleading the House. I objected, and Mr. Speaker said that is only the cut and thrust of the debate....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But there is only one Chairman in here, and I want you to understand that when I rule, I rule. I have made no ruling. I have called on the hon. member to withdraw a statement; he has done so, and I am now listening to his remarks.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not reflecting on you, Sir. I am not disagreeing with you. I was merely saying that I would be glad to hear it ruled on, if there was an objection, because on a previous occasion when it was said that I was deliberately misleading the House and I objected, Mr. Speaker said that it was only the cut and thrust of the debate. I was not reflecting on you, Sir. I was just commenting that this is something that has happened already in here; this phrase about deliberately misleading the House has been mentioned in here more than once, but in this session on the one occasion I heard it, that is what Mr. Speaker had said. I much regret that anything I have said has been taken by you as my wanting to quarrel with you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I have been trying to prove to you. I have taken no objection to the statement made by the Minister. It is only when I take objection in the Chair to any statement made in here that the statement will be expunged from the records. I will hear the hon. member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that I was making statements that were reflecting on his character. I was not aware of that, and I think that would be the most difficult thing to do in the world, Mr. Chairman....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not read between the lines, Mr. Chairman. I have not said what you think I have said. I may mean it, but I have not said it. I do not care if the Minister answers my question. It seems strange that somebody received threatening telephone calls — this is a matter of pure criminal investigation — the Police go to the Telephone Company, as I understand it, and the Chairman or the Manager of the Telephone Company either does not give or refuses to give to the Police the

number requested. He does not speak to the Director of Public Prosecutions or the Commissioner of Police, so why is it that the General Manager, at this stage, had to go to the Minister of Home Affairs in connection with this matter? That is what the House would like to find out. If there was no agreement between the Telephone Company and the Minister of Home Affairs, then the General Manager would have told the Police that they could or could not get the number, but he would not have gone to the Minister of Home Affairs. There must have been an agreement between the Government and the Telephone Company whereby telephones should not be tapped without the consent of Government or something like that. Certain things will slip out. You may deny them all the time, but the truth will come out. The point is that if the General Manager had gone to the former Minister of Home Affairs — I do not think he would have gone to the present Minister, because he would have had more respect for the present Minister to have gone to him with that sort of foolishness.

4 p.m.

What I would like to find out is this: if when the Manager of the Telephone Company had called up the Minister, the Minister had said "yes", do you mean that the Telephone Company would have issued the things to the police? In other words, everything depends entirely on the words of the Minister. If the former Minister does not want to answer, and I believe he is getting on like a little child, who goes into a corner and sulks, and he is sulking already, I believe that the present Minister, if he knows anything about it, would assist the House.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, from 1965, not only have the members of this side of the House been contending that there is some relationship existing between the Government and the Barbados Telephone Company and Cable and Wireless in respect of snooping into their private telephone conversations, but practically everybody in this community will remember the pre-Independence debates and what used to go on. The Hon. Minister who has just spoken most probably would remember repeating telephone conversations which were supposed to be private. Now he has just got up today, seven years hence, to tell this honourable Chamber.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, I deny categorically that I have ever repeated any telephone conversation that was supposed to be private or said that I had done this. I have never even listened in on any telephone conversation that is supposed to be private.

Mr. BOLDEN: I heard the hon. member say that the Minister who has just sat down will deny, but if he wants me to repeat the conversation which I am talking about, I am sure it would not enhance his position, because I will talk about the time when they were trying to get somebody to sit as Attorney General.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, I would want him to repeat it.

Mr. BOLDEN: I will tell the House how they used to tap my telephone and who used to telephone me, and he used to ask me every night why I don't come over and be Attorney General. I want to know how they knew.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not know who has been impersonating me and who invited him to be Attorney General of what, but I can assure you that no such invitation to the hon. member or any other hon. member or any other Barbadian for that matter either on the side of the Opposition or on the Government Benches has ever come from me. I do not know who has been impersonating me or who is dreaming whether at night or day dreaming, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the Honourable Chamber that no such invitation ever came from me, and I am certainly not responsible for his pipe dreams to be Attorney General of this country, which were shattered last September.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to know what the hon. member means about pipe dreams, but all I am saying is that after 1965 the Hon. Minister comes in here now and lays the blame fairly and squarely in the laps of the Barbados Telephone Company, and has said that even since they have modernised, the system has become worse and he has told this Chamber that he picks up his telephone and hears a conversation going on with the Police Department. As Minister of Home Affairs as he was then, does he consider this to be a fit position that any citizen can pick up a telephone and hear the police's private conversations going on and has done nothing about it? I am calling on the Government and the very Minister as Minister of Home Affairs to institute a full-fledged discussion and investigation into the Barbados Telephone Company. It will do more than two things. If we have an enquiry it will relieve the minds of people who believe up to this day that the Government is involved in tapping the telephones in this country. I know the Minister would never want one. The second thing it would do is that it would put the Telephone Company in order because the Minister says that since they have modernised they have become worse and we have got to pay more for a bad service, and thirdly

we will know whether there is any agreement existing between the Barbados Government, the Telephone Company and Cable and Wireless, because despite what the Minister says, I am one who is firmly convinced that there is such an agreement, and I have had too many examples in my own house. Up to a few months ago, I had to chase the telephone engineers out of my office, after they came to my office and said that they were fixing the telephone because there was a report of a bad line. I heard they had gone to my home to fix the telephone there and I again chased them out. What are they doing otherwise than bugging people's telephones. I would like to know from the Minister if he says he can hear the police conversation on the line, if it is not possible that other people will also hear the police conversation, and I want to know why the Minister does not ask for an investigation into the Telephone Company.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't really wanted to speak again and I hope I do not step on any corns on either side if I say that I am quite prepared to accept most of what the hon. member for St. Michael North West has said, but that does not mean exactly what he thinks it means, because his statement that the Government has never authorised the tapping of telephones cannot, with greatest respect, to the evidence with which he has supported it, be taken at its face value. First of all, I just do not believe, and if the Minister reflects he will not believe either, that if somebody is getting threatening telephone calls that the police have to ask the Minister of Home Affairs or the Manager of the Telephone Company has to ask the Minister of Home Affairs for permission to tap the phone.

My late father was the recipient of many offensive telephone calls.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, the question of tapping telephones never arose. I never mentioned anything about tapping telephones in that respect, and I want to make this point clear.

Mr. ADAMS: My argument is that you cannot get the names unless you trace the number from which they come because people do not say "this is Philip Mottley speaking, I am threatening you". I just happen to mention this and I hope the Telephone Company does not get offended. I do not think that the gentleman who arranged it is now an employee of the company, so I can safely talk about it. My late father had many offensive telephone calls, and I have myself been downstairs in the Telephone Company and helped to arrange for his line to be tapped without asking the police or anybody other than the engineer of the Telephone Company. Now let me point out to the

Minister where the logical fallacy in what he said lies. If somebody is being threatened, all he has to do is to go to the Telephone Company and ask for a tap to be put on the line. He can carry his own taperecorder to the Telephone Company and the Telephone Company will tap the line on their own tape and they can do what they like with it. The Manager does not have to go to the Minister. It is within the discretion of the Telephone Company. If a subscriber wishes the Telephone Company to listen to his telephone conversations, they will listen; so I just do not believe that they are the circumstances and nothing else could be the circumstances if the Prime Minister or whoever it was was being threatened. If someone is being threatened over the telephone, he does not need the Minister. There is no question in what the Minister told us is being done against his consent. All he has to do is to listen and tape. What the Minister may mean is this: that the police wanted to tap the telephones of persons who were making threatening calls, or they wanted the Telephone Company perhaps to supply them with a list of names which the Telephone Company had in its possession, I do not know, of persons who had telephoned someone who did not want the police to know who was ringing him. But that is a different matter altogether from threatening.

4.10 p.m.

If members think again, they will realise it could not have happened in the way the Minister said. If I am being threatened, or if the Prime Minister is being threatened, and either of us picks up the telephone and tells this to the Manager of the Telephone Company, it is a simple matter. It takes a little time to trace calls through automatic exchanges, but what the Minister is saying could not be accurate, it would have to be that the Police wanted to know who was ringing the Leader of the Opposition or who was ringing Mr. Bobby Clarke for that matter. That might well be what the Police wanted to know, and the Minister very properly told the Manager of the Telephone Company he was not tolerating that. I think the Minister at that time is now the hon. member for St. Michael North Central.

Telephone tapping is a more involved business than hon. members are appreciating, because they can be tapped in the company, they can be tapped on the telephone instrument itself, and also by such amateur devices as it is alleged the Prime Minister once wanted to tap my father's telephone conversations by holding a tape recorder close to the receiving telephone. That is a little crude but it can be done that way. You have more elaborate devices to put inside the telephone, and when the telephone is picked up it keeps the tape recorder running for three minutes or whatever time you set

it for after the telephone is put down, so you also get what is said in the room after the telephone call is finished. That has to be done by trepass, so to speak, but it is a whole spectrum of things involved.

I do not like hearing any "holier-than-thou" nonsense about no telephones being tapped in Barbados, every overseas call is monitored. Recently I believe the Telephone Company may have made some adjustments by which it is more difficult to listen, but many hon. members will have had the experience of speaking on the telephone and hearing the overseas operator come in to say that she has an overseas telephone call for you. That does not worry anybody, but a clear stage has to be drawn between three things; first, the Telephone Company's internal regulation of its own business, secondly, Government's authorisation through the Telephone Company and the Police and Security Departments of placing listening devices on people's telephone lines, or indeed I would include places where the Government manages to get it done without the assistance of the Telephone Company, and thirdly, Mr. Chairman, do not forget that many members of the Force, especially the Security Department, came along in days when they were responsible ultimately in security matters to a British Governor and therefore felt free to tap telephones of the then prominent members of the community and Ministers.

There has been a stage in this country at which even the elected members and Ministers had been subjected to security checks and security control by some of the same Policemen who are now working for the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. I do not know how much confidence he has in them now, but the point to be derived from that is that the Police may have means of tapping telephones unknown to the Minister. In many large countries, we hear of these things going on, there have been complaints in the House of Commons about members' telephones being tapped, and it is well known that the Cabinet Secretary at the time, before even consulting the Prime Minister, instructed an official at M.I.5 to make security checks about Mr. Profumo, and it is believed that those security checks included the tapping of his telephone. The Prime Minister was then informed and it all came out subsequently, but I am suggesting to the Minister that because he says that Government has never authorised it, does not mean that Government forces have never done it. All these things get done, and this is why I would like to see some punishment attached to telephone tapping where at present no punishment lies. Governments are there, they do not necessarily know what happens, especially in these

Departments of Security, so although the former Minister of Home Affairs must be congratulated in stating that the Government's policy has not permitted it officially in the past, we will want more than that and I also welcome what the hon. member said about spelling out these things in detail.

There are hon. members in this Chamber who have had very strong feelings indeed that their telephones were being tapped. There are occasions when I find myself repeating certain statements over the telephone in order to see if I can hear them at a later stage, because I have heard noises which made me feel that my telephone conversations were being listened to. The hon. member for St. Joseph has mentioned that during the St. Joseph bye-election, the trouble that we had at our conference at Bathsheba with men climbing up the telephone poles in front of our very eyes and putting two clips on the telephone poles, picking up a telephone and listening in. We have seen that with our own eyes and I called them inside the house and asked them what they were doing. These things are obviously things that worry you. You must not dismiss this as a pipe dream of the Opposition, we have had to contend with these things. We have never been in the position of practising it because we are a responsible Opposition, but it is not unknown for Opposition Parties to find a way to listen in to Government's telephones.

4.20 p.m.

People have a right to be private on the telephone, although I say that nobody has any right saying anything on the telephone that he or she would not like to hear repeated in Court or on a political platform. I know that I have transgressed this very often but, nonetheless, I think it is something to be borne in mind. Now that we know the Government is of a similar opinion to us upon this matter which impinges on privacy, security, defence and crime, we call on the Government to have a code by which if it is thought necessary something in this line can be instituted, but the most rigorous penalties should follow any irregular, unlawful, or improper listening to other people's telephone conversations.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying yea or nay that lines may be tapped. I should like to say that if hon. members have very private business to discuss, why cannot they go to places where they think they can privately discuss their business? If they think that the telephones are not safe and things are happening, why do they continue to converse over the telephone and then come and accuse people by saying that people are tapping their lines? Is it fair to accuse the

Telephone Company in this Honourable House when the Telephone Company cannot defend itself? This Telephone Company has done an able job, because in most parts of the world people have to pay for the number of calls they put through. In Barbados people take advantage of the telephone; they use it regularly; they talk everybody's business on it; they do whatever they feel like doing. The time has come when very soon the Manager and the people responsible for the telephone will have to cut down on this, because Barbadians are not getting any better, if they live on the telephones. The telephones are being over used in this country. I know that lines can be crossed. It has happened to me and I take it as a joke. As regards the tapping of telephones, if you think there is tapping, then you should stop talking your personal business on the telephone. That is the answer.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I wished the answer was as easy as the hon. member, who has just sat down, has made it. I believe that it is a fundamental right of any citizen of this country well set out in the common law of England that his house is his castle. Certainly, if I paid for using any public device or any public utility, then I am entitled to use it subject to my privacy and to the security of this country.

When it comes to criticising the Barbados Telephone Company of this country, let it be clearly understood in this House that any monopoly which operates in this country must be subject to the criticisms of this House at any time regardless of whether it is the Telephone Company or any other Company which operates in Barbados. If they cannot conduct their business other than subject to certain scrutiny where either by tacit consent or otherwise they are not giving us the service that we deserve, then they must be criticised and criticised they will be by me, at least, and I am sure by other hon. members of this House.

I do not like always to prolong debates on matters, but I would not come in here lightly and refer to certain matters unless I had certain information available to me. It is open to the Government, if the Minister says that the Government does not authorise a certain course of action, to investigate the matter and to bring laws against it, if it is being done either with the consent or without the consent of the Telephone Company or the Government. But if members are genuinely concerned about a growing incident of unfair prying into people's business, in my submission, it is not enough merely to say go and use somewhere else.

For the benefit of this House, during the last election in order to make telephone conversations

to my constituency and to my workers, I had to set up a system by which I used neighbours' telephones, and we never got the clicks in those circumstances nor were the conversations repeated then. That is not good enough. I am always prepared to be beaten, but not in that sort of manner. That is why the first opportunity I have got, I have taken objection to it in this House. Regardless of whether it was done with the consent or otherwise of the Government, in my view, it is not a satisfactory standard for any country to accept.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I hate to rise again. Sometimes if we have any thoughts for our less fortunate brothers and sisters; if we have any iota of public decency about us, we have to defend those who cannot defend themselves. We have to let those persons who might be in the pay of the big institutions in this country know that, as long as some of us have any integrity, we will fight them back into the sea. Whether they are paid or supported by the conglomerate or whatever it may be, let them understand that they must guard the statements they make particularly in this Honourable House that represents 250,000 Barbadians.

Mr. Chairman, there is a Public Utility Board which was set up because the Government of the country thought that, where you have public monopolies, there must be some controlling interest over them, and that is the reason the Public Utility Board is there. The very Telephone Company, which the hon. member has said is doing such a good job, came into this country and put banners and stickers all over the place with the words: "Please bear with us. We are giving you a better telephone service." Up to now we have not have a better telephone service. This is why I have constantly called for a Public Inquiry to know what is going on. They went to the Court and insisted that they must get a recognised, increased profit margin on what they put out. Are you saying that they have done a good job? Are you talking about Barbadians over using the telephone? You are paying for it and you do not get it to use at sometimes. Let a little bit of rain fall and you cannot use it, and see whether they will deduct \$1 from the bill. Do not pay your bill by the 21st of the month, and see whether you will not have to pay \$4.00 for pushing in a plug. The Company is not doing a good job.

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that the Minister of Home Affairs who picked up his phone and heard a conversation going on in the Police Department should put it down, and walk to Broad Street or to the Pine to talk to the Minister of Communications and Works? Is that what the

hon. member means? That is what I should like to find out. Is the hon. member saying, Mr. Chairman, that if you want to telephone somebody in Trinidad – because the Telephone Company might have backed somebody in the election – you must put down your telephone, pay B.W.I.A. and go to Trinidad and come back?

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Even if the outside person does not hear, then the people operating the telephone can hear any conversation they want to hear. Why do you not have an investigation into the Telephone Company itself? Why are you blaming the people outside?

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the further you go, the deeper you seem to get into the mess.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The deeper we go, I realise we are going from the Resolution. I am going to ask hon. members to get back to the Resolution.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, that is why I say that the easiest thing to do as we say in Court is to draw red herrings across the trail. We on this side believe that the Government has got some agreement, and the only answer to this, Mr. Chairman, is a public enquiry. We will know if the Telephone Company is doing a good job, we will know if Barbadians are over-talking on the telephone, and we will know if the telephone operators are the malicious ones who are listening, or whether the Government really has an agreement. But we are not saying that, Mr. Chairman. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said quite clearly that he believes there might be a certain amount of listening in, because every time you send a telephone call, you can hear somebody butting in to tell you that the line is wanted for an overseas connection; but the Parliamentary Secretary herself in trying to defend something said that it is the telephone operators, not me. I have nothing to say against the operators because I know that if a little rain falls tonight, those poor girls will get clicking trying to connect you, but the old Telephone Company which the hon. member said was doing a good job is charging Barbadians more for second hand equipment. I am calling for a public enquiry and that will tell everybody where the fault lies, and we will not have to get out of our beds at 10 o'clock at night and walk to Bridgetown if we want to talk to the Minister of Home Affairs, or if you want to call the doctor your telephone call will not end up in the Prime Minister's house.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, very shortly on this matter. I just want to issue a disclaimer. I do

not know if the hon. member for St. Michael North East is saying that we are attacking the Telephone Company, so she must defend it, or if she is saying that we should be attacking the telephone operators. We are not attacking the company or the operators. What I said about tapping is that the operators must necessarily listen to certain calls for certain purposes. I have got nothing but assistance from the Telephone Company and all the tapping that I have ever known has been done has been totally beneficial and at the request of somebody who wished it done and quite lawfully asked for it to be done. We are not attacking the company or the operators; get that quite clear. We did not use the word "malicious".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, you have granted a lot of latitude in this debate. Probably hon. members might have read something from the Canadian House of Commons "The Parliamentarian" which deals with this same matter of wire tapping. There is a Bill which is engaging the attention of the Canadian Parliament on this precise matter, but whether or not wire tapping goes on here I do not know. If any hon. member has any substantive question to ask on this particular matter, he can probably do it in a different manner. We have a Supplementary Resolution dealing not with wire tapping as such, but more than half the time was spent on wire tapping and we have heard a few experts on the Opposition Benches who seem to know the inside technicalities of wire tapping and things of that nature, so I think we have still benefited this afternoon.

The question that Head 22A – Establishments Division – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 37 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this amount of money is required to supplement the vote for Ex-gratia payments to three Pensions Enquiry Officers. Two of them have served for over ten years and one for five years and seven months, and the amounts are for the two over ten years \$1,920 each, and the other \$214.40. I think this is a very deserving case, Mr. Chairman, and I beg to move that Head 37 stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$15,555 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 2

Head 2 – Services Commissions – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving Head 2 – Services Commissions, the full explanation on this particular matter is that the current provision under this Item is \$7,000. The total expenditure to date is \$2,899.63 leaving a balance of \$4,100.37. Under normal circumstances this balance might have been sufficient to meet all anticipated expenditure in respect of advertisements of vacant posts both locally and overseas to the end of the current financial year. There are however a number of late claims for payments made to the Crown Agents in respect of vacancies advertised during the last financial year. These claims which amount to \$9,056.55 were received from the Accountant General too late to be brought to account during 1971-72, and it is evident from the foregoing that the provisions in respect of 1971-72 as well as the current financial year have been grossly underestimated. For that reason we are asking for this supplementary.

So far as the other item is concerned, for furniture and equipment for the sum of \$734, I think the note is fairly explicit.

I beg to move that Head 2 – Services Commissions – stand part.

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

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

Head 18 – Training Division – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 18 – Training Division – we are requesting the sum of \$5,920. The Training Division has considerably expanded local training and is also encouraging the siting of regional seminars here. In order to improve the quality of training, the old lecture method is largely being supplemented by workshops which require active

participation by the students. The method calls for promotion of workshops and books, teleguide, aid memoirs and manuals, the usual materials which are still for the present largely adapted or copied from English or American sources. This work involves the heavy output of typed material.

I beg to move that Head 18 – Training Division – stand part.

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

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold up the passing of this Head for too long, but I just want to make a couple of points on this question of training. I notice that the note states, and that the Leader of the House made reference to the fact, that the Training Division has expanded its programme recently. I think that reports of this have reached the Press. The point I would like to make is that there is considerable need for more training to be done at the departmental level. Most of the Government Departments in this country are set up by Acts of Parliament, and one often finds that there are a number of people who are working in various Departments who know very little about the legal framework in which the Departments have been set up, and I think that this is an area in which there is need for much more training, because at least one would assume that when a person goes to work in a Department that person is there to help the public who go to that Department for assistance. There are a number of Departments in this country where, if some Clerks who are dealing with a particular matter happen to go on vacation or are out of the office for any length of time these matters cannot be dealt with, and I would suggest that the Training Division look into this matter with a view to expanding their training programme in this particular area.

Also, there has been some complaint surrounding the availability of scholarships and training programmes which are available to Barbadians and which are under the direct control of the Training Division. I am not sure whether the Division has done anything like this yet, but I would like to suggest that the Training Division should give some consideration to the publication of a news bulletin where people who might be interested in a particular area of training would have access to this and would know what is going on.

The final point relates to the need for a greater co-ordination amongst the various training

programmes which are at present in operation in this country and to which the Government is contributing. We know that the Government contributes to the programme at the Institute for Management and Productivity, but Government also grants money to the Extra Mural Department of the University of the West Indies. We also have the Community College which is totally financed by the Government, and at each of these institutions I think there is a certain amount of training which is going on which the Training Division might be interested in, and it would seem to me that if there is a greater co-ordination a lot of the repetitive stuff which is being done could be eliminated, and a lot more could be done, so I would like to suggest that this could be looked at closely and a lot more co-ordination should exist between the Training Division and the other institutions which are involved in training in this country.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear what the hon. member said about a news bulletin. Perhaps the Minister in charge might be able to say whether or not this was not circulated to all members of the House, but I have received copies of Reports from the Training Division.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: I think what the hon. member is referring to is a Training Report of the Training Division. That is not what I am talking about, I am talking about a bulletin which would make Civil Servants and other people in this country who have got to apply through the Training Division for scholarships or training of some nature know that this information is available, and it should be put out from time to time to make people aware of what the possibilities are in particular fields where financial assistance by way of scholarships is being offered.

The question that Head 18 – Training Division – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 22 – Establishments Division – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 22, there are four Items to be considered under this Head. I could probably just explain a little about entertainment allowance which has come about, but provision is necessary because the old provision has proved to be inadequate owing to the establishment of two additional posts of Permanent Secretary which have been recently added to the permanent establishment. We have the Permanent Secretary, Defence and Security and the Permanent Secretary

to be Head of the Civil Service, so it is as a result of the creation of these two new posts that the amount which was previously voted is not enough and has to be supplemented.

The same explanation goes for Travelling and Office Expenses. They have borrowed certain furniture from the Central Purchasing Department, and this is to enable them to purchase their own furniture. I beg to move that Head 22 stand part.

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

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

Head 24 – Ministry of External Affairs – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, is it that the Minister does not have any confidence in the Head and that is why he does not give us any information? However, this Item is for \$13,000, and the note tells us that this money is required to purchase a new official car for the Permanent Mission to the United Nations for a sum not exceeding U.S. \$6,400.

What is amusing about the whole thing is this. The present official car is a Lincoln Continental which was purchased in April, 1970 at a cost of U.S. \$5,636.75 and between April 1971 and May 1972 the amount of U.S. \$3,267 has been spent on what they call essential repairs.

We take it to mean that up to the end of May, 1972, there were other repairs to be effected, but were not considered as essential as those which cost \$3,267 (US). Now, we would certainly like to learn from the Minister whether it was a new car that was purchased in April, 1970, for \$5,637.75 (US). What mileage has it done? Who was responsible for its maintenance? Mr. Chairman, from April 1970 to May 1972 we have been spending money on this car, and we are now being asked to provide \$13,000 to provide another car. Is it a case where we must turn our backs on situations at home that are crying out for what benefit could be derived from the spending of \$13,000? There are so many things to which I could point, Mr. Chairman, where we could spend

\$13,000 to the benefit of so many children and poor people. We could spend it where the benefit would be long-lasting. What is wrong? Is it because it is taxpayers' money that you find the Government coming to the milch cow, the taxpayer, and spending money just like this? What is this Mission doing? Is this Permanent Mission established for the permanent destruction of a car like the Lincoln Continental? Anybody who knows a Lincoln Continental that would have cost \$5,636 (US) in 1970 would know what type of car it was. We were told here that you had to buy a car that would go with the office and fill the eyes of the people. We were told that we could not give the officer a cheap car. To my mind this is a disgrace.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that the Minister would have some information about the car. Has it been involved in an accident? If so, how many accidents has it been involved in? What about the insurance premium? Is the car at a stage where it has to be written off? In that case, what is the Insurance Company doing about it? (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: "What is the Insurance Company doing about what?") Mr. Chairman, we would not like to waste time by talking about the use to which the car has been put, because we have certain information here at our disposal on this side of the House. We know who have been driving about the car and damaging it. We know how many unauthorised people have been using the taxpayers' motor car. Whatever information the Minister has he can give it to us. If the Minister is going to give us the information, then I am willing to sit and hear what he has to say.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the information which I have to hand is that in April 1970 the Permanent Mission purchased a Lincoln Continental to replace the old one at a cost of \$5,636.75 (US). Since April 1971 the Mission has spent a total of \$3,267.34 (US) for repairs to the car, and it appears likely that this trend will continue. In addition to repair expenses, the cost of renting an alternative car when the Lincoln is out of commission is heavy. In view of the age of the car. (*Asides*) It is only two years. Probably the policy is to change the car every two or three years. I will withdraw the statement about the age of the car. In view of the frequent necessity for repairs.... (Mr. HINDS: "What is the mileage?") The mileage is 46,489 miles on the speedometer. The garage has estimated the current value of the car at between \$1,900 and \$2,100. The insurance for these cars is approximately..... (*Asides*) They have listed the insurance premium for various cars of that value:

Lincoln Continental	..	..	\$6,600 (US)
Buick Electra	..	..	\$6,400

Marquette	..	..	..	\$6,000"
Mercedes	..	..	..	\$7,577"
Mercedes 300SEL	..	..	..	\$9,500"

The insurance for all of these cars is approximately \$750(US) per annum. There is no provision in the current Estimates to cover the cost of a new car. For that reason, Sir, I have come with this supplementary in order to meet the cost of a new official car as the present car is always breaking down, and the cost of hiring another car for performing official duties is very expensive. That is the information I have, Sir.

I beg to move that this amount of \$13,000 stand part.

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

5 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the car I saw you driving prior to the elections could have been nothing less than twelve years old, and I am confident that you have not spent \$4,000 on that car. Let us note carefully that this is the official car which should only be used for official occasions. I do not think that the Permanent Representative would take up the official car and drive up the road to buy roti. How can they account for 46,489 miles over a period of two years? That works out to be just over 2,000 miles a month, and the Government has the audacity to come here and ask for an additional \$13,000 to buy a motor car to do the same thing. This Resolution is nothing but scandalous. The note says that a large sum was spent on essential repairs. If they had said this is for gas, oil, servicing and things like that, one may say it could be in that figure, but what are the essential repairs? Do you mean that the transmission broke down once, twice or three times, the crank shaft was broken or the differential fell out? There is nothing mentioned about tyres, and that is why we are asking for more information. There were essential repairs to keep it road worthy and in two years' time this Government, this socialist dog-eared Government, this half-baked socialist conservative in outlook Government, wicked to the people, can come here and ask the taxpayers to put \$13,000 at their disposal again to buy another Lincoln Continental. The person who is in charge has a flair for Lincoln Continentals, but we in Barbados with champagne lips and mauby pockets have to provide this, and they sit by smirking. I am sorry I have to say anything on this because I imagine the lady member on that side would have to say something. Maybe she will say how many times she drove in it and was taken to the airport in it, and I am sorry that I jumped the gun. I do not think we on this side can sit down and be satisfied.

Mr. Chairman, the Government should have known that they should not have brought a Resolution of this nature. I can imagine that if the Prime Minister had been in the Opposition and we had brought a Resolution of this nature he would have been pulling the roof down as they did when we first offered the Governor a car for \$5,000 EC; they said the Governor should be riding a bicycle; but from April 1971 to May 1972 they have spent something like \$6,534 EC on repairs to a car, while you have pensioners living on \$5 a week here. They were trying to block a Resolution in here to give old age pensioners only \$10 a week more, but they can come here in their sweet coffees today and ask us to support a Resolution for \$13,000, and all the Minister did was to read out the Addendum. I think we should have more information from the Leader of the House. I do not see how the Leader of the House could have decided to take a Resolution like this and bring it here without getting more information from the Ministry, knowing that we would have to attack a Resolution of this nature. What are the essential repairs? My colleague has asked if it had an accident. If it had an accident the Insurance Company would have to pay for it; so that could not be essential repairs, and they would have had to repair it to the satisfaction of the Permanent Representative. If it got struck on the right side and the steering is bad, he would not be satisfied; so what are the essential repairs? All we have heard from the Minister is that it has done 46,000 miles.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that we on this side are not going to support this Resolution. We know that they with their numbers will obviously support it, but as I said earlier, might is not always right, and I would like the Minister before he continues with this Resolution to get some more information on it so as to satisfy not only this side but members on the other side who are not satisfied with a Resolution of this nature.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, he wants some more information. In April 1970 the Permanent Mission purchased a Lincoln Continental to replace the old one at a cost of \$US5,636.75. During the past year the Mission has spent large sums of money for repairs to this car and it is likely that this trend will continue. The following is a break down of the expenditure incurred for repairs between April 1971 and 19th May this year. 1/5/71 repairs and two tyres \$US184.55; 30/6/71 one tyre \$US19.43; 16/7/71 repairs \$US27.20; 20/8/71 repairs \$US282.20; 2/9/71 repairs \$US114.20 and again \$US312.61; 13/9/71 purchase one hose \$US14.68; 17/10/71 repairs transmission \$US399.80; 6/12/71 battery \$US88.50; 16/11/71 repairs \$US41.57; 4/2/72 repairs \$US422.22; 29/2/72 \$US14.21;

24/3/72 \$US40; 5/4/72 \$US303.89, and then there are other big amounts; 19/5/72 \$US915 for transmission. The car has broken down. Do you want to continue spending money that way? It is for that reason that we have come here. If I did not have this you would continue prancing up.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the amounts given, you will observe that the little light things like a hose for \$US19.20 and a battery for \$US88 are given, but when it comes to amounts like \$US422, \$US303 and \$US1,157 all you hear is repairs. I suspect, Mr. Chairman, and I do not care how they feel about this, that the Permanent Representative would have to be a friend of the mechanic. If you realise that the transmission is giving trouble in one year, how is it that you do not write the Lincoln Continental people and tell them that this was a bad job? They have their reputation at stake and they would have put in a transmission free of cost. The first amount spent on this car was \$US1,157 in the first year and not one word was said about it, but they go on spending money, and the only itemised accounts you can get are for a hose, three tyres and a battery.

5.10 p.m.

They say they are doing repairs all the time but they are not itemising these repairs. I am sorry that the Minister cannot say if it is a recognised garage, because I suspect it is some wayside garage or a friend of the Representative who is sending in these bills because they will get up there and say that we have the Barbados taxpayers down here to provide the money.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is fair for an hon. member to come here and impute improper motives to a person who cannot come in here and defend himself. The hon. member is imputing improper motives to the Permanent Representative to the United Nations and I do not think you should allow this because he cannot come here and defend himself.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The hon. member did not impute dishonestly to the Permanent Representative, but let me just say this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear you but sit for the moment. I have heard what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has said and I would like all hon. members to understand that as a public servant and not as an hon. member of this Chamber there is no Standing Order under which I can deal with the hon. member, I can only deal with him on his own character if he decides not to impute such, but there is no Standing Order under which I can deal

with him. I can only deal with him when it comes to an hon. member of this Chamber or the Judiciary or Her Majesty. I will hear the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I just want to clarify one point. I want to let the hon. member who spoke know that the information which I gave is, in respect of repairs. It was contained in a Savingsgram from the Charge d'Affaires to the United Nations to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs, so it is nothing from the Permanent Representative himself. These are things which have been checked and are the official figures. It is an official communication from the Charge d'Affaires to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs so I have every reason to believe that the figures are accurate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the hon. member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I give way to the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, you should recall that I sat down and allowed the Hon. Minister to make a point but I had not completed my address.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are in Committee, therefore it is your right to speak as often as you want to.

Mr. HINDS: That is what is worrying me because the hon. member for St. James does not seem to have the same right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Five hon. members were on their feet and I called on them to take their seats. You will speak now.

Mr. HINDS: What I am particularly concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is the rapid depreciation of the value of the Lincoln Continental that cost US\$5,636.75 in 1970. Nobody can say that it was not rapid. What has brought this about? The request for \$13,000 comes at the right time because I believe that this amount would buy two chassis for two buses that we need so badly to provide transportation for the travelling public here in Barbados, and I am sure that an investment of \$13,000 to assist the Rocklyn, the Transport Board or the Elite Bus Companies with a chassis at this time is a much sounder and safer investment, a more humane investment, than to take another \$13,000 of the taxpayers' money to invest in a Lincoln Continental just to make one man "look posh" before the United Nations.

As the hon. member for St. James has said, it is either a case where fools have been toying about

with this expensive motor car, not knowing anything about the care of it, not putting fluid in the transmission, driving it dry and not caring about it and bringing about all sorts of conditions which we have to deal with here today. I understand the Minister to say that the figures are authentic, they have come from the Charge d'Affaires to the Permanent Secretary. What we are concerned with, is by whom they were checked before they reached the Charge d'Affaires. We have nothing against the Charge d'Affaires, nothing against the Permanent Secretary, but when these Bills were tendered, was there anybody at that end to look after the interest of the taxpayers to know that these people were not charging you ten times more than what they should have charged for the job, or did they just state, as the hon. member for St. James said, a figure knowing that the Bajans down here have more money than sense and they can get their money?

5.20 p.m.

We understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister only wants to hear what we have to say because he has his numbers. We appreciate and understand all of this, but we have to make it abundantly clear that \$13,000 has been taken from the taxpayers' money to be spent on another Lincoln Continental and it is not going to be the end of this spending unless we can say in no uncertain terms that the taxpayers cannot be taken for this kind of ride every two years or, perhaps, a shorter period.

After all, Sir, we agreed, in the first instance, that a certain type of car must be made available to the officer, but something has gone wrong. Let the Minister tell us what is the position. We are sure that the Permanent Secretary here would have to be informed from time to time about this matter. As we understand it, the first repair bill was dated 1st May, 1971. I wonder whether the Permanent Secretary here had any notification whatsoever, between 1970 and the 1st May, 1971, that anything was going wrong with the car. What did they have to do? Did they rent another Lincoln Continental? Tell us exactly how this money was spent and what went wrong.

Mr. Chairman, considering all of these repair bills and the various dates on which repairs were carried out, it means that this car must have been in the garage for a very considerable time. Nobody is going to suggest that the car goes into the garage in the morning and it will be back out in the evening. This car must have remained in the garage for a considerable period in the light of the long list of the dates when repairs were effected. There should be some communication from the Charge d'Affaires to the Permanent Secretary advising him

that the performance of the car was not what was expected or that something had gone wrong. In other words, it is not a case of driving the car into the garage tonight and it refuses to work in the morning. We would like to see the Minister have these matters examined.

Mr. Chairman, no Minister or no member on that side of the House would be satisfied to buy a Lincoln Continental for \$5,636.75 (US) in April 1970, and then find that at this time in 1972 he is called upon to get a replacement for \$13,000 (WI). He just could not feel happy about it. We are asking hon. members on that side of the House to place themselves in the shoes of the taxpayers. They are also taxpayers and some of them are Ministers, but they have to work for their money. Do not be a party to somebody else having joy rides, smashing a car, and then a Minister comes to this House and gets money for the purchase of another car for \$13,000. If you buy one for \$13,000 in two years' time, then you may have to buy another one in 18 months' time, if you are not careful. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: "Are you suggesting that a car should not be bought?")

Mr. Chairman, a question is being asked if it would be suggested that a car should not be bought.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you asking that question? I have not heard another speaker in here other than yourself. Are you now asking me that question?

Mr. HINDS: I am addressing the Chair, and that is all I am doing. That is part of my address to the Chair. We agree, Mr. Chairman, that a car must be provided. If a Lincoln Continental did not stand up to the test, then why invest money in a Lincoln Continental again? Is it the fault of the car's performance, or is it the fault of the driver? Why invest money in another Lincoln Continental if the first one did not stand up? The statement that the official car has done 46,489 miles in that short period poses a very big question. All of these things call for some serious investigation. How is the Mission being run? At least it would appear as if it is being run on wheels. This Resolution indicates that it is being run on wheels, but at the taxpayers' expense. We would certainly like to know that the Government does not lend itself to wasting taxpayers' money in this direction. (*Asides*)

Mr. Chairman, I cannot suggest that any particular officer be withdrawn. I am not concerned with who is at this Mission. The car must be provided for whomsoever is there, but it must be borne in mind that the official car is owned by the taxpayers of this country; and it

must be cared and respected. That is what we are concerned with, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to see the Government give every sort of consideration to what has been said on this side of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that I am going to vote against this aspect of this Resolution. I have been one of the people who feel very strongly about the question of the cost of overseas representation, probably, because I represent a constituency where there is a tremendous need for social services, etc. Now, I know the car in particular, Sir. I drove in it when it was new. In fact, I had an opportunity to go to the house then occupied by the Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I was astounded, Sir — as one who represents one of the constituencies in this country which need more social services and development than any other constituency and which, incidentally, is still being ignored by the Government — when I arrived at the house in the Lincoln Continental. The car was then relatively new; it was air conditioned; a tape deck, a radio and other amenities were installed in it.
5.30 p.m.

When I arrived at the house I was astounded. I got out of the car in the car port to enter this palatial mansion owned by the Barbados Government in which the Permanent Representative lives, and there was carpet from the time you got out of the car outside the house and inside the house is beautifully carpeted. You would have thought it belonged to a country like Venezuela or one of the other countries, not Barbados with the poor people who live in the type of houses you have here.

On the question of the motor car, I remember when this Resolution came to the House in 1970 and I enquired then of the Prime Minister why is it that the Barbados Government is changing the car every two years, the Prime Minister gave me an answer which I accepted then. He said that the Barbados Government would buy a car through diplomatic channels and get off things like excise tax, purchase tax and so on, and you would buy a Lincoln Continental for \$US5,600 when in actual fact that car on the open market would cost almost \$US10,000, and then he went on to say that the reason why you changed every two years is that at the end of the two-year period when you were going to sell it you could sell it on the open market and get a value almost equal to what you paid for it. I accept this at the time as being a reasonable explanation, but if we apply the explanation given by the Prime Minister then that this car which was bought in April 1970 for \$US5,600 which would have amounted at the time when the dollar was two for one to over \$10,000EC, you were buying a

car that cost about \$20,000 EC but getting it for \$US5,600. So that now that we have come two years later to sell the car, what has happened is that the car has not depreciated by \$US3,000, but whoever used the car in the United States has depreciated the car by over \$8,000 because you are now getting \$US2,100 on the open market. Are you asking us to sit down in here and agree to that? That is my objection to it. I don't care how much the repairs cost, because in two years, the persons using it have so recklessly and wantonly misused it that it has depreciated by \$US8,000 in two years, and you are going to ask me to vote money to buy another new car to do the same thing with? Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Government could be serious. I would never in this House vote any money to buy cars like this or to purchasing houses until I see some benefit being derived by the people in Bridgetown.

Mr. Chairman, it is no strange coincidence that the present Permanent Representative to the United Nations — I do not want to accuse anybody personally — who must take the responsibility for the depreciation of this car to some extent was the same man who refused to live in the house that the taxpayers bought in London for over \$200,000. The same gentleman when he was High Commissioner to London refused to live in that house and the Government of this country had to rent another flat for him somewhere else in London. Mr. Chairman, these people may be highly qualified academically, but I do not think the Government of this country can afford such a luxury.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: On a point of order, I would like to point out to the hon. member that Mr. Ramsay has not been occupying the post for two years. Before that, he was in London and he was only transferred there last year; so it is a bit unfair to be accusing him specifically.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to mention Dr. Ramsay's name. I did not want to say specifically that Dr. Ramsay was only there from last year, because according to the Addendum here it is only from last year that you had to spend the money; but since the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has called the name of the gentleman and pointed out in the Resolution that he was only there for a year, then I would be more specific. That gentleman must accept responsibility. The Addendum states that between April 1971 and May 1972, at a period of time when the gentleman was the holder of the post, this happened. I did not want to call names, but what I say is that the gentleman is a luxury which Barbados cannot afford, and sooner or later

the Government must realise that he is too great a burden on the taxpayers of this country. Barbados bought a house in London and he would not live in it and you had to look for a flat for him, while the house remains vacant. He complained of the house being too cold and too far from London. You bought a car in New York and it has depreciated by \$8,000 in two years with the majority of the depreciation, according to the Government, coming from last year April when all the repairs had to be effected.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this Resolution must be looked at even in a wider sphere, because I think the time has come when we must look at the cost of our overseas representation and see whether we are getting adequate value for the money we are spending on overseas representation. When I heard the Minister read out the list of cars, I thought it was one of the Latin American Dictatorships or one of those rich countries. What is the justification for the Government to purchase a Lincoln Continental which has depreciated to such an extent in two years or so much has gone wrong with it, and they are going to purchase another Lincoln Continental?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, if the hon. member would recall, I mentioned that the Government needed this money to purchase a new official car. I never suggested that the new car will be a Lincoln Continental and it is for that reason that I read out the list of the names of the cars under consideration. It was the hon. member for St. Peter who introduced the question of buying another Lincoln Continental.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope the Leader of the House will tell us whether the car has yet been purchased. Mr. Chairman, if a little country like ours is trying to buy a Lincoln Continental, a Buick or a Mercedes and then the Government will tell the people that they have no money to invest in fixing the roads or providing houses for the people, then it is a sad state indeed. During the last elections I spoke at a meeting in a place called Drax Hall Tenantry, and I wonder, how you, Mr. Chairman, would like to tell the residents of Drax Hall that in two years the Government of this country is spending about \$40,000 on two motor cars. How can you justify to people who live in the middle of canefields without light and water that this socialist Government can spend money buying motor cars, buying houses overseas and yet in the middle of Drax Hall Tenantry they do not have water nor light? I was told that the lights were turned on at election time but that they are off again. For the sake of the people who live there, I hope this is not true. However, that is only by the way.

How do you think members would feel to tell their constituents that we passed last week some more money to buy motor cars, and the people about here have to pay high bus fares? How can we justify voting for this? A classic example is that the member for St. Lucy was today begging for amenities for St. Lucy; what sort of priorities has this socialist Government? You should see the squalor and all sorts of conditions under which some of my constituents live, and you would be quite right in telling me I would be out of my senses to vote for this Resolution.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members of the Opposition who spoke, I can well understand how they feel. If I were an Opposition member I would be just as aggressive, but the member for St. James intimated that he did not know how many times I drove in the Lincoln Continental. Unfortunately, I did not drive in it and I am sorry about that, but I want to tell him that I drove in the Mercedes in London which was taking a party of us to a meeting in Manchester, and that has done just over 1,300 miles in two years and it broke down with us on the road. The cost to repair that now would be nearly as much as would buy a new car. Do you believe that you are the only people who are interested in the taxpayers' money? We are interested as taxpayers too. Fortunately we are the Government and none of us are fools. The Minister of External Affairs is not here, and I am not the Minister of External Affairs, but fortunately I was in London and I drove in the Mercedes which was considered a reasonably new car having done just over 1,300 miles and we had to hire another car to get where we were going. A car is something that people make, it is a mechanical thing to move around in, some can be good and out of 1,000 good ones you will get a bad one, so you must consider these things. You are considering the people's money and we are considering the people's money, and if anybody should argue about money it is the Government. The people that we put in jobs to do things for us, some of the Barbadians, whom we think, we can rely on, they are the people who are letting us down because they think they can give you the Government, but the Government belongs to us for a long time.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point I want to reply to. The Member for the City said that in the last year the depreciation of the value of the Lincoln Continental was in the vicinity of \$8,000. From the notes here I notice that in the last year the depreciation was \$3,267 which is by no means half of \$8,000.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member for St. Lucy who is in another

capacity as Secretary for Education should read more carefully than that, it is the repairs that is \$3,000, not depreciation.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Probably I read it incorrectly, but the point is that I think that one of the points which one has got to take into consideration is that in the United States the depreciation of cars is considerably great for the simple reason that cars are produced in bulk there and after a while a car, no matter how expensive it is, depreciates in value and this could be the reason for the depreciation which has taken place with this particular car.

5.50 p.m.

It seems to me that this would be a reasonable explanation for this depreciation.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw attention to this Resolution from a different angle. First of all, it is strange that we are being asked to vote a sum of \$13,000 to buy another official car. It is also strange that we need another official car involving the same personnel out of which there arose arguments in London over two cars. That is a strange problem here. Mr. Chairman, the note here is inadequate in all its phases. They say that the garage valued this car at between \$1,900 and \$2,100, and they need to replace it by a suitable car for \$6,400(US). Nothing has been said as to whether they intend to trade in the present car now in use. It looks as though you are going to end up with two cars similar to the London situation where you have two cars.

The next point at which we have to look, Mr. Chairman, is that the Leader of the House read out the repairs in order to justify the Resolution to provide money for changing this car. As far as I know, there is the Cadillac which is the No. 1 car in the States and the Lincoln Continental is No. 2 (Asides) Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing that this House has certain privileges. I am sure if anybody had taken this note outside and the proprietors of the Lincoln Continental had seen it, they would obviously bring an action against the person who wrote this. The Lincoln Continental is just like the Rolls Royce, and you do not hear about a Rolls Royce breaking down.

According to what was read by the Leader of the House, the car was bought in April 1970, and in April 1971 the repairs started. In April 1971 they changed three tyres. In 1972 the car is now doing 46,489 miles, so those tyres would have done, probably, 23,000 miles, and there would have been a claim on those tyres. Nobody is going to buy an expensive Lincoln and have two or three tyres blown out during a year without making a claim on them.

If a transmission went bad within a year, you should make a claim on it. Look at the battery, Mr. Chairman. Practically all of the major repairs that have been read to us can be the subject of a claim.

Mr. Chairman, it is shameful to think that the Barbados Government has bought a car as expensive as this one only to find that at the end of the first year it is being saddled with expensive repairs, and we are told that it has not made a claim against the suppliers of the car! The hon. member for St. Andrew will tell you that if that sort of thing had happened to his expensive car, he would have driven it back to the garage and told the proprietors that he did not want it. It was not fit for the purpose for which he had bought it. Mr. Chairman, are we selling the old car, or are we buying a new one and keeping both? The holder of that post must have two cars at all times. The Leader of the House and I were in England together and we could not get into one of the cars. We could not find the two cars, and not even the holder of the post could find one when he needed one. Very often he cannot get either of the cars, and he has to borrow another officer's car in order to go around. His wife drives about her Guyanese friends in the cars. The Leader of the House knows about this, and it is time the Government does something about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that has been said on this side of the House. Since 1960 the Government has not done a major road in St. Joseph. From the time I came into this House in 1970 the greatest argument that has ever come here is on the question of this Government paying out money for certain people to buy expensive cars in which to drive around the world. The people in St. Joseph cannot get from Dark Hole up the hill, because that road has been broken down for 10 years and the Government cannot spend any money on that road in order to have it repaired so that the people can use it. I am going to vote against this as a matter of principle.

In the light of the reasons set out here, it is only the Great United States Government that would tell you that after buying an expensive car and having all of these expensive repairs in two years – the car has depreciated by a considerable amount – it would dispose of it and ask for another \$13,000 to buy another car. I think it is a scandalous Resolution to bring before this House at this time.

The question that Head 24 – Ministry of External Affairs – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. WEEKES – 9.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN – 4.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I declare the Ayes have it.

HEAD 25 – MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Head 25 – Ministry of Home Affairs – was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of \$2,150 comes as a result of an Enquiry into the Physical Development Plan. This Enquiry required the services of three people: a Judge, a Clerk to the Judge, and a Shorthand Writer. The Enquiry took 12 days to complete, and this money is being paid for their services. The amount is not calculated on a *per diem* basis, but it is given as a lump sum or honoraria for their services.

I beg to move that this amount stand part of the Resolution.

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

Mr. ADAMS: What has happened to the results of the Enquiry? Have they been published, Mr. Chairman?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, the Judge who conducted the Enquiry has submitted his Report, and the Report is presently engaging the attention of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that is a very oblique answer. I asked: Has it been published? The Minister has not even said it will be. He said it is at present engaging the attention of the Ministry of Home Affairs. I now ask the Minister: Does he intend to publish the Report, or do we have to wait six years for the Report just as we had to wait six years for the Plan? Does he intend to publish the Report of the Enquiry? We are being asked to vote money for a public function, and we want to know if we are going to see the results of the taxpayers' money.

6 p.m.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: After it has engaged our attention a decision will be reached on whether it will be published or not.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, what kind of joke is this? There is legislation which refers to the Physical Development Plan. The Town Planning Act is specifically conditioned to the publication of a Development Plan. All the advice which the Ministry has got on Town Planning for years has been that guidelines of policy be published and that areas which are subject to particular or specialised planning restrictions be published so that people can know what they are doing. There is nothing more rewarding than certainty in Government, and the Minister should know that discretion, while very exciting to someone entering office for the first time, becomes very burdensome when you realise that the exercise of discretions can drag you down off a pillar that you might once have occupied, that people make the most unpleasant accusations against persons especially in Barbados in the Ministry of Home Affairs relating to decisions having been taken within the discretion. Accusations have been made, and all hon. members are aware of them, that little sums of money have to get paid out from time to time in connection with town planning work. Now something that can stop all those accusations is the publication of a Physical Development Plan, the publication of the guidelines under which the Town Planner and ultimately the Minister exercises his discretion. If you have the plan you know what you can do in this area, you know what you cannot do, you know what conditions you have to satisfy, and you know that if the conditions are satisfied that the discretion will be exercised in your favour. Ministers protect themselves by that.

Some day I predict that the Minister of Home Affairs is going to find himself on the receiving end of a law suit where it is alleged in respect not perhaps of town planning but of citizenship that he has not exercised his discretion in certain matters, because Courts have often held that you can examine a Minister's course of action even though it appears that he has been given an unfettered discretion. Courts have often punished, — and I use the word "punish" in a general sense; I do not mean punished for wrong doing — where the Minister appears on the face of it to have exercised discretions, declared he has not exercised his discretion, therefore his decision must be upset. If you do not publish the Physical Development Plan, the results of the enquiry and a guideline for town planning, you will continue to get blockages in the Department. The Town Planning Division of the Ministry of Home Affairs is not in as bad a condition as the Department dealing with citizenship, because it has not had a volcano

suddenly create a new island in the middle of what was a relatively placid lake, if I take an analogy from a neighbouring territory, but you can get just as much clogging of the town planning wheels, if people do not know what is needed and what is going to be done as to citizenship.

We had the example of the Prime Minister when he made his extremely useful and valuable contribution to the debate on the Estimates which I have held out before and will hold out again as examples to his young Minister of how to speak to the House. He would not have given the reply the Hon. Minister just gave. You had him drawing to the attention of hon. members and the public that a whole development was created in St. Philip at the end of where the new airport is going to be which will render the houses uninhabitable and the Government is therefore going to be put to enormous expense to pay compensation to the people in Ocean City who will no longer be able to live comfortably because jets will be at maximum noise level immediately over their houses. Hon. members may recall the Prime Minister saying that this was a result in his view of town planning foul up. If you had the Physical Development Plan published that could never happen again because nobody would be able to say "look I got permission, I did not know the airport was there." That is why there is a necessity. The Development Plan is already out of date. If there is now going to be further delay in holding up the publication of the enquiry, town planning will continue to be in a mess, and you can continue to get this terrible and dreadful waste of the taxpayers' money as you get where you put a development that precludes housing in an area where housing has previously been allowed, or indeed you refuse over a long period of years to give permission to build houses at the behest of the Ministry of Agriculture in some area, and then it is realised that the area was never suitable for agriculture or was only marginally suitable and should have been used for houses all along; but by that time the man may have sold his land. I say this quite neutrally. I see the Minister of Agriculture looking at me with some apprehension, but before he was Minister of Agriculture or in one of the periods when he was not Minister of Agriculture, the Ministry of Agriculture had adopted a somewhat restrictive view when it had to consider a reference made to it by the Town Planner in respect of releasing agricultural land. It was a very restrictive policy coming out, and appeals never even got to be heard because no sooner than the appeals appeared, it was realised that they were well founded, but people may not have had the resources and may have heard what the Minister said and may not have continued with their applications. These people have suffered a loss in those circumstances.

A proper Development Plan would have revealed that this is not an area where the Government contemplated agricultural development in perpetuity or in the long term. All of this is what has been pressed by Opposition members. Senator St. John has pressed it in here all through the last Parliament. Eventually when the Physical Development Plan came out, they brought it out like it was a secret document. They had it tied up in the Library of the House of Assembly in brown paper parcels and members had to go and tear open the parcels themselves to get out the copies. This is before certain hon. members were in the House. Are we to have the same thing happening all over again?

Obviously Mr. Justice Williams has to be paid. The Court Clerk is getting \$250; he had a lot of difficulty as far as I am concerned. I do not believe that Mr. Justice Williams' salary is six times the salary of the Court Clerk, but I see he is getting six times as much. Anyhow that has no doubt been worked out. These amounts are not by any means extravagant amounts considering the work that all of us saw having to be done at the town planning hearing, and we would approve them, but we cannot approve the attitude of the Minister that he has to play a defensive bat on something like this. He should be telling us straight that at the earliest possible opportunity, the results of the enquiry will be published and the Physical Development Plan in whatever form or with whatever amendments, will be designated so that it can be a proper guide to the Town Planner and the people of Barbados.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, just as a short reply, I see that the intentions of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition are good, and I would like to say that as he should be well aware a Physical Development Plan has disadvantages. It takes a lot of time to be prepared and very often by the time it has been prepared, you find that the date that has been used in the preparation of the Plan has become outmoded, and then a lot of amendments have to be made. In fact it is observed now in European countries that you get away from a Physical Development Plan, and you use what is referred to as a broad brusque structure plan, which is just a statement of what you intend to do with a particular area, and if you decide to come around to doing these things, then you prepare a detailed plan of how these things should be carried out. Now we have had an enquiry conducted into the Physical Development Plan and as a result of this enquiry, we have to accept that some changes will have to be made to the Physical Development Plan based on the submission of the Judge, who conducted the enquiry.

Another point is that the Seawell Development Plan, which has come into place recently, was not there when the Physical Development Plan started and this again means that other alterations will have to be made to the Physical Development Plan. It is the intention of this Government to bring the Physical Development Plan in its completed form before the House of Assembly for approval, but in the meantime, a lot of work still has to be done, and I would like to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are well aware of the need to have a clear-cut policy where land is concerned in this country, and I would ask him to bear with us in the meantime while this is being prepared for publication for the members of the House and also for the public.

6.10 p.m.

The question that Head 25 — Ministry of Home Affairs — 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 \$34,585 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 3

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$33,583, and the Addendum sets out the position quite clearly. The University of the West Indies submitted a claim which is payable by this Government in respect of expenditure incurred on a Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme for the University for the period ending 31st July, 1970. According to the Colonial Development and Welfare Act this Government is required to bear a reasonable share of the cost of the expenditure, and Barbados' share this year has been calculated at 7% and 36% respectively, so this is to refund the British Government. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr.

CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three resolutions in Committee of Supply, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTES TO HEAD 35

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively simple resolution which is to amend the notes to Items 6A and 7 of sub-head (2) — Primary, Adult and Special Education, and to Items 8 and 9 of sub-head (3) — Secondary Education in order to ensure that the amount of money appropriated by Parliament for certain purposes should be properly spent.

The notes as they appear now are misleading, inadvertently so. As the Addendum states, the amount provided under Item 6A — Books and Publications of Head of Expenditure 35(2) of the Approved Estimates 1972-73, does not in fact include any provision for stationery as stated in the note to that Item, such provision is however included under Item 7 — Apparatus and Material of that Head which also contains provision for scheme books which is not included in the Note to the latter Item, and this resolution is in order to rectify that situation.

Under Item 8 of Head 35(3) provision for stationery is not listed in the note to that Item. This was inadvertently omitted, and the note to Item 9 although that last Item does not include such a provision, the purpose of this particular resolution is to make an amendment and correction of that also. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting, and I believe the members of the Opposition would like to proceed with their business at this stage.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be selfish to other private members because it is not generally the intention to proceed at length, but I think I am right in saying that a Private Member's Bill has priority over other Private Members' Business, and if it is not controversial, I would like to get the Select Committee appointed

to deal with this Bill. I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the first Item of Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

THE MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill of which I gave notice and moved the first reading at the last sitting of the House. As the Objects and Reasons set out, on the 14th day of December, 1971 the Honourable the House of Assembly passed a Resolution calling for the raising of the age of marriage in Barbados from 12 years for females and 14 years for males to a uniform age of 16. I will not now go over the arguments that were used on that occasion. This Bill seeks to amend the Marriage Act, 1904 (1904-9), and a new section 17A which is drafted in the form of the Marriage Act of 1904-9 is to be inserted. I am suggesting to hon. members that this Bill be not brought into force until 1st January, 1973, the reason for this being that there may well be 13 year old girls and 14 year old boys who wish to get married and they should be given a few months to carry out their business.

6.20 p.m.

There are other reasons, Sir, but, in keeping with the Rules, this matter has to go to a Select Committee in any case, if given a Second Reading. I will not go into them now, but I will go into them at Committee level.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. If the Leader of the House would be kind enough to

indicate which hon. members on the other side he would wish on the Committee, certainly I would respectfully suggest the Minister of Home Affairs. I do not know if the Minister of Health wishes to make the point of view of the Département of Health, or perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Health. If the Leader of the House would suggest the names we could work out the size of a Committee. I would suggest no more than 5 persons presided over by Your Honour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Home Affairs, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health, and the Minister of Lands and Housing, etc., if he is willing to serve.

APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. ADAMS: May I formally move that the hon. members for St. Michael North Central, St. Michael North West and St. Michael North East, and the hon. members for St. James, St. Philip North and St. Thomas be the Select Committee to consider and report to the Honourable the House of Assembly on the Bill to amend the Marriage Act, 1904.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I take it, Sir, that the hon. member has concluded Private Members' Business.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have concluded Private Members' Business, but I would suggest Question Time, as I have been informed that questions are ready. If the Rules will permit, I move that Question Time be now taken for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there is only one question. As soon as the question has been thoroughly answered, we will adjourn, I take it. I see no point in making it 20 minutes.

The question that Question Time be now taken for 20 minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been informed that the answer to Question No. 2 is now ready. It stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Thomas.

PAINTING AND REPAIRING OF THE HOUSING AUTHORITY'S HOUSES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Minister of Housing:—

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that I was laying the answer to the question. It was not a question for oral reply and I, therefore, laid the answer to the question.

INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE AT THE PUBLIC BATH IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 18.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Will the Minister take the appropriate steps to have a public telephone installed at the Public Baths known as Clifton Hill Bath situate at Walkes Spring in the parish of St. Thomas for the use and benefit of local residents?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 18 asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas is as follows:

The Barbados Telephone Company Limited has undertaken to provide a public paid telephone for the area. The telephone is expected to be in use by the last quarter of this year.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Parliamentary Secretary or Acting Minister most cordially for his kind attention both to the question and to the problem raised therein. It is not often that a question in the House can obtain such an immediate result. I am sure that the residents of Clifton Hill and Walkes Spring in the parish of St. Thomas will be extremely grateful to

the hon. member. Perhaps he can come and open the telephone in the fullness of time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 1st August, 1972, at 2.30 p.m.

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

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my letter dated 14th July, 1972, I signified to you my intention of raising the following subject on the adjournment of the House today. The subject was the administration of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with special reference to the lack of adequate medical staff and in particular in respect of the Casualty Department. This question arises, Mr. Speaker, from an incident which occurred on the 6th July, 1972, when, in response to a telephone call from a person who was then at the Casualty Department, I went to the Department. When I arrived there I discovered that for some two hours no doctor had been on duty.

If I may give the House a picture of what happened during the interval of time, it was about 9.30 p.m. when I received the telephone call as a result of which I telephoned the Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I could not get him, and I think he was out. I spoke to the nurse in charge of the Casualty Department, who verified the fact that no doctor had come on duty at eight o'clock in the night. I then enquired of her who could assist me in this matter, and she told me to telephone the Matron's Department.

Sir, I am not one who would come in here and abuse civil servants.
6.30 p.m.

I would say that whatever criticism can be made of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I think by and large the nursing care as distinct from medical attention nobody can criticise, and I say this as one who attended the casualty for the last four weeks, and I can safely say that I have absolutely no complaint of the nursing care. On this particular night when I telephoned the Matron's office and spoke to the person on duty I told her that I was concerned about the fact that a number of persons were at the Casualty Department awaiting treatment and no doctor had turned up, and that some of these people had been there, I was told, from 10 o'clock in the morning and up to 10

o'clock that night had not yet seen any doctor, and at that stage, there was no prospect of seeing one. I was somewhat shocked and amazed at the reply the person gave me. I spoke to this person for about five minutes trying to find out who was in charge of the Casualty Department and to whom I should speak about the state of affairs that existed at the Casualty, and to this day I have not received any assistance whatever as to whom I should contact or speak to. In fact the person who spoke to me said, when I said it was grossly unfair that people should be waiting so long, that if they waited there so long there was nothing wrong with waiting longer. This is not the attitude which should be adopted when dealing with poor people, because if it were somebody that had money, this sort of thing would not have happened; but they were dealing with people who could not afford to pay other doctors and who went to get free medical attention at the Hospital, and this is the sort of treatment meted out to them.

Let me say that the person who called me about 9.30 p.m. that night began by telling me "skipper, I should not really phone you because I do not belong to your political party and I know you will use this against my party because I am a Dem, but I think it is grossly unfair to the people who are here at the Casualty who cannot get any treatment." He said that the reason why he called me was that he had asked what about a doctor and he was told by the person responsible that there was no doctor and they did not care if a doctor came or not; but the Minister will get in here and say that Dr. Lele went out. Do you want me to tell you why he went out? I phoned Dr. Lele, but with the system at the Hospital, when you phone to get a doctor, the operator will phone up the doctor and find out if she can get the number first of all. I do not blame them for that, but I have no doubt that the operator at the Hospital told Dr. Lele whom I was, and as a result I told Dr. Lele that it was grossly unfair to people to be in the Casualty and no doctor to attend them. I will say that Dr. Lele was very helpful. He said that the matter was drawn to his attention and that he would come. When I arrived at the Casualty about 10.20 p.m. Dr. Lele was there, but what he did not know was that when he was talking to the Director of the Hospital and telling him that he would not come out again in such conditions if the Director did not get people to staff the Casualty, I was sitting next to him. He said that a politician called Mottley had phoned him.

The Acting Prime Minister can tell you that so concerned was I about this situation that I called him the same night; but you see it is not merely enough for the Minister to make a statement in the Press Release on 12th July, 1972, saying that

patients occasionally have to remain unattended for long periods at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As I said, up to that night I had attended the Hospital for treatment to my foot for 21 days consecutively and was seeing what was happening in the Casualty, and that was the first night I had not gone and I was called. I knew the circumstances in the Casualty and I knew the number of people who used to be there every night for the last 21 days. I also saw the night before the reaction of the people and how much noise they kept because they were dissatisfied with the fact that they had to wait so long, and it is no answer to this situation merely to say that people are going to the Hospital who are not emergency cases.

Let me say this: if you are providing a service there for medical outpatients, do not make people come and sit down for hours and tell them they cannot get it. Tell them straight that you cannot afford to provide the service and let them go to their own doctors; but if you are providing a service, you should provide an adequate service. It is grossly unfair for anybody to be made to sit in the Casualty from 10 o'clock a morning and not see a doctor until 10 o'clock the night. This is a daily happening and I take issue with the Minister on this. It is not a case of periodic shortage of medical staff, nor is it a case of this happening occasionally. I walked around and listened to people who were there sitting in the Casualty complaining how long they had to wait at the Hospital.

Now, Sir, in his statement the Minister talks about a 20 percent deficiency in medical staff. I challenge the Minister on this. There is no 20 percent deficiency in the Casualty Staff. Let the Minister get up and give the complement of the Casualty staff at the moment. You have, as I understand it, a consultant in medicine, a consultant on surgery, a Registrar, and up to two or three days ago, two senior House Officers. I am not dealing with the House Officers or the interns now, because I will deal with them later. There is no 20 percent deficiency because I believe that the establishment at the Hospital carries about six or eight senior House Officers to work in the Casualty, and there was one who left on the 15th of the month who was working there; so there is only one now. You have one post filled out of six or eight senior House Officers, and this is not a situation that exists for the first time. This is a continuing situation which is due, as I will deal with in a few minutes, to the general administration of the Hospital and the approach which the Government has towards the Hospital.

When I said in my press statement that I was concerned about the attitude to people towards

the treatment of poor people in this country when it comes to medical affairs, it is not sufficient merely to state as far as I am concerned that there is a world-wide deficiency of doctors. The Government should examine their whole recruitment programme at the Hospital. That is where the deficiency exists because everyone knows that when you are dealing with House Officers or interns, the Director of the Hospital can engage these people himself; but when you come to the senior House Officers, people who are going to work for six months, the Medical Staff Committee makes the recommendation. That recommendation I understand passes through the Director of the Hospital, then on to the Ministry of Health, then it must go to the Establishments Division and then to the Minister of Home Affairs to grant a work permit. All that takes about three months. Do you mean to tell me that a doctor overseas applying for a job here for six months has to wait three months on the Hospital to get an answer? Invariably the man who is recommended for the job has already taken a job by the time it is approved by the Establishment and by the whole redtape of the Civil Service administration. If you know for a fact that there is a world-wide deficiency of doctors, the question is how are you going to combat this.

6.40 p.m.

It is not right that a number of new House Officers who have gone to work at the Hospital since 1st July have been put to work in Casualty at night by themselves. This is an unfair situation, not only to the people they must treat but to the doctors themselves. Quite sometime ago the interns kicked against this, and there was a directive from the Director of the Hospital that interns should not work in Casualty by themselves for the first 6 months, but this is not being observed because up to last night an intern was asked to work in the Casualty and he refused.....

One of the reasons why interns refuse to work in the Casualty is that the Medical Defence Union that covers doctors in cases of negligence etc., refused to cover interns working in the Casualty Department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Government has not made it clear to these interns that if they are guilty of any negligent practice that the Government will cover the liability 100%, and that is the reason why interns decided they will not work in Casualty, because the Medical Defence Union does not cover them, and secondly the Barbados Government will not accept responsibility for any negligence, and it is under these circumstances that the interns refused to work in Casualty. It is grossly unfair to the intern himself to put him to work by himself in the Casualty Department, and it is unfair to the patients as well.

This is not all, the Government believe they can hide things. When they talk about a deficiency of doctors, how is it that there were two qualified Barbadians with specialist degrees in surgery, and neither one could get a job at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? If it is a question of changing the establishment, why not change the establishment? It was changed to accommodate some consultants, why can it not be changed to accommodate two qualified Barbadians in surgery? One of the same gentlemen who applied for the job as consultant in Casualty has had to leave the hospital with a Fellowship in Surgery and has gone into private practice purely because there were people who came out here with less experience than he had and walked straight into a consultant's job at the hospital. This gentleman bears no grudge against the hospital, because he is one of the two doctors at the hospital who will do part time work at the hospital, so the Government cannot tell us that they are short staffed at the Casualty and that is why people have to wait. This is not a situation that arises periodically, this existed at the Hospital for the last two or three years and the Government is doing nothing about it.

You have at the moment two doctors in private practice who go in, what efforts are being made by the Government to get more doctors in private practice to go in and work? When you come to legal aid, there are lawyers in Barbados who work for a lot of money but who will as a civic duty to the community put their names down on the Legal Aid Scheme and do a murder case for \$75. Do you mean that some of the consultants at the Hospital cannot work, if there is a shortage of staff? Are they so great and have gone so high that even if there is a shortage of staff at the Casualty, they cannot do an hour or two to assist us? Ours is a developing society and we cannot expect to have the same rigid guidelines as a developed society, and the same way the lawyers can give of their time to do a Legal Aid murder case for \$75, why can the doctors not assist the Casualty Department? This is one of the reasons why in the Barbados Labour Party we say that we need a free national health service and we will for ever advocate that.

As I understand the position, the Government says this is a periodic thing, but every year for the past two or three years whenever interns go into the hospital they are being told they must work in the Casualty temporarily. This is no periodic thing, this is something that has existed at the Hospital and unless a bold attempt is made to remedy it, it will get worse and worse, and it is no answer merely to say that cases that are not genuine emergency cases go to the Casualty and that is why you get this problem. If you take a look at the

statement made by the Minister today, he says that it is known that the ultimate solution to the Casualty problem lies largely in a physical separation of the services catering to emergencies from those which deliver general medical care, but this is a joke. What will happen is that you are going to relieve the pressure on the Casualty but you will put the pressure on the medical out-patients, because if you are saying that a large number of people, who go to the hospital now, are not emergency cases, once you build a medical out-patients clinic, you are going to create the pressure there unless again you have adequate staff, and you cannot get adequate staff by sitting back.

Let me show you how ridiculous the administration at the hospital is, Sir. There is a doctor who has just recently left the hospital, and I asked a question during my investigation about the arrangements which should have been made when this doctor was leaving. I asked if this doctor had been replaced, since he left on 15th July, and the answer I got was no. I asked then what steps had been taken to replace him and I was shocked when I discovered what happens at the hospital in these circumstances. If a man is leaving on 15th July, instead of the hospital two or three months before hand advertising for the post from 15th July, whoever is responsible for advertising waits until the man goes on 15th July and then advertises the post.

6.50 p.m.

Are you going to tell me that these people are concerned with the treatment meted out to the poor people of this country? How can you wait until a post is vacant and until a doctor has gone and then advertise for someone to fill the post and talk about being concerned about the people and about the general deficiency of doctors? If a doctor is needed, you should endeavour to appoint somebody especially when you know that there is a deficiency of doctors. You should try to appoint doctors as soon as possible so that there will be no time-lag, and the people will be receiving continuous treatment.

I am not satisfied merely with somebody saying that the incident occurred because the roster was changed. I do not think that is the answer to this situation at all. This will continue to happen at the Hospital as long as the Hospital is being run as it is at present as a Civil Service Department. That is what is wrong with the Hospital. You close it down at four o'clock, and you find people working in the Drugs Department going home at four o'clock. You have people waiting there from eight o'clock in the morning to get drugs; by four o'clock they do not get them, and yet you will find the place closed down at four o'clock.

I remember when I was in the Hospital in 1970 one week-end — it was Independence week-end — the nurse told me on a Tuesday morning that she could not change my sheets because all of the washers were off duty over the week end. You cannot run a hospital in that manner. You cannot run a hospital as an 8 to 4 department of Government! The hospital must be opened all night long and you must have shifts working. In the Hospital when the Casualty runs out of a small thing like elastoplast, you cannot get it. Sometimes you cannot get strapping plaster because the Drugs Department has closed down. It is a hospital and not a Ministry of Works working from 8 to 4, and there must be proper service day and night. The time has come when you must remove the Hospital from the hands of civil servants, and put it in the hands of a properly run Board. I am not talking of a Board consisting of yard fowls. I am talking of a Board with people who are capable of running it in a businesslike manner.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the Director of the Hospital. I know that if the Director of the Hospital had power to make appointments to the junior medical staff and the senior House Officers in the same way as he can deal with the internees, then the Hospital would be run on a better basis, but he has no power to do certain things. He has to go to the Ministry of Health, the Establishment Division, and to the Ministry of Home Affairs before he can get certain things done. You are asking people to come here to work for a 6-month period in the Casualty. Do you mean to say that you cannot trust the Director of the Hospital to be able to judge from a person's qualifications to bring somebody here to work for 6 months in the Casualty? Do you mean to say that people must go through the Establishment Division and all of that rubbish. There is no wonder you cannot get people to work here. If there is a deficiency of doctors and you recognise that, you give a man a job and three months later he gets a letter of appointment, do you think a doctor is going to sit down and wait for the Barbados Government to give him a letter of appointment in three months' time?

I say that the time has come when the Government must take the Hospital out of the hands of the civil servants and put it into the hands of a properly established Board to be run on a businesslike manner. Look at the Diagnostic Clinic; look at the other Clinics; look at the St. Joseph Hospital and see what is happening. The Minister of Home Affairs will know what I am talking about when he was doing private practice. There are two doctors working now: one is working in the morning on a sessional basis. I think a gentleman left us some time during the week. Try to bring in

some of the doctors who work from about eight in the morning to two in the evening. Ask the District Medical Officers and other doctors in private practice to help you at the Hospital. I know that some of them are making a lot of money and they will not come, but you will certainly get some of them to give assistance at the Hospital. There is no doubt about it that if they decide to come and work at the Casualty it will be a sort of advertisement because a lot of people will get to know them. There are doctors who are willing to assist the Government, and they should be brought in on a sessional basis to do two or three hours in the Casualty. You could even bring them in during the day so that the existing Hospital Staff can work during the night.

I believe that the Minister of Home Affairs will agree with me, because when he was not in politics or in the House this is a scheme I have heard him advocate over and over again. With regard to the deficiency of doctors, I understand — if I am wrong I should like the Minister to get up and correct me — that this very problem of staffing has led to the resignation of the head of the Pediatrics Department. If that is not correct, then the Minister can get up and correct me. They shifted around the people who were working with him and he decided not to stand for such nonsense, and he resigned because of the inadequate management of the Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I am amused when I see the Minister's statement to the effect that the Consultant said that there were only 23 patients found on arrival. What the Consultant did not know, and I do not know whether the Director knows about it, is that a woman had a baby in a motor car during the 2-hour period when there was no doctor. She had the baby in a car outside of the Casualty Department while she was waiting to see a doctor. He has not said anything about that, but he mentions the 23 people. I know that I counted 40 people, but I cannot say whether all of them were there for medical attention.

Mr. Speaker, I was told by the same member of the Democratic Labour Party who called me that, between eight o' clock and the time I arrived at twenty minutes after ten, a lot of people went away disgusted with the fact that there was no doctor at the Hospital. I think it is disgraceful in this day and age that a woman could go to the Hospital and have a baby in a motor car because of the lack of a doctor in the Casualty Department! It is a disgraceful state of affairs.

When I arrived at the Hospital I wondered what would have happened to the woman who was admitted by the doctor immediately. If I had not

phoned Dr. Lele, who came to the Casualty Department, I wonder what would have happened to the 10 patients who were admitted. Perhaps some of them would have gone back home or others may have died there. When I was walking through a ward I saw a woman in a wheel chair who was admitted suffering from severe hypertension. What would have happened to her?

Now, Sir, this idea of doctors not coming on duty is nothing new. This has been brought to the attention of the Ministry before. I know for a fact that an English doctor working at the Hospital refused to report for duty at a time when he should have gone on duty. He was reported to the Ministry by a Barbadian doctor who was working with him, and he was also reported to the Hospital Authorities, but the doctor left Barbados and nothing was done about the matter. He remained in the Hospital working for a while and then left Barbados when his contract had expired without anything being done about the matter.

7 p.m.

No wonder doctors believe they do not have to go on duty. When a doctor can be reported for failing to go on duty when he was telephoned by the nurse, and the Ministry did nothing about it, no wonder they feel they do not have to go on duty. As I said, Sir, we on this side are seriously concerned about this. We do not believe the answer is merely for the Government to make statements saying that there is a world-wide deficiency. That is not the cure for the Hospital. The cure is that you cannot afford to run the Hospital as any Department of Government. You cannot run it with that Civil Service mentality, the same mentality that the Prime Minister talks about as an army of occupation. That is the whole root of the trouble at the Hospital. It has to be changed completely and until that is done you can talk about as much deficiency as you like, but you are not tackling the problem. It has been identified as the lack of adequate medical staff. How are you going to solve it? How are you going to get around your recruitment programme? It cannot take you so long. This is nothing new. This is a situation that existed for two or three years at the Hospital and nothing has been done about it. You should do something about the recruitment of doctors in the interest of the poor people.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we on this side of the House will advocate in the highways and byways of this country the need for a national health service, and also in the case of the Hospital that it be taken out of the arms of the Civil Service. As an example of what I mean, for over ten weeks I wrote to the Hospital for a medical report and cannot get it. Even the police complain that they cannot get

reports from the Hospital. This is not right. The whole attitude needs examining. I know that doctors in this country are making money, but they must not lose sight of the fact that they owe something to the poor people of this country, and they should treat them properly; they are human beings, and but for the grace of God the doctors would be in the same position as the poor people, and they should treat them properly.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry it is not a Resolution that I could merely second the passing of it and end there, because this House has been given I feel more than enough to satisfy hon. members on that side of the House as to the serious view we take of the situation that is obtaining at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am sure that much of what the hon. member for Bridgetown has said I have been drawing to the attention of the last Government day in and day out. Complaints of every department of the Hospital have been given to me and I have been at pains to draw them to the attention of hon. members on that side, but sir, it would appear to us that because some hon. members might feel they do not have to attend at the Casualty Department and suffer the pains and be subjected to the indecencies which befall other people who have to go there that that might be one of the reasons why we still find that this Government is content with having, as the hon. member for Bridgetown has said, Civil Servants bringing their mentality to bear upon the administration of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we will have to have a full investigation into every aspect of everything that goes on in the Hospital, not merely the Casualty Department. I heard the hon. member make mention in his closing remarks about the difficulty encountered in getting reports from the Hospital to assist litigants in the Courts. This is a situation which I have brought before this House on more than one occasion where I have made it known that records at the Hospital have been stolen. Persons have gone to the Hospital and have become patients and the records of these persons have disappeared, and there is no record that those persons have been patients there. There is no record as to what was wrong with the patient to assist in a Court action or in an insurance claim or anything. That is the kind of institution that we are running. You will find that there are people going to the Hospital time and again to find that those who have got to depend on getting their cards before they can see a doctor are satisfied that this is not merely a question of people saying something for the sake of saying it. I am not throwing out anything against any employee of the Hospital or any Civil Servant or whoever it might be, but there are still

people at the Hospital who are accepting bribes from some of these poor people, and those who hand out the biggest bribe get their cards handed to them first, and that is where you get a lot of confusion and rowing, and those who are not able to pay for the finding of their cards have to suffer. Those are things that need investigation. You will find particularly at night at the Casualty Department, you go there and find pools of blood on the floor; there are nurses who find it extremely difficult to call on anybody to clear that pool of blood, so that if somebody accompanies another patient, there is a question of having to walk through that pool of blood. Sometimes there is a case of vomiting; so you have both the vomit and the pools of blood. The whole thing is in a mess at the Casualty Department. All these conditions that we try to point out, must in themselves weigh heavily on those persons who go there and have to wait unduly long to be attended.

I have witnessed for myself that time and again that when a doctor goes on duty in the Casualty Department, he is already a tired man, and he sees a crowd of people waiting on him. People can be noisy and you cannot prevent them from making noise. The Orderlies may try their best and the nurses may try to close the inner doors, but that cannot keep out the noises, and the doctor himself is put under additional strain; and I am telling you here and now that I have very grave doubts as to the diagnoses carried out by some of these doctors when they are called upon to function under such conditions.

7.10 p.m.

It is not easy. We appreciate the fact that there is a shortage of doctors, a shortage of medical staff, but there is something else operating against many of our doctors in this island. We have quite a number of doctors who are only working half day for a certain number of days each week, and the doctors will explain that it does not pay them to work for longer hours because the Income Tax Commissioner receives the greater portion of the extra dollars that they make. The Income Tax Commissioner has got to get a slice of the extra income they may earn, and you will find that there are many doctors who might be willing to assist at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but when they do so the money that they earn is of no use to them because they have to pay it back to the Government. All these things need investigating to see what are the main causes surrounding these doctors who try to shy away from this extra work and from the hospital work on the whole.

I have heard the hon. member for Bridgetown make mention of certain doctors who have resigned from certain responsible positions at

the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I can say that there are very serious stories surrounding all this. I feel it would shock certain hon. members on that side of the House if they were told what underlies many of the actions that are taken by some of these doctors when cases occur at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We bring these cases before them, but what do they do about them? It cannot be denied that there is a complete lack of discipline in the Casualty Department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is not easy for the nurse in charge, or the officer in charge, to be able to get Porters and Orderlies to function as they ought to. Some Orderlies feel that they have been there long enough and they need not be told by Staff Nurses and others what to do, and I am sure that it is just because of the Nurse's training in many cases and that she wants to uphold the traditions of her profession that she must shake her shoulders to avoid an open brawl with some of these people at times, and we must give them some sort of credit for this.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to see that young doctors who are not given an opportunity in Casualty are given every opportunity to work there but with the assistance which the consultant is there to give and that this assistance is given more readily. I say that advisedly. In other words, there is a greater need for the assistance of consultants to these young doctors in the Casualty Department than perhaps any other part of this institution, and the sooner these things can be looked into the better it will be for all concerned. If there was need for an admission that the hospital is mismanaged, is badly administered, that there is an admission of suffering by people who go to the Casualty Department, the Minister in his statement admits all of this, but he seeks to lay the blame in some measure on what he calls the world wide shortage of doctors. I believe that there will be a shortage of doctors as long as this world lasts. I do not believe that the world will ever be able to produce doctors as quickly and as readily as the demands of the population will crop up, but you will find that there is to be linked with the same situation in the Casualty and in the out-patients department, on the medical wards, some other things which arise in the same hospital.

You will find there are not enough druggists at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to dispense the medicine, so all of these are added burdens. It is responsible in some measure for the delay in patients getting better, because when a patient should normally have his medicine within an hour's time after he has been examined by a doctor, he has got to wait sometimes for two or three days before he receives that medicine. In truth and in fact, sometimes when the patient receives the

medicine the condition has become so acute that the medicine as prescribed by the doctor on a particular day does not then have the same effect as if it had been made available to the patient at the time when the doctor prescribed it for that patient. All these things have got to be taken into consideration if we want to have the hospital administered and functioning as a hospital should. We appreciate that it would take a lot of time and money, but we are not concerning ourselves now with the cost because it is a question of health, and we are not prepared to find ourselves counting the cost of health in dollars and cents, we just want to know that we have an institution that we can really be proud of, not merely of its architectural beauty and the equipment that is housed there or two or three good cases that the doctor may have, that is not good enough for us, there are certain underlying factors which need to be gone into if we are really to find ourselves getting anywhere, and we are urging that there be an investigation into every department of the hospital and the sooner this is gone into the better it would be for all concerned.

7.20 p.m.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I need not labour these points any more because the hon. member for the City, I think, has done justice to this matter. There is just one point here which I should like to throw some light on for the benefit of the Minister. I refer to where mention was made of the Casualty Department having 5 doctors in constant attention from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Even this, Mr. Speaker, is not 100 per cent correct. There are occasions during the day time — and this has been my own experience — when people have called me to the Casualty at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and there was no doctor present. I agree that the Minister has been so advised and that is the reason why he has said so. We know on this side of the House that it happens at night, and situations have occurred during the day time when there is no doctor present in the Casualty Department. These matters need being looked into.

With regard to the question of doctors working and getting extra pay, we would like the Minister to have a general review of all of these matters. We support the view that every case is not a genuine emergency case that comes to the Casualty Department, but we believe that 99.9 per cent of our people, if they had the means, would prefer to go to a private doctor 10 times before going to the Casualty Department and spending the greater part of any day or two-thirds of any night waiting to be attended to at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Our people do not go to the Hospital when they have money in their pockets. I think I am right in saying so. They go to the Hospital

when they do not have the money to pay a doctor. If they can find a doctor to open his door during the night, they would go to such a doctor.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you will find a man for whom life does not hold much, and even if he went to the Garrison and won a first prize he would still put in a few rums and find his way to the Casualty with his pocket filled with money. We cannot bring that chap into the debate at all, because that type is far too few. The majority of Barbadians would prefer to go to their own private practitioner and pay a fee although, Mr. Speaker, the fees now charged will cause some people to die if the Hospital does not improve itself to deal with these cases in a more appreciable manner. We would like the Minister to agree to our having an investigation into every aspect or function of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as soon as possible, because it might allay a lot of the fears of many people who have to go there.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go into some of the bad things that go on in certain other parts of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Those things are too wellknown. We have the dietitians; threats of poisoning and so on. I do not want to go into those things at this stage.

Mr. BOLDEN rose --

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member who has just risen has no right to speak on this matter. On the motion for the Adjournment only those people who have intimated their wish to speak have a right to speak.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to challenge your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: In fact, you cannot.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have listened rather attentively to the hon. member for the City and the hon. member for St. Peter, and there is a lot in what both hon. members have said. There is one thing in which I am concerned more than anything else. The hon. member for the City made reference to the fact that people are poor and said something about the inhuman attitude meted out to them by the Government. I should like to assure all hon. members in this Chamber that there is nobody who could be more humane and have greater regard for the poor people in this country than the hon. members on this side of this Chamber.

Unfortunatley, Mr. Speaker, in all of these Institutions run by the Government, people are no longer giving consideration to the honour and

decency of their professions or human relationship. Today it is just a question of money and no regard is paid to the decency of their professions. That is the unfortunate position that is taking place all over this Island. When the hon. member says that he got on the telephone and called somebody, that is not a matter of profession, but simply a question of breeding from the milk that they nurse. That is regrettable. How much would it have taken out of anybody to give an answer in a proper manner and to put the hon. member on the right track, if the person were interested in the people. Those are the people who could not care less. The only regard too many of them have got is for the pay cheque.

I have been into the Casualty myself, and I know that a lot of what has been said is true. What the hon. member for St. Peter has said here is true. You see a doctor coming in weary and tired and he has to look forward to attending a number of people who are waiting on him. He does not know how long it will take, and that in itself is a setback to a man with a profession as essential as a doctor. I am very concerned about it, and I do not want hon. members to think that I am the Minister and I do not care about the matter. I am rather perturbed about this matter. You have a doctor coming to work at eight o'clock at night, in a profession like medicine, and he has to work until eight o'clock next morning. Do you think that if I went into a hospital at five o'clock in the morning, I would allow a doctor who had been on duty from eight o'clock the night before to touch me? I do not feel that a man, in a profession as essential as that, who is tired and worn out, can render the best service to patients.

Mr. Speaker, I heard about the lady who had a baby on the way to the Hospital. The Director and the Matron know absolutely nothing about that. I would say that in a Casualty, even if you did not have a doctor there, that would have been an ordinary duty for the nurse to perform, unless it was a case where the patient had to be admitted by a doctor. This is common practice in midwifery.
7.30 p.m.

I do not see that that would have meant much in regard to keeping back because there was no doctor there in a baby case, because this is common practice in midwifery, and all the nurses trained in midwifery would be competent and capable of carrying out cases like that unless there were unforeseen circumstances involved during the passage. I would like to assure the hon. member that this is becoming common practice in Barbados that from week to week while being transported to the Hospital, persons have given birth to children. I have been hearing complaints from taxi drivers for the last couple of weeks and there is hardly a week

that one has not told me "One was born in my car this week", or "I have got to spend a lot of money in getting my car cleaned up". Some of them have come to me and they even expect the Hospital to clean their cars for them.

With respect to the night of the 6th, I arrived at home about 11.15 p.m. and there was a note by my telephone that my colleague the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister had called me up to go to the Hospital immediately. I left and went to the Hospital, and I can well agree with the hon. member that by the time the doctor got there a lot of the patients would have left, because some of them were there from 1 o'clock the day. I do not know how they can actually do it. Part of the solution would be that if you have 100 people visiting on a particular day to specify the hours for attendance, because you cannot see eighty people in an hour and I do not see that there is any sense issuing instructions for eighty people to visit the Casualty at the same hour, since one doctor will see them one after the other. There should be a schedule of so many people visiting in the first hour, so many the second hour and so on, and thus eliminate this behaviour by people having to go there from early, because people have children there and have nothing with which to feed them.

My Parliamentary Secretary and myself have been looking at this matter. She has visited the United Kingdom and looked at their hospitals and there may be recommendations which she can suggest. The hon. member is asking for a thorough investigation, but I do not know that an investigation is needed into this. People like myself and the hon. member know exactly what is needed there, and an investigation would only be wasting time. I think the unfortunate position is the hard Government routine in getting things done which is completely different from private enterprise. You see something, you know what is wrong and you can walk in and do it in private enterprise, but in Government you know what is wrong but you cannot do it like that because your hands are tied. It is a rather frustrating thing. The whole problem is not being able to get these things done.

The hon. member mentioned the question of doctors leaving in July and the fact that we have to replace them. If I got caught the first time that it took me six months before things could be cleared up, the next time I would move nine months in advance. If I know it would take me two hours to lower my sails before a squall bursts on me, I would not wait for the two hours to lower them if I knew this is the position three or four hours ahead. These are the obstacles you find in administering and carrying out what you yourself know but are not in a position to remedy it. You

have got to take the long routine of Government in handling it. I will look into the point made by the hon. member for St. Peter. He has mentioned that there are private practioners who are free and easy on evenings and would be glad to contribute something to the profession for which they have a regard. All these are ideas that are worth while checking on and seeing what can be done, but I would like to say this: the hon. member for Bridgetown says this has been continuous. This is not so. I would like to assure him that about three or four months ago I was making regular checks at the Hospital and some days after 1.30 or 2 o'clock the Casualty was quite clear. This is not something that has been going on like the village blacksmith. It has built up again during this particular period which is the time of renewal of contracts at the Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I will assure hon. members that I will investigate all the complaints that have been made including that about the lady that gave birth to the child there and see what can be done with regard to private practitioners and other sessions being given to relieve the situation, because I would feel afraid of a doctor that has got to be twelve hours on duty from 8 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock at night and still be on call in his own department for the next twelve hours. One blunder from a man like that could cost somebody's life and it could possibly be no fault of his.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Hon. Minister would give way for a minute, at the moment many doctors at the Hospital have to start on Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock and work until 4 o'clock in the evening, then from the Tuesday night at 8 o'clock until 8 o'clock Wednesday morning, and then he has to go to work from 8 o'clock on the Wednesday until 4 o'clock the next day.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order; that is a point of information the hon. member has risen on.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure hon. members that I will give the matter great consideration and see what can be done, but I ask hon. members not to use the political idea. It is your right equally as it is the right of hon. members over here. It is not a matter of poor people either. I know a lot about people working when they are over tired and the patients do not get the treatment they should have, and this is where relationships break down.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for four weeks' leave of absence from my duties as a member of the House commencing on 29th July, 1972.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, the leave of absence is granted the hon. member for Bridgetown with effect from the 29th July, 1972.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 1st August, 1972 at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.43 p.m.