THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76

CLERK OF PARLIAMENT 1 DEC 1973 BARBADOS

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th October, 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); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information amd Public Relations); Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, (Temporary Minister of Health and Welfare); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Home Affairs) and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1972.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bourne's Land, Christ Church, for the purpose of widening the St. Christopher's Boys' School playing field.

2. Resolution to approve the lease of a parcel of land at the Garrison Savannah, St. Michael, to the Barbados Rugby Football Club.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $95,234 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. 16, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $170,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 17, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with this Resolution in all of its stages today. A letter has been sent asking Your Honour's permission to deal with it; an intimation was made by the Prime Minister at the last sitting of the House, and an appropriate letter has also been sent to the Leader of the Opposition to that effect.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice that the Written Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 54 asked by the hon. member for Christ Church West is ready. I now lay the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 54.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution that the sum of one hundred and seventy thousand dollars be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1972-73 No. 17 which form the Schedule to this Resolution in all of its stages at this sitting.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Messrs. MOTTLEY and WALCOTT entered the Committee and took their seats.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, but, in view of the fact that it relates to the Port Department, I think the appropriate Minister, who is the Minister of Communications and Works, should deal with it. It is to approve of the expenditure of $53,243 required to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1972-73, Part I - Current of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES – PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this request for the sum of $53,243 is to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1972-73, Part I – Current of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution. The Addendum clearly sets out the purpose for which this money is needed. You will notice at Item 34 - Clothing and Uniform, this amount is needed to meet Crown Agents' accounts for Items during the financial years 1970-71 and 1971-72. The claim was not received in time for payment to be made before the end of the financial year, 31st March, 1972, and the present Estimates do not contain any provision for the payment of these sums.
2.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, supplementary provision in the sum of $1,584 is also required to complete payment to contractors who made uniforms for Port Department's employees during the financial year 1971-72. The rates of pay to contractors for making uniforms for Government Departments were increased after the commencement of the year. Consequently no provision was made and this requirement is to meet the payments for the previous financial year. It very often happens that the accounts for a financial year are not received until the consequent financial year, consequently when you pay out these amounts, there is a depletion of the amount voted by Parliament.

At Item 36 again this is to meet the Crown Agents' accounts for the financial year 1971-72 which were not received until after the new financial year, and consequently no money was provided because I think you know, Mr. Chairman, that if the money voted for a particular item is not spent by the 31st March in any one year, that money automatically lapses and cannot be used to meet commitments which had been incurred in the previous year. This very often happens where persons to whom the Government owes money send in their bills after the closing of the financial year.

At Item 42 again this is to meet a claim of $4,532 received after the financial year commenced, and the present provision was inadequate and consequently supplementary provision is needed.

Under Item 57 the sum of $33,542 is required to supplement these Estimates.

In my humble submission these are non-controversial. The debts are to be paid, the circumstances are beyond the control of the Government, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, since in the last couple of weeks the Port has come in for so

much publicity, I thought I would have heard something from the Minister about the charges that have been laid against the Port that there is a ten percent pilferage and all this nonsense that has been spoken by some of the employers in the area. I do not have any objection however to what is to be done, but I would like to say now that we are dealing with the Port and that from what one has read, the Port seems to be a little different from what it used to be. I would like to say to the Minister responsible for this Department that there seems to be a tendency in Government circles in recent years that the running of Government institutions is to be looked after by certain interests. I say this because in setting up a body to go into the working of the Port I want to make it very clear here today that if the Minister or anybody is of the opinion that they are going to set up a Steering Committee comprised of the employers and Government and the workers play no part in the Steering Committee and they think they are going to give the workers marching orders, they are making the biggest mistake in their lives. No workers in these days are going to take marching orders from anybody unless they know where they are marching. Everybody believes that the Port was built by somebody else other than the people of Barbados, and some people have the idea that when you talk about the people of Barbados, you do not mean the workers. We have some classic idiots in Barbados always discounting people, and when you talk about people, you do not mean the workers, you mean somebody else. When you talk about the people of this country, you have to talk about the workers. Let me make it clear that whatever you do at the Port, the workers have to pay a very important part in any Steering Committee or in anything you set up because the workers make a substantial contribution, and with all the nonsense you hear about the Port, the Port workers of this country have a turn around in cargo that can compare with the international ports, and I want it to be made clear that cargo is handled to a higher degree in Barbados than in the other ports in the Caribbean. This is no guess work; so when you hear other employers bemoaning the situation in their own country, it is time that our own people in Barbados get up and say what are the facts in Barbados, because the problem in the port is not a problem of the port workers or any port labour. We handle cargo to compare with people in big countries with equipment more advanced than we have, and when you think in terms of a Port employing about 400 people, we do not accept this nonsense; so let us get this clear in people's minds.

Mr. Chairman, I will not on this occasion refer to the statement by the Minister, but I am speaking about this particular position in so far as the Port is concerned. I want the Minister to understand that I am not here for big documents to be put in my hand to read after somebody has decided what they want and we are just here backing up anybody. The workers are not back-stopping. When you have a Steering Committee on anything as vital as the Port, we feel that the workers should have a say in it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for St. Michael-West knows that the Steering Committee was set up before I went to the Ministry of Communications and Works. I went to the Ministry in October 1971 and found this Steering Committee operating, and I saw no reason at that time to change it; so I am not to be blamed if the workers were not represented on that.

The other point is that I have disposed on another occasion of the non-sensical statement that 10% of all cargo is pilfered at the Port. When the hon. member for Christ Church-West raised it, I said that the particular gentleman from Jamaica was talking nonsense, and I quoted figures to show at the opening of the Caribbean Shipping Council last week that there was no merit or truth in the allegations made by this gentleman from Jamaica. What I would like to say is that the hon. member for St. Michael-West knows that he is represented on the Harbour Advisory Council, and I think he knows better than anybody else my interest in the Harbour from the workers' point of view, because he knows I am trying to get the canteen at the Harbour which has been since 1961. He knows I have been there and I am endeavouring to get the workers some place where they can relax and have something to eat. So when it comes to the workers, the hon. member is no greater lover of them than I am, and he can have positive evidence of my interest in port workers by seeing that there are proper surroundings and they are properly looked after.

The hon. member is represented on the Harbour Advisory Board. We have now set up a Committee to go into the technical aspects of the harbour and this report will be discussed in detail with all the interests concerned. As I say, the hon. member can rest assured that as far as I am concerned, and as long as I remain in the Ministry of Communications and Works, the workers will be considered in any future planning for the Harbour and in the existing facilities of the Harbour, and he will be consulted and his organisation will be considered. I do not think he can accuse me of setting up a Steering Committee because he knows it was started long before I went into the Ministry. He has concrete evidence on the question of recruitment of seamen and he also knows that as far as his organisation is concerned he has been getting the maximum cooperation from the

Minister of Communications and Works and the Ministry. I think he can allay his fears because we are battling on the same track and we have the same goal, the promotion of the interest of the workers of this country.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to pose a short query here particularly since we are discussing this matter with relation to the Port. Some time ago we heard reference made to the fact that the Government was thinking in terms of taking over the complete operations of the Port of Bridgetown, and I am wondering whether in the scheme of things this is still the Government's intention and how soon this will be done, because I see this as a very important economic matter for the entire country. When this is done it will mean that the Government will be given an opportunity to bring some influence to bear on the cost of goods which reach the people, and would indeed give an opportunity for the people of Barbados to be involved totally in something which is of extreme importance to them. I am aware that workers to a certain extent are involved in certain aspects of the Port, but we are concerned, as the member for St. Michael West has pointed out, about the fact that we were not involved when the study was being done and we sincerely hope that an oversight like this will not be indulged in, in the future.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not know if the Hon. Prime Minister would care to answer the first part of the question posed by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not rise as the Hon. Prime Minister to answer the question, but to speak. On the question of the pilferage which it is alleged goes on at the Port, I know that the Minister outside this House has made a speech setting out the amount of money paid in insurance claims. I do not know whether this was a true indication of the amount of stealing that goes on at the Port, nor for that matter do I accept the figure of 10 per cent given by the gentleman from Jamaica who made a speech. I do not know what was the background for it but I do know that this matter was brought to the attention of this House in the past, and in the Labour Party we have asked the Government to investigate the possibility of establishing a special Port and Police Department that would not only have the running of the Bridgetown Port but also the Airport and the entire sea around Barbados, and I wonder whether the Minister would state what steps, if any, are being taken to prevent the pilferage that goes on at the Port. It is a well known fact that the importers of goods suffer heavy losses from time to time. Sometimes thirty and forty bolts of cloth are missing from the Harbour and three or four stores get cargo of 20 transistor radios coming in but only four or five reach the importers, and I would like to find out from the Minister of Communications and Works what steps will be taken by the Government to ensure that this sort of thing no longer continues.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Government has the matter under review and it would be very foolish of me to tell the hon. member for the City what steps we are taking in order to stop pilferage at the Port because this would be disclosing security measures. Security is not operated on that basis, but I can assure you that steps are being taken to cut down pilferage such as it is at the Port.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept the Minister's statement of not wanting to disclose security measures, but I think he should have stated that steps will be taken to ensure that pilferage is prevented.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution again stands in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, but it deals again with the Port Department and should be more properly dealt with by the Minister who gave notice of it in here. It is a Resolution to approve of the expenditure of $69,775.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES – PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution clearly sets out the purpose for which it is intended and I do not think I can usefully at this stage contribute anything. I am prepared to answer any questions posed by the members of the Opposition, and even from my own side, but it is a clear indication of the sum that is needed. 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: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is to grant the sum of $561,160 out of the Consolidated Fund. I am asking for leave to deal with this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You do not have to ask for leave.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73
NO. 15

Head 17 – Prime Minister's Office – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Item 9 - Special Allowance for the Head of the Civil Service. The full explanation to this matter is that in the Current Estimates provision was made in the sum of $1,300 to meet expenditure on the above-mentioned special allowance. This sum provided for only one month's additional allowance in case of acting so that with the present acting appointment of Mr. C. B. Williams, who is the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, which began on 28th June and ended on 30th September, 1972 funds are required to supplement this Item.

The next Item, Membership of Institute of Air Transport, the original provision of the sum of $1,000 which was made in the Current Estimates proved to be inadequate. The Institute Head has stated that the assessed contribution for the year was $1,263.67. It therefore needs $263.67 more to deal with this matter.
3.00 p.m.

It is considered highly desirable that the membership to the Institute of Air Transport should continue. Supplementary provision is therefore being sought to make up the deficit.

I beg to move that Head 17 – Prime Minister's Office – stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Head 22 – Establishments Division – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of Temporary Staff, the sum of $540,000 was provided in the Estimates and $347,527 was spent up to the end of August this year leaving a balance of $192,473 to meet expenditure to the end of the financial year. On the basis of known commitments this amount is needed. The amount spent up to now is as follows:-

April	$ 63,114
May	66,550
June	70,758
July	71,148
August	75,957
Making a total of	$347,577

As in past years there has been a continuing need to attract and retain personnel for whom there are no positions readily available on the permanent establishment. It has also been necessary to create a few posts of special assignments on salaries of $1,000 a month. In addition, it has been considered prudent in some cases to contact the staff Inspection and Organisation Methods Surveys before placing posts on the Permanent establishment, and this resulted in salaries being met from temporary staff vote for a longer period than ordinarily. I do not know if hon. members want a summary of these posts. This amount is necessary in order to put the Department in a position to make payments up to the end of the financial year.

As far as Item 19 is concerned, out of $3,100 the sum of $2,693 was spent at the 31st August, 1972, leaving a balance of $407 to meet payments to persons appointed and required to act as Permanent Secretaries or Heads of Departments where there is no provision elsewhere and they had to be accommodated under this vote. It is a new Item, and the amount of $3,100 was based on the 1971-72 Estimates on the assumption that each Permanent Secretary or Head of Department would take an average of one month's leave. This Estimate turned out to be a conservative one. It is, therefore, necessary to meet payments amounting to $704 deferred from the financial year 1971-72 from current provision. In addition three new posts of Permanent Secretaries have been established and many qualifying officers have taken leave in excess of one month.

I beg to move that Head 22 stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Head 26 – Police – was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26 – Police – stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with clothing and uniforms as well as subsistence for the Police. I think this amount is intended to cover the new post created by the Civil Establishment Order last week. However, there are just one or two points I should like to raise at this stage. The first one is that since the last promotion of Inspectors there was some time-lag before they were able to get their uniforms, and no reason was

given for the delay. Secondly, you are going to create new posts in the Force, but one undesirable feature still exists in that no sooner than the Commissioner went out a new Commissioner was appointed; no sooner than a Deputy Commissioner was promoted you had a Deputy Commissioner appointed; no sooner than an Assistant Commissioner was promoted an Assistant Commissioner was appointed to fill the vacancy, but the same sort of attitude does not exist when it comes to filling vacancies in the Inspectorate. Several vacancies existed in the Force, as far as Inspectors are concerned, and almost nine months went by without filling these vacancies. I know that the Minister will say that he is not responsible for the actual appointments. I accept this, but I believe that any comments made here can be passed on to the Police Service Commission in the hope that they will act speedily. If you are going to create new posts, one can only hope that the Police Service Commission will become more active in filling these posts quickly rather than allowing a time-lag of nine months of exist.

With regard to the question of the Police uniform, how soon are we going to change the Police uniform? I have been in here for three years, and I have raised this question at every single opportunity. I have already asked the Government to take steps to change the present uniform. I was once told that no recommendation was made by the Police Association on this aspect of the matter, but I do not believe this is entirely true. I believe that the Police Association has been making representation to the Government on the question of a change in the uniform for quite some time before I came to this House.
3.10 p.m.

You have changed the unform of the bus drivers and conductors and the Fire Brigade people have changed their uniform, but yet you insist that the police wear this heavy material which one must accept does not suit a tropical country. Again I would ask the Minister of Home Affairs or the out-going Minister of Home Affairs to use his good offices in the short space of time that he has remaining there to see what can be done to ensure that the police uniform is changed. Do not let us come again with the next Estimates for a member of the Opposition to get up and make this speech again asking when is Government going to do something to change the uniform of the police. Even the women police uniform is badly in need of a change. It is outdated. I am not saying this because the skirts are too long, but every effort should be made to change the uniform both of the women police and of the lower ranks. You only have to compare the type of material worn by the inspectors upwards, the weight and the quality, with the heavy serge or whatever material is worn by the general members of the Force. Members of the Government should not look surprised every time this matter is raised in here. I see that the present Minister and the former Minister of Home Affairs looking surprised when I say that representation was made on behalf of the Police Association, but I have been informed over and over that representation has been made to the Government to change the uniform.

Let me put it this way. Unfortunately the intended Minister of Home Affairs is not with us today, but I can only hope that the outgoing Minister of Home Affairs, even if no representation as such has been made to Government, will take it upon himself to use his good offices in the few days he has in that Ministry to do something on behalf of the Police.

Now, Sir, there is one other point I want to raise. I see here in the Addendum that it is proposed to introduce a scheme of accelerated promotion in the Royal Barbados Police Force in an effort to find suitable persons to fill senior positions in the Force. This is a laudible idea and one for which I think the Government should be given credit, but I think also that the whole relationship between the Police and the Police Service Commission as regards extended leave for the purpose of studying should be reviewed, because as far as I understand, there are people who can work in the Registrar's Department and in the various departments of Government and be given leave with full pay or half pay to go and study law, and yet Police Officers make application..... *(Asides)*

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Which hon. member?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am informed that members of the Registrar's Office and various other departments, if they want to go away to study Law or some other subject, are given leave and favourable terms either of full pay in some cases for one year or half pay, and yet there are Police Officers who have been getting a great deal of trouble to get money out of the Government for the purpose of pursuing legal studies. I understand that the Police Service Commission wanted to know what they want lawyers in the Police Force for. There is one young gentleman in England who has been there for over a year

and has made application to the Public Service Commission for leave with pay. They told him he can get the leave but he has not received any money during that period of time. This is discriminating against the police because any other Civil Servant would have been able to get pay or get his vacation and get a good salary. This cannot be fair to Police Officers.

There is another Police Officer who wanted to pursue a course at the Law Faculty at Cave Hill, and again he did not get leave with any kind of pay and was unable to pursue this course. It is not merely a question of getting people with "O" Level subjects into the Police Force; you must also try to attract people with qualifications over and above that, and if there are people in the Force who are prepared to go and study, I think the Government should give them every assistance and encouragement. Although this might not be a good example, if you look at Trinidad, you will see that most of the top people in the Trinidad Police, the Commissioner and two of the Assistant Commissioners are qualified lawyers who qualified but continued in the Service and put the benefit of their legal knowledge at the disposal of the Police Department. This is so with other people who studied and qualified in Economics at St. Augustine's where they had suitable terms for the purpose of studying and continued in the Police Force. Attracting people with "O" Level subjects is not the only answer, because when you bring a boy with "O" Level subjects and he has any sort of ambition, he is going to want to move on and study whether it is Law, Economics or general administration which would benefit the Police Force. The lack of a forensic laboratory today which results in many criminals going free is because the Police Service Commission was not prepared to give people proper terms so that they could go away and study and return to put their knowledge at the disposal of the Police Force as a whole.

I therefore draw these things to the Minister's attention: (1) the fact that people who are promoted to Inspector are without uniform for quite a number of months; (2) that in the same way the Police Service Commission can appoint with speed a Police Chief, Deputy Commissioner and the senior superintendents, etc., why is there this great time-lag in appointing members to the Inspectorate? This is going to lead to frustration in the Police Force because these members are adequately qualified to be appointed to the post of Inspector. I sincerely hope that the outgoing Minister will leave some sort of note or memorandum for the incoming Minister and since both the incoming Minister and the former Minister of Home Affairs appear not to agree with me by the shaking of their heads when I mentioned the question of dress, I sincerely hope that the Minister will take it upon himself even if he says he has not had representation from the Police Association to see that steps are taken to give the police of this country a proper uniform suitable to the climatic conditions under which they are living.

3.20 p.m.

We have changed, and at the same time I look at the member for St. Michael South Central and see that he is still in his own tradition and doing his own thing, perhaps there might be policemen like him who would not want to change, but there might be others like the Minister of Home Affairs who would welcome the change.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I notice from the notes that these new personnel will be recruited at the grade of constable and then they will be promoted after going through some formal training. I remember when I first took my seat in this House I enquired about the regulation or stipulation whereby constables are required to pass a first aid examination before they got promoted. I have not seen anything set out in this note which deals with this aspect of it, and I am sure that if that regulation still stands – and I am told that it still stands – that there is going to be a great deal of dissatisfaction among constables in the Royal Barbados Police Force whom I am told have been able to pass most of their promotional examinations but have not been able to pass First Aid because it is not of their liking. I know of a particular case of a constable who has acted in the Courts for quite a long time, there is nothing against him character-wise, but he has not been promoted because he has not been able to pass First Aid.

I am hoping that the Minister in looking at this particular aspect of recruiting these persons who will soon take senior positions in the Police Force will forthwith look at the position of these constables who have not been able to pass their First Aid Examinations but have passed the other examinations. I remember when we had incidents of the deaths of two persons who died because ambulances did not arrive the Minister of Home Affairs said that the police were not equipped to deal with ambulance cases, but from what we see done we know that the police do not do a lot of ambulance work, therefore there is not then the necessity for policemen to be trained in First Aid and pass a First Aid Examination. If they have a general knowledge I believe that is good enough, and if those policemen who have not been able to be promoted because of their lack of passing a certificate in First Aid, I am sure that something

must be done for them at this particular stage. If I were a policeman and it was intended to bring six people into the force and start them at the grade of constable and within six months or a year you promote them to some senior grade without having passed a First Aid Certificate I would not be happy, because after spending twenty or thirty years in the Police Force and find yourself still a constable because you could not pass First Aid but somebody else in the course of a year is an Inspector, this does not lend itself to harmony in the Police Force. I think it would be appropriate at this time for the Minister of Home Affairs to look into this particular situation and make some sort of recommendation to deal with those persons who are still in the force and have not been able to pass a Certificate in First Aid.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. members from the other side, I would like to say that if the hon. member would like to look at the way in which he, others and myself are dressed and then look around and see how others are dressed, he will see that this is some indication of tastes. We are definitely of the opinion that the climatic conditions which prevail in Barbados warrant a suitable form of dress to suit those conditions and we have started right here in this Chamber, but I would like to tell him that since I was M nister of Home Affairs I have taken up the matter of dress reform with the Commissioner of Police and the Police Association and they have stated that they do not wish a change at this stage. I do not know if this is the view of all the policemen or of a section, but this is the view that has been passed on to me, and this being the case I do not see any need on the part of the Government to enforce any dress reform among the members of the Police Force. It is clear that any move for dress reform should come from the policemen, and if it comes tomorrow they will find that the Cabinet will be very willing to accede to their requests because we of the Cabinet feel very strongly that we should dress more suitably to the climatic conditions of Barbados.

As regards the other point about passing a First Aid Examination, again I have taken up this with the Commissioner of Police and at the moment steps are being taken to ensure that this will be eliminated in future examinations. We realize that this has been a source of contention and irritation, and we realize that it would be a handicap and will lead to further implications and frustrations, and the Commissioner of Police has agreed that it should be eliminated as soon as possible.

I would like to assure the members on the other side that while we are concerned with the improvement of the Police Force and we want to attract people who have the basic qualifications that will enable them later on to pass on to university education, we have to realize that at the moment how things are arranged in Barbados the Cabinet on one side elected by the people of Barbados and are supposed to be responsible for everything that occurs in Barbados, you find that a lot of power without responsibility has been delegated to certain Commissions in Barbados, and one such Commission is the Police Service Commission. Many of the problems occurring from day to day within the Police Force do not reach the notice of the Minister of Home Affairs or the Cabinet because they are considered to be matters purely for the Police Service Commisssion. While we are introducing this system of accelerated promotion for policemen with a view to improving the Police Force, we must allow a certain amount of specialisation to occur at the top, and we have to make sure that people with adequate qualifications are selected either from without the force, or if they are already within the force and have the adequate number of G.C.E. subjects they can be selected and trained to hold specialist positions later on within the Police Force.

3.30 p.m.

The hon. member for the City has mentioned the forensic laboratory, and this is one of the areas where specialisation in the Police Force is needed. I hope that if we can get enough interested people in Barbados, either within the Police Force or outside of the Police Force, to come forward and take advantage of this scheme, in the near future we will see an improvement of the quality of the people at the top of the Police Force. Unless that is done, we feel strongly that the image of the Police Force is likely to suffer. When you look around in Barbados you can see people in other areas going to the University, getting degrees and coming back and carrying on, and I see absolutely no reason why this should not obtain in the Police Force. If the top officers in the Police Force are going to rely merely on graduating to the top by the process of old age, then we are not going to get the improvement in the quality in the Police Force that will compare with other Departments or organisations within this country.

I would like to know that policemen – not only those with GCE's but the others – will continue to make a special effort to train themselves whereby they will be able to be promoted quickly rather than waiting for old age to overcome them in the hope that as they get

older they will, eventually, reach the top. We want specialists not only in the Police Force, but in many other areas of the activities in Barbados. I should like to know that policemen start adapting themselves to this type of training.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I see that the Minister has said that it is time that the higher ranks of the Police Force should be suitably trained. I do not remember whether it was during the last Estimates, or the Estimates before the Hon. Minister came to this House, that I said I was of the opinion that as soon as any Police Officer had reached the rank of Inspector there should be an aptitude test to see in which division he should be promoted.

For instance, quite recently you had an officer who was dealing with immigration for a number of years. However, the establishment of the Police Force was such that, having reached a certain level, he could go no further in that section and he had to be transferred to a different Department. I think this is one of the things that need to be reviewed in the Police Force. In the light of this, you may find that there is a need for the appointment of more Assistant Commissioners so that officers may be promoted from the rank of Inspector to Assistant Superintendent, Senior Superintendent, Assistant Commissoner, Assistant Deputy Commissioner and then to the Commissioner, rather than having an officer doing immigration work and then transferring him to general police duties. In such circumstances, you will lose efficiency at the top of the Police Force.

Sir, I know that representation has in fact been made to the Government by the Police Association with regard to the changing of the Police uniform. Each time I stand in this House and say so I get a denial from the Minister, but I should like the Police Association to come out and state as a fact that this is so. I have been informed not now, Sir, not during the time the present Minister was a Minister, but even before he was a Minister that representation had been made to the Government to change the uniform for policemen. It is not a question of saying that no representation has been made. Representation has been made in this matter for some time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say, for the benefit of the hon. member, that no representation has been made to the Ministry of Home Affairs, which has been responsible for the Police Force for some time, as regards a change in the Police uniform. If the matter has been discussed in the Police Force, it has not gone outside the Police Force. I have taken it on myself to discuss this matter with the present Commissioner of Police and the one immediately preceding him, and they have drawn to my attention that there is no need for a change. I have not been in a position to go and canvass each and every policeman. I have to depend upon the people who represent the police: the Police Commissioner and the Police Association. If they tell me that there is no need for a change in the Police uniform, then I accept it.

I repeat that where this Government is concerned, we are keen to see a change in the dress of the people in Barbados, and we have started this change right in this Chamber. If tomorrow morning representations can be made to us that there is a need for a change in the uniform for the Police we would change it, because we feel that people should wear the type of dress that is suitable to the climatic conditions in Barbados. If the hon. member has been informed that representations have been made, then his source of information is different from mine.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking on this matter at all, but references have been made to the period when I was responsible for the Ministry of Home Affairs. I can only repeat what the present Minister has said. Representations were made when I was the Minister of Home Affairs, but those representations were made by me. I took the initiative when I was the Minister of Home Affairs in bringing it to the attention of the Police Association that there should be a change in the Police uniform and I canvassed their opinion. I was informed, Mr. Chairman, that the Police Association did not want any change of uniform. That is the official position obtaining at that time. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that they are a disciplined Force, but we do not believe in regimenting people to that extent.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister dealt with the question of the removal of this First Aid Examination but he has not told us what is the position of those policemen who are still constables who are still in the Police Force, who have passed the necessary examinations, but have not passed the First Aid Examination. The moment you remove the Qualifying Bar of First Aid in order to allow new recruits to be promoted, obviously, you will have to deal with those persons who have passed the necessary promotional examinations but have not yet passed the First Aid Examination. It will be necessary to do something about them.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be rude, but I think we are discussing clothing and uniform for policemen and not matters of promotion and administration in the Police Force. I was only trying to be courteous when I made a reply to some of the points raised, and I do not think it is fair, at this stage, to pursue this matter any further. I should like to tell the hon. member that new Promotion Regulations are being provided.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that he has had discussion with, I think, the former Commissioner of Police on this question of dress, but it is strange that the Police Association has entirely different views on the matter. I think that the Minister should not only take note of the views expressed by the Commissioner of Police. The Commissioner of Police and the senior gazetted ranks do not need a change in uniform because they wear gaberdine or lightweight uniform; it is the ranks from Station Sergeant down that I am dealing with now, and the only way you will get representation is to find out how they feel through the Police Association and not from the Commissioner of Police who is not a member of the Police Association.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: If the hon. member would give way, I had discussions with the Police Association and I took up the matter on my own initiative because I do not see that there is need for heavy clothing in a tropical climate since it is not conducive to good health, and that is the reply I got. I will tell the hon. member that if he is going to suggest every time we have an issue on the Police Force that we must go and find out who are for and who are against a change of uniform that it is tedious, time-consuming, frustrating and moneywasting. If the Police Association is to represent the Police and they come and give you opinions not only on uniform but on other affairs, and then you are told that these are not the group's opinions, what is the Minister going to do? What is the Government going to do if Government is going to get advice which does not represent the views of the majority? I should just like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that he and I are just different from the Minister of Communications and Works. He is doing his own thing and we are doing our own thing which may be the same problem with the Police Force. There may be some people who are keen to have a change in dress, and the others may prefer the traditional uniform, and I repeat it would be a waste of time, tedious and money-wasting to go and have a survey whereby each person would be given an opportunity to say whether or not he wants a change in uniform.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not dealing with the word "survey" because it usually has a dangerous connotation, nor am I suggesting that every time there is some discussion you need to take the views of each individual policeman. What I am saying is that during a discussion on the Estimates, I think it was the then Leader of the House who gave the assurance that representation had in fact been made. He may not have been Minister of Home Affairs but he was handling the Ministry of Home Affairs in the House. Can I get from the Minister the assurance that he will consult the Police Association about this matter? The Minister could not be suggesting that he consulted the Police Association and they did not want a change in uniform. That I would never accept. That is an oversized joke and I am absolutely certain...

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Are you suggesting that I am joking? I am not joking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I have given sufficient latitude on this matter and I will put the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But I was speaking, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have ruled. There are two items under this Head and I have given you latitude to touch every possible thing except the two items.

The question that Head 26 – Police – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 32 – Ministry of Communications and Works – was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is a supplementary Estimate to meet the commitments of the Government for lighting of streets and public places. The first thing I would like to do is to let members see that this programme in itself is costing the Government nearly $400,000 a year with the lights which it is proposed to put in and are in existence. The programme for 1971-72 is here and the programme for 1972-73 is not completed. The completion of the programme for 1972-73 is awaiting the arrival of fittings from overseas. I would like to say that from October last year the Light and Power Company had no lights or fittings until April 1972. Since the end of June,

1972, we have not got any lights installed in Barbados because there were none, so that you will see that after October to April we had no lights installed. The Ministry is not the one to put in the lights. Light and Power does and we pay them so that we had a hiatus between October and April and a hiatus from June to the present moment. They assure me that they expect lights some time in November and I have been impressing on them the need to order lights because the requests that are coming in are fast and furious. The Government has got to tread softly and hasten slowly because already it is costing $400,000 which is a sizable amount of money on this particular programme; not that we grudge it, but we have got to do it in accordance with the other commitments for Government financing. This Resolution for $68,000 which will bring the total amount to roughly $393,219 is needed to supplement the money which is to be paid to the Barbados Light and Power Company when the programme for 1972-73 has been completed.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to know, every constituency in Barbados gets a piece of this street lighting programme; it is not confined to any particular area. St. Michael has had quite a bit. I cannot pick out St. Michael Constituency as such, but the City has got, St. Michael has got, Christ Church has got, and the member for St. Joseph has got. We have put in hundreds of lights in St. Michael all over the place. I can let hon. members see the list, but lights have been put in and we have also asked the Light and Power Company to survey about 40 areas in St. Michael, about 30 areas in Christ Church, 10 in St. Philip, Todds Tenantry, Pot House, Hilltop and Newcastle in St. John. We have asked them in St. Thomas to look at Sandiford's Land, Allenview, Fisherpond, Vaucluse, Carrington Village, Canefield, Stoney Gully and areas in St. Joseph and St. James; so every person is getting a little piece of the action. As I said, we are awaiting the arrival of lights in November and will complete the programme as soon as the lights are available, and in the new financial year we shall spread the net a bit further and include as many areas as we can.

3.50 p.m.

I think I have been pretty fair in the distribution of these lights, but the company has explained that they have had problems in England with strikes and so on, and we have found that on one or two occasions equipment has been sent here from England but has not been standing up because it was not properly made for the tropics. In a discussion with Mr. McConney, the Manager, he said that he has drawn this to the attention of the company in England and they are trying to improve this. The gadget that is needed to put on the light in the area of Goodland, St. Michael, has not arrived.

I do not think any member can complain about this programme, the Government is committed to extending lightning to as many areas as possible, and we are paying the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited $400,000 at the moment, so that we have got to meet the needs of the people but within the limitations of finance. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a couple of points on this particular Item. I know that the Minister of Communications and Works in introducing this stated that the Government has got to tread softly and hasten slowly, and it would seem to me as a representative of one of the most distant constituencies in Barbados that this is the Government's attitude with regard to this particular constituency. It was borne out here by the Minister when he was reading out the districts because he made no mention at all of the parish of St. Lucy, and I would hope that the Minister would give some consideration to the fact that in the lighting programme St. Lucy has been somewhat behind hand and that he would hasten as far as this parish is concerned.

I also note that part of the money which is being requested is to pay the service charges for the lighting of streets and public places. I think that if one were to observe the public places and the street lights which the Government has got to pay for, one would see that at times the amount of care which is necessary for one to economise is not exercised, but the point I am making is that sometimes one sees lights in public places and street lights on for whole days. I remember distinctly about two weeks ago passing by the stadium about 11 o'clock in the day and all the lights in the stadium were on full blast. This is the kind of thing which would obviously raise the expenditure on this particular Item, and I would want to let the Minister know that some attention should be paid to this because this might reduce the amount of money which the Government would have to pay for this particular item. Let me once more appeal to the Minister to pay a little closer attention to St. Lucy.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, may I on the floor of the House thank the Minister for consenting to instal lights in Bonnetts, Christ Church. He gave this undertaking during the debate on the Estimates and I am very glad for this opportunity to thank him because I think it is right when acts are carried out on behalf of our constituents that we should acknowledge these things, and I am glad to see that the Minister runs his Ministry without having to look over his shoulder. I hope one of these days the Minister would find it convenient to visit the constituencies represented by members of the Opposition in company with the members without feeling that he has to look over his shoulder.

The Minister has said he is looking for the greatest good for the greatest number of people, and I think in this House we represent all the people of Barbados, our constituents primarily. I would take this opportunity to draw to his attention that there are still areas that need light, and I trust that those 40 areas listed in Christ Church include places like part of Brathwaite's Gap, other parts of Forde's Road, Gill's Gap, part of Rockley Tenantry and part of Navy Gardens. I hope that these areas will be given some priority treatment, and also a little dark place called Thomas Gap, Christ Church. I do not want to say any more at the moment, I will be writing to various Ministries from time to time asking them for assistance for my constituency and inviting them to visit my constituency. We want to show that we are loyal subjects of Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Opposition as well although we did not vote for the Government in as many numbers as they would have liked.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Minister has to bemoan the fact that it is $400,000, the fact that it is $400,000 is because more people are paying tax today. Barbados was a dark place and therefore if we are going to enlighten this country we have to pay the cost for doing it, and the people have to pay the cost for doing it. It is a public expenditure and I am very pleased about it, but I am not very pleased to hear the Minister say "even in Goodland."

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I was explaining that we had already put lights in Goodland but we cannot get the lights to work because of the gadget which has not come.

Mr. WALCOTT: Goodland is part of Barbados. I would like to say that we feel that this is a good policy of lighting the country and I would say that I am very pleased to see that there are more lights today, but I think they could be more discreetly located in some of the areas. Sometimes I see some lights in places that I wonder if there is any reason for them to be located so profusely along certain areas where nobody is living, and I would prefer them to be placed in the residential districts where people can make greater use of the lights.

4.00 p.m.

Sometimes we see lights near grass lands where there are no houses. I should like to see proper lights in the City and in St. Michael. We are not allergic to good lights. We would like to see some of the old fashioned lights in St. Michael replaced by modern lights. If you are talking in terms of population, one of the best things you can do for a country is to give the dark areas more lights. You will soon find that wherever there is good light, the population will increase. I hope that the Minister will pay due attention to that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there was a time when I was extremely tolerant; I wanted to get on with the people's business, and I would come into the House sometimes. Invariably I sat in the Speaker's Chamber and allowed members to make all sorts of statements in here, but as long as I got the work transacted, I was not particularly concerned. We now have a new element in Parliament – the kind of Dunkirkians, I call them. Even when they are defeated, they went on to tell you what percentage of the votes they got.

In Trinidad some people say that the Government is a 28% Government, because only 28% of the people voted for it. One of the misguided Unversity Lecturers, who wrote me a letter, said: "Dr. Williams' Government is a 28% Government and you will have to come and talk to me, because I represent the other 72%." But he does not have a seat in Parliament.

When I sit down and listen to the hon. member for Christ Church, I find that he is giving my Ministers bad advice. I know what he means. He is saying that we have been carrying on the Government from 1961. We have a Development Plan ; we have a list of priorities; we decided that street lighting and road improvement even on private lands is a must for the people of Barbados, because the question of ownership is irrelevant and the question of representation is important. We had a policy of lighting up the whole of Barbados and taking the light into dark corners.

I do not understand the member who represents the parish in which I am proud to belong. Although they say it is in St. Lucy, I was born in St. Lucy. There is no corner in St. Lucy which is not illuminated at the expense of the taxpayers of this Island. There is no part in St. Lucy which does not have a good road system, because from the time St. Lucy was under the Central Road Board and the senior representative for St. Lucy was a member of the Central Road Board he used to say that charity begins at home. He started repairing the roads in St. Lucy before he went into Hall's Road and various other places in St. Michael where roads should have been repaired. I just wanted to put things straight.

There is still a superstition in Barbados that the Opposition had to ask a question, and as a result of asking that question they got these roads done. Now, we do not put in anything that is not in our programme. You do not have to tell us in what part of Barbados we should do the roads, because we know what we have to do. Their timing is impeccable; they always have a few stooges in the Public Service, and we have inherited a lot of dishonest and disloyal people in the Public Service. I did not appoint the 14,700 of them; they appear in the Law Courts and at Grand Sessions from time to time, but I did not appoint one of them. You cannot say that Barrow brought any of them into the Public Service. Even before that I was defending some of them.

There are also some marginal operators; they do not carry away money, but they carry away the good reputation of the Government by their laziness and incompetence. They run up to somebody like the member for Christ Church West and tell him: "We are coming to do the road in Second Avenue, Harts Gap," and the next Tuesday....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, before the Prime Minister gets off on his tirade, let me say that no dishonest civil servant has ever run to me, just as he knows that no dishonest politicians will ever come to me either. That is the first point I should like to make. As far as I am concerned,...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He joined a party with dishonest politicians.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to that remark, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member joined the Party to which I belong, Mr. Chairman. I ask the Prime Minister to withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has not stated any individual member of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He said party, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no party in this House; there are 24 honourable members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then the entire D.L.P. party consists of dishonesty from start to finish with the head man being the chief and most dishonest person.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Mr. Chairman, you will have to ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What do I have to withdraw, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The head of the Democratic Labour Party being the Chief and most dishonest person.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What member, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The head.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw the word "head". The entire Democratic Labour Party is dishonest, Mr. Chairman, including all and sundry.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, let me get things straight. The hon. member made a remark; he is the first person to use the word "dishonest". He said that no dishonest politicians come to him, and I said that they do not have to come to you because you joined a party of dishonest politicians, and I mean dishonest in the sense of people having criminal convictions in the highest court in Barbados. That is what I mean. It is a statement of fact and he, voluntarily, over the age of 21, goes and joins a bunch like that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into any crossfire with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is an expert on what is dishonesty; he might be able to write a volume on it, but I am not interested in his volume on it. He has absolutely good knowledge of it, so let him keep it, but I will join whom I want to join. I will not join with the dishonest ones, and he knows whom I am talking about. Let us get a few things straight. I am objecting to the Prime Minister getting up in here and talking about dishonest civil servants running to me to tell me that something is happening in an area. That is untrue and he knows it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like the hon. member to refrain from saying that for the simple reason that at no time was it pointed out to me that the hon. member for Christ Church West had civil servants running to him. He never said that. *(Asides.)*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before I was so unnecessarily and rudely interrupted, I will be glad when you have a test, before you come in here, on the Standing Orders. You should be called upon to pass an examination before you come through the door, and I know that a lot of people would fail.

Let me get back to the point. I am saying that we have inherited a lot of dishonest people. We have a Constitution in Barbados and I have no control over it. I said you will notice that every time the Minister of Communications and Works is about to carry out a programme, you will find members running in here with a Resolution asking us to come and fix a road in Second Avenue, Harts Gap. If that is in the member's constituency and he thinks I am referring to him, I am merely referring to the area, and saying what the practice is.

I said that the Government has a programme. We do not run the Government by what they want to do, or by Questions and Resolutions tabled in here. The fact that they have introduced a Resolution – in the first place, they cannot come with one to impose a charge on the Treasury – only a Minister can do that.
4.10 p.m.

The mere fact that they ask questions would not compel me to do what used to be done when I was in the Opposition, and if you did not want something done, come in here and ask a question, and rather than let anybody get the credit, even if they started the works, the works would close down.

When I represented your constituency, they told the Vestry of St. George not to worry to put in for more than 800 feet of road for the whole parish for the whole financial year; and 800 feet of road is about from here to Nelson's Statue. Then we had to go and say we wanted 1,500 or 2,000 feet, and the person in the Ministry of Communications and Works said "no, Barrow represents that parish and we cannot give them too much road." I want the people of Christ Church West to know – you were in the Vestry and you know what I am talking about, the road guardians or whatever you called those antiquated people – that we are not going to stop our programme for Christ Church merely because he represents it, because we represent the whole Island. I have been in here now twenty-one years come next month, with a sabbatical in 1958. I know you voted for me, and when they asked me why I did not get a seat in St. George, I said that the other two people got more votes than I did. I could turn around and say the elections were corrupt and that kind of thing, but that did not stop me from representing St. George and St. John, and more roads are being done in St. George today than ever were done in the whole of the previous history of the Island going back to my great grandfather's days, all the way back in the 1830's, and he was in the Vestry and could not get any roads done.

I want to disabuse their minds of this idea, as the member said, of saying that members will remember that as a result of my coming in here a road has been done; and then he goes on to give my Ministers bad advice. He said he is glad to see they do not look over their shoulder. They had better keep looking over their shoulder because I always tell people in Barbados do not mind what the Opposition says, and that you do not have to look over your shoulder. They do not understand the Constitution. There is a verse in the Bible in the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Timothy, Chapter 6 verse 7 and it says, "For we brought nothing into this world and it is certain we can carry nothing out." The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh, Blessed be the name of the Lord. When he tells a Minister do not worry to look over his shoulder because he asked him a question and he ran and fixed a road for him, not only am I Prime Minister and I decide whether the road is going to be done or not, no matter who asked the questions, and nobody in the Opposition can vote any money for any road. They can vote against a road, but the road will still be done. I am the Minister of Finance, and if I say there is no money to do that particular road, it will not be done. So the only person who can claim credit for anything relating to the expenditure of money in Barbados is me. You can come in here and table 75,000 Resolutions or you can look straight ahead when a big steam roller may be coming at your back to flatten you out; so if he is going to tell the Minister he is glad to see he does not have to look over his shoulder, he means he does not have to get permission from me; so he does not understand the Constitution, and it is time they do their homework and try to learn about the Constitution of Barbados.

There is no Minister who can be so crazy as to say he does not have to get the approval of the Minister of Finance, because the Bill cannot reach in here; but fortunately, we run a

Government by consent and we look at the requirements of the whole Island, and as a result of looking at the requirements of the whole Island, there is no parish or village of this Island that can claim that the Government has neglected it because of its mistaken representation in choosing people who cannot do them any good even in this life or the life hereafter. I just want to get the records straight; so that when they get up with these mealy-mouth pronouncements about their Resolutions and the Ministers do not have to look over their shoulders, I am not really concerned about them, but I like to see my Ministers stay in their jobs, and a word to the wise is sufficient.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would also like the hon. member to get a few things straight. One of the fundamental rights guaranteed the people under the Constitution is to elect members of Parliament regardless of whether they have elected a member who does not please him or not. The second thing that the hon. member must get straight is that it is the right of every member of this Legislature regardless of how much of a bully some people think they are to come into this House and ask questions affecting not only his constituency but any other part of the country. You can ask for instance if the Prime Minister is dishonest in bringing a Bill before the House or taking a particular action. You are entitled to put questions of this nature. The fact that I come in here and ask questions about my constituents and my constituents' business shows that in my view I am aware of what is happening in my constituency. I do not have to make any apologies to the Prime Minister for anything at all in this world, because I do not depend on him for anything, and if the Government does not put things in Christ Church West, the people will deal with them when they come back. *(Asides.)* I am not going to be heckled today. I have just come back from Guyana in a very quiet mood. Any swords I have to cross with any member I will cross with them outside. I am not going to be heckled, nor provoked, nor will I get into any accusations of calling people dishonest, because that I can say outside where I can justify it. I will just rest on that, and I believe it is unfair for a Head of the Government to get up here and criticise his Civil Servants about being dishonest in circumstances when he should be defending them. It is very unfair and very unparliamentary unless he is naming the people he is referring to.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I just want to get it straight that I have not practised at the bar since 30th November, 1961, and I do not have to defend anybody. I invite the hon. member to go and read the House of Commons debates in the case where Sir Thomas Dugdale was Minister of Agriculture and Sir Frank Soskice was the Solicitor talking about defending Civil Servants, and the Solicitor General of Great Britain clearly set out the conventions of the Constitution in that case. It was the case of "Critcheldowne" which was a property which belongs to friends of mine where the Government had tried to sell a property when according to the Land Acquisition Act they had to give it back to the owners, and Sir Frank Soskice said this, and I have written to the Civil Service about it, that whereas it is true that in the discharge of their duties a Minister is bound to defend public officers who are carrying out his instructions, even if they do the thing badly – this is what we mean by Ministerial responsibility; Civil Servants do not come in here, but if the Minister says that a road is to be done in Hart's Gap and the road is done in such a way that water rushed down on to somebody's property and does damage, the Minister has got to answer for that because he gave instructions for the road whether it was done at the invitation of the representative or otherwise; but this is what Sir Frank Soskice said and the debates are in the rood next door and you can go back to about 1952 – but where a Civil Servant deliberately ignores the instructions of the Minister or does something on his own which the Minister has not instructed him to do, then the Minister not only has a right but he has a duty to draw it to the attention of the public the misfeasance and malfeasance of the particular public officer.

Now I have not practised at the bar since 1961 but I know my constitution, and if he tells me I am supposed to come here and defend Civil Servants, the foremen and supervisors at the Ministry of Communications and Works used to dismiss a man because he voted for the Democratic Labour Party and since then we have a lot of relics, and the member immediately on my right would know that up to today, but it would certainly have been the first five years in office, all kinds of victimisation used to go on in the Works Department in this Island, and the foremen and supervisors and so on used to tell the workmen to go and let Barrow and Talma give them a job because they voted for them.
4.20 p.m.

Now you talk about protecting and defending civil servants. I am going to tell you about them, they are the biggest thieves since creation, some of them have eleven houses out of the Government's money, whole lorry loads of cement disappear at night. One time one fellow

was put on a charge down in the East Coast Road, St. Andrew, and the same civil servants took seven years to try the case. The man was suspended on half pay, and at the end of the seven years they could not find any papers and the man then had to be reinstated, he was not only doing one job during the period, he was doing two jobs, and we had to pay him seven years' back pay for carrying away cement. You say I should not be attacking civil servants, but I could call the name of the man, I do not get up and make wild statements like that, I am talking about ministerial responsibility, I am under no obligation to defend dishonest people in the Government Service. I have a little flying squad now, nobody knows about it, but we look into the accounting procedures, and a lot more of them will be up before the Courts. But to come back now to the main object of the Resolution, the hon. member for the City.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I gave way on a point of order. I thought the Hon. Prime Minister was making a point of order when I gave way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not true, there was absolutely no question of any point of order. I was making a speech and he interrupted me and I am not going to have him interrupting me now. How is it that after about fifteen minutes he is talking about a point of order?

Mr. FORDE: He can huff and puff as much as he likes, he would not huff and puff me out of here, let him get that straight.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will wither away, man, huffing and puffing would not be able to touch you.

Mr. FORDE: I am having no cross talk with him, Sir, those whom the gods will destroy, they first make mad.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please sit. Once again I will have to rule. I am allowing both hon. members to have their say, I am not going to allow it to go on like this because we are here to do the people's business and I will put the question. I am telling hon. members I am not going to allow what is going on, if it must go on in this manner I will put the question. I am prepared to hear both hon. members.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That would be the longest point of order in history if the hon. member is right, but since the hon. member talks so much about honesty and dishonesty, and the son of one of the taminy hall politicians in the twentieth century in Barbados would also talk about the same thing, I feel myself constrained to read from a document which I would like to make a document of the House. They say that I attack civil servants but I am under no duty to defend them, I am not a lawyer, I am Minister of Finance so I have to see that the money stays in the Treasury or is spent in a way authorised by Parliament and not by any questions put by him, or he and the Minister of Communications getting together and deciding how the Barbados taxpayers' money must be spent, I decide that, so do not let us get this talk about not looking over his shoulder because whenever you look back the Minister of Finance will be behind you and you cannot get anywhere unless you look back and talk to him.

On page 24 of their latest effusion, their Manifesto for the General Elections 1971, this is what they said. "The party is acutely concerned that one of the gravest dangers facing newly independent countries is the lack of confidence in the democratic system of Government....." – not the Democratic Labour Party, they lost confidence in democracy – "..... arising from abuse of office for personal gain by Ministers, political appointees on Boards, and civil servants." This is their Manifesto. Ten or twelve months ago they were saying that the civil servants were dishonest, not all of them of course, we did not take them to that, but they accused the Ministers of dishonesty, and I invited them to send the facts to the Director of Public Prosecutions, it is no concern of mine, go on television and tell the people what acts of dishonesty the Minister has committed, but they elected not to do it and I want to draw a veil of silence across that, I do not want to comment on that. Here today the member for Christ Church West will get up in the House and say that he is suprised that I will say that there is dishonesty in the public service.

We have 14,700 people drawing money every week and every month out of the Government's coffers, and if only seven out of the 14,700 are dishonest then I am entitled to say that there are dishonest civil servants. I go further now, and you can tell me if I am out of order, there are people in your constituency in St. George who are the biggest offenders, and you know them, Mr. Chairman, and these are the same people who turn around and tell a man who is working for $32 a week that there is no work.

You talk about Clarke & Tucker, but some of our own people are the biggest oppressors of mankind in this island and nearly all of them are adherents to the Barbados Labour Party, so let us just get the record straight. I am in a position to know, and wherever I find them, whether it is a Minister, an appointee on a political Board or a civil servant, they do not have to put that in a Manifesto, I will see that they are rooted out and if they are not rooted out, I will refuse to work with them, and they can work with people who can accommodate them. Let us when we come in here keep the debate at a level where you are not trying to make it appear that you have more say about spending public money than the Minister of Finance has, because it is simply not true. We are not going to refrain from carrying out work in a constituency merely because the people happen to be unfortunate enough to be represented by the members on the other side.

I have nothing more to say now. He can make as many speeches as he likes, but when I elect to deal with him I will deal with the hon. member, I just wanted to straighten the record now.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, let me make it quite clear again that any member of the public, far less a member of this House, is entitled to ask of any public servant information relating to any of the business of the Government, and once it is not under the Official Secrets Act, that civil servant, if the Government is being properly run, should give the information, but in this country there are a lot of people who can give advice about everything, they quote the Bible whenever they want to justify anything, only the passages that suit them, but they would not take for instance the advice that they should first remove the beam out of their own eyes before removing the mote out of other people's eyes, and I can hear all sorts of allegations which will tarnish the Civil Service completely. If this has been a Government for more than ten years now and there were all these dishonest civil servants we are hearing about, why have they not been dealt with?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, do you know why they have not been dealt with? Because they misguidedly placed people like the hon. member on the Public Service Commission and I do not have any power to dismiss them, I can only ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to deal with them, but if it was left to me, he would not have been on any Public Service Commission.

4.30 p.m.

If he says that they have not been dealt with for 10 years, it is due to the fact that the authority was vested in the Public Service Commission and he was a member.

Mr. FORDE: With respect, Sir, the hon. member knows very well that, when I was on the Public Service Commission, the business of the Public Service Commission was properly conducted. The hon. member cannot help himself.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. Do not tell me that I cannot help myself; I do not have an incompetent bladder; I can help myself at all times, and I can help myself in dealing with you. Ask the hon. member how many people were dismissed for dishonesty? How many charges were brought for dishonesty? Ask him how many of those people were dismissed during his tenure of office?

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on the Public Service Commission we carried out our duties, as far as I was concerned, properly. Now the fact that I happened to be on the Public Service Commission through no vote of his, Sir, shows that he is not in charge of his Party. As I understand it, he could have recommended me. Do you know what happens with people like the Prime Minister? Unless you agree with him on everything you.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tell him how he was elected, because I do not want to destroy the inflated opinion he has of himself. What happens in Cabinet is no matter of concern of his or the general public. I will leave him in his glory and let him have his little illusions of grandeur.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the only illusions of grandeur that I can have is to imagine that I was doing some good to the country when I was working with people who could not appreciate it like the hon. member. The hon. member has got on the floor of this House to make people believe that I got on the Public Service Commission without having any ability to be on it. He would not tell you when he came and begged me to be the Deputy President of the Senate, nor would he tell you when he had been sending people to me to ask me to do things for his Party. He cannot say so. If you oppose him, he cannot take it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member is going to cry soon, so I do not want to press him any more. I ask him to be very careful in making these allegations. He is on the verge of tears now, the only thing is that he does not have a clean handkerchief. Take off your

glasses and let hon. members see that you are not crying!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It comes to the point where I am going to rule. I am going to put the question; I will hear absolutely no more on this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot do that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not tell me that I cannot do it! I am going to put the Question.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, I am the Minister responsible for this Resolution. I am not the Prime Minister who is not responsible for the Resolution. I am responsible for the Resolution, and I have not been involved in any argument in this hon. House. I have a right to reply to what has been said on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to appear to attack the Chair, Sir. Just now you wanted to put the question when I wanted to talk. Now that the Minister of Communications has got up, why do you not put the question? Is this the sort of attitude that obtains in here? He can talk on it, but I am not allowed to do so! Why must we have this one-sided attitude?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have the right to reply as the Minister responsible for the Resolution, and that is all I am saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I also have the right to put the question without any Minister replying.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Put it then!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not tell me that I cannot do it! The Standing Orders give me the power to do so. We are in Committee and any Head that I feel has been amply discussed in my opinion, then I can put the question.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, just let me make this clear. Any time I feel that it is a public duty to ask any question in this House about my constituents, or people in any constituency, or the conduct of any Minister, I will bring it to this House. I have no apology, and I am not going to offend the Rules of the House. I will try to refrain from having to become personal, but if the debate must be kept on a high level, then other people must stop being personal. I am sorry if the debate has dropped to the level that you do not want to see in this House, but you must appreciate that all sorts of provocative remarks and statements are made by the hon. member who sat down on the other side in an effort to think that he is going to frighten somebody out of this House or out of this Chamber. He cannot frighten me out of the House, out of the Island, or out of the world, and the sooner he gets that straight the sooner we will get an understanding between ourselves in this Chamber as to how to get on.

I am not going to repeat the words of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he accused him of having a perverted mind. I am not going to repeat those words for him to know, but I should like him to realise that if he wants respect he must show respect instead of fulminating and quarrelling with people trying to blow them out of the world.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are dealing with the lighting of streets and public places. I sat patiently and listened to what has been said. The Minister of Finance has said that, despite all the talk and all the Resolutions we bring, nobody can get anything done unless he okays the money.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely saying that is the Constitution. The hon. member should know that. There is no private club in here where two people can get together and do something unless the Minister of Finance agrees with it. The hon. member and I get along all right at some times, and if he wants something done he must come and see me.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has just said that there is no private club where two people can get together. If I get together with him I will be in a private club.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I mean with one person other than the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BOLDEN: I do not want to be told later how inflated I feel I am, because I am not. Mr. Chairman, let us have a look at some of the dark holes in St. Joseph. St. Joseph had election lights and election water.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. If they had election lights and election water, then when they returned the hon. member they should have taken them out the next day. The lights are still there. Do you not see how fair the Government is?

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is twisting what I have said. The member who ran on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party said quite clearly that if he were not elected he was going to take up the

school and take down the lights. I have asked several times why is it that the school is still in operation and the lights have not been removed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to apologise to the hon. member. When he was sitting I thought he said "it was expected." I never heard the statement that he has attributed to his companion, parishioner, or antagonist in the bye-election. I know that St. Joseph has more lights per square mile than any other rural parish in the Island.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, at Joes River the electric wires were run to a particular point. The people at Joes River are constantly complaining that they cannot get electricity, water, etc. A bridge was broken down up there since 1960 and nothing was done to it. The Light & Power Company are saying that they cannot install electricity down there because they do not have the road on which their vehicles can travel. For instance, at Cambridge the lights stop at Bissex House. There is no telephone or anything at Cambridge. With regard to Hawthorne Village, I have heard some members express the view in here that we should not put people to live behind cane grounds.
4 p.m.

At least I would like some of the lamp posts put in Horton's Village. That is behind cane ground and I would hope that the Minister of Communications and Works would get together in his little private club with the Minister of Finance and at the same time think about these areas in St. Joseph particularly where we could have a little electricity and so lighten our darkness in these troublesome days.

The question that Head 32 – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 35 – Ministry of Education (12) Public Library – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 35 for the sum of $28,000 stand part, hon. members will recall that this unit has been in operation from early 1963 providing a library service on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays to more than 8,000 readers. The unit has deteriorated and has now been proved unserviceable and the parts are not available. They used to be obtained from the United States of America. They are not available from local agents. A certificate of examination dated 26th November, 1971, was issued by the Ministry of Communications and Works, and in their general remarks they stated that this unit is eight years old and has done well over 100,000 miles and spares are extremely difficult to acquire as no local agent keeps them in stock. From time to time certain spares for other units have had to be substituted, and when these could not be obtained the unit had to be put in cold storage until these spares were brought in from the United States of America. At present this is the case. This unit is unserviceable and is on cold storage. The cost of the bookmobile was $22,000 and its value at the time of examination was given as $4,000. It is estimated that the sum of $28,000 will be required to purchase a replacement.

I beg to move that Head 35 – Ministry of Education (12) Public Library – stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the public library has just celebrated one of its anniversaries, and it should be placed on record by this House the good work which the public library and the members of the staff are doing and the interest which they are showing in making books available to the reading public of this country. I think it is also fitting that in International Book Year this House should show its tribute to the Civil Servants at the Library who happen to be honest people and have done a very outstanding job, both the present staff and the past staff in helping to promote education in this Island. There are some thoughts that I think one ought to leave with this House. I believe that in other aspects of Government affairs books are bought for particular departments and some of them do not often receive the care they should get. For instance, one can think of the Law Library where the vote comes under the Registration Office and the Registrar has the duty to order the books. There is no librarian who is properly qualified to service the Law Library or to know how to order and particularly to replace copies that are outworn or indeed even to classify books in any true sense of the word as used in library science, and it seems to me that if the Government wants to make the greatest use of the ability which they have in the library services, the library services should be centralised and the Public Librarian treated as the Chief Technical Officer responsible for library services where books in every department, the Attorney General's library, for instance, the Law Library and other Departments of Government, are ordered by a central purchasing process, and that the services of the qualified librarian are available right down the line to all the other departments that need them.

It would seem to me that in a small country such as ours with limited resources, man power in some respects and certainly in technical fields such

as this, and with limited financial resources, it is better that we should revamp the system rather than leaving the public library librarian to look after the books at the public library without having direct responsibility for the upkeep of the libraries in other departments. It may well be that this will call for some readjustment in the terms of his employment. But I think when one goes to the law library and sees the waste sometimes of the library resources, one is really worried about this matter.

I think that some years ago the public library's staff was lent for a short while to the law library, but other than that there has been no real attempt to gather up around the place the books which belong to the people of Barbados and to have specialised librarian services available to manage these books, and I am therefore throwing out for consideration that some system should be used in dealing with books belonging to the Government not only in the public library, but also in other departments of Government. Sometimes, for instance, you find there might not be a particular Act in the Courts, but there may be three copies lying in another department that has no great use for them. If we have our library services much more centralised than this, then I think the resources would be better distributed and better used.

The question that Head 35 – Ministry of Education (12) Public Library, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving Head 37, Item 61 – Ex-gratia Awards for the sum of $606, the position is that we voted certain sums of money, $12,850, to effect payment of ex-gratia awards. This was done in 1969 and 1970, but there was difficulty in tracing all the people to whom awards were due. Only recently application has been received from the daughter of one of the parties entitled who died before the award was paid. Application has been made by the daughter of the deceased, Miss Denise Griffith, to the Ministry of Finance requesting receipt of the sum. Approval has been granted for her to receive this ex-gratia award on behalf of her father's estate, and this sum of $605.75 will be paid to this lady on behalf of her father who was an employee and who was also entitled. His name was Gladstone Griffith. On 1st December, 1970, a letter was forwarded from this Ministry to the estate of Mr. Gladstone Griffith requesting that the necessary voucher for the sum of $605.75 be encashed at the Treasury, but there was some doubt as to the executor of the estate.

4.50 p.m.

The position is that the father died and the daughter is now seeking to receive this ex-gratia award.

The second Item, Sir, Access Road at Lady Meade Gardens. An estimate was prepared some time ago by the Ministry of Communications and Works for the amount of $6,000 but since then, in May 1972, the Ministry was asked to revise the estimate in the light of the rising costs, etc., and the sum is now $7,414. This sum is required to supplement the non-recurrent estimate of Head 37(1) – Ministry of Health and Welfare in order to meet the proposed expenditure to provide this access road to Lady Meade Gardens to facilitate the access to this area in which there are many houses housing medical staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I beg to move that Head 37 stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak at length on this, all I want to say is that I am glad to see that the Government can find money to provide access roads to Lady Meade Gardens, and I sincerely hope they can find some money to help the people in Philip's Land. The Minister knows the position out there, he visited the site with me some time ago. I am not coming cap in hand begging for anything for anybody, because they are citizens of Barbados and if you in your wisdom do not feel like giving them that is a matter entirely up to you. I am not thanking anybody for anything, all I say is that the same way you find money to provide an access road up there for the doctors, at least you could spare some of the money to provide a little access for the people in Philip's Land. I would not even mention Chapman Lane, but you could put some rubble or marl or some sort of filling there so that the people can walk out properly when the rain falls. Even that little bit the Prime Minister would agree the people are entitled to.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am glad the hon. member said that even I would agree with that, because I know the whole history of the sale of that land, and I came along and did Chapman Lane.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, the Prime Minister did not hear correctly, Sir, I said Philip's Land. I said I would not even mention Chapman Lane on this occasion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have better not mention Chapman Lane because the roads down there are so good now that I took Prince Philip

down there, so I thought you had changed it to Philips Land because Prince Philip went down there but in the days of the old Vestry you could not take anybody down there, so what are you talking about? You should be happy.

I want to get something straight. The hon. member said he was glad that we have money to provide the road for doctors. Perhaps the Leader of the House did not explain fully, it is Government Land - one of the best purchases we made - with 13 houses and about 11 house spots, over 8,000 sq. ft. for $250,000 to solve our problems of accommodation for medical staff, but the access road to which the Resolution refers is in Lady Meade Gardens itself. What happened was that the people who live on Jemmotts' Lane, two or three of them wrote in and said that they would like to extend their backyards because a lot of rubbish was being dumped there and they would like to lease the land to the Government, so on my suggestion we wrote to all the people who had land abutting and bounding on Lady Meade Gardens, and we said we would draw a straight line and let everybody move back their palings to stop this undesirable rubbish heap collecting, and we rented that land out at $5 per year, the average being about 500 sq.ft. more or less.

The access road now, since these houses are jam packed side by side, is not more than two or three feet behind each house, most of the people have motor cars or people visiting and they tend to park the cars on the pavement on Jemmotts Lane. The idea of the access road is to allow them to have garages in the back of the land that we lease to them, but in addition to that now we are developing the land, so this access road along the back of these seven houses in Jemmotts Lane will also give access to the new quarters that we are in the process or very soon hope to construct to provide further accommodation for the medical staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. All the roads in Barbados are going to be done whether it is Philip's Land or anybody else's land, whether it is private land or whether it is Government land, because all the people in Barbados are entitled to good roads and it is only a question of time, not a question of whether it is in the City or whether it is in St. John. There are some roads in the parish I represent that are worse than any in the City, but they have to wait. Sealy Hall is one as you know, because from the time of the Southern District Council they have been asking for it to be done and it has not yet been done but it will be done in the process of time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Would the Minister who introduced the Resolution give me some sort of idea of where this land is in relation to what is known as Delaware Clinic.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has nothing to do with the Delaware Clinic. The plan is here, you can come and see it, I am not walking around there, you have to make application if you want to stay over here permanently.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very particular about where I make application to stay permanently.

5.00 p.m.

Why is the Minister afraid to send the plan to me?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is stapled to other documents in a Government file and it cannot be detached. The hon. member can come over here and have a look at it.

The question that Head 37 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 38 – Queen Elizabeth Hospital – was called.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 38 – Queen Elizabeth Hospital – stand part, I should like to state a few facts. With regard to Item 17 – Overtime Pay – the sum of $40,000 was provided in the Current Estimates and expenditure up to the 15th September, 1972, amounted to $40,000, leaving the sum of $9,365 due and owing to the present staff. It should, however, be pointed out that these rates had been revised and the revision was done after the Estimates were approved on the basis of specified rates of expenditure for the 5½ months period. Prior to 15th September, 1972, the sum of $67,700 was necessary to supplement the Estimates for the remainder of the fiscal year. However, in the interest of stricter control of expenditure, it is proposed to request only $50,000 as a supplement.

Under Item 21 – Consultant – a temporary post of Consultant – Casualty was filled in March, 1972, and the terms of reference provide that an allowance in lieu of private practice outside the Hospital be paid. The allowance which is equal to 20% of basic salary was not provided for in the current Estimates, and the sum of $2,400 is being requested to supplement this Item to the end of the financial year.

With regard to Item 98 – Travelling – the sum of $11,000 had been provided in the current Estimates to pay travelling to Laboratory Technicians, X-ray Technicians, Dispensers and Administrative staff. In the Chief Establishments Officer's letter it was thought that authority

should be granted for the payment of this allowance at the approved rates to Registrars, senior House Officers, and House Officers who live outside the hospital compound and are required to use their own vehicles in responding to emergency calls during their "on call" duty.

During the current financial year the approximate monthly rate of expenditure under this Item has been $1,600, and expenditure at 15th September was $8,827. It is considered that a supplement of $8,200 will be required to meet expenditure under this Item.

With regard to Item 106 – Rental of Quarters – the sum of $56,700 has been voted in the current Estimates for the rental of quarters for 21 officers at the rate of $225 per month. There are 53 Hospital Residences whereas accommodation now has to be provided for the holders of 80 posts. It has been observed, however, that the rent paid is more in the vicinity of $330 per month and, consequently, expenditure at 15th September, 1972, amounted to $56,700 with the sum of $3,550 due and outstanding. It can be seen, therefore, that the provision required for the entire year should have been $106,920, and the deficit of $50,220 is therefore requested to supplement this Item to the 31st March, 1973.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I intimated to the House that I proposed introducing a Resolution at the next sitting, and then I discovered that there was a Ministerial change. Purely by coincidence I had submitted a Resolution dated 19th October deploring the conditions at the Hospital and calling on the Minister responsible for Health to resign.

On the 20th October, we were informed by a release from the Government Information Services that the Minister responsible for Health had been transferred to the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Minister responsible for Home Affairs had been transferred to the Ministry of Health from the 1st November. At first I thought it could have been due to the problems which we are facing at the Hospital, I thought and thought and thought, and I am still at a loss to decide whether the Minister of Health was moved because of the inefficiency at the Hospital!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is entirely out of order. What he is saying is irrelevant to what we are discussing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Cannot I discuss the Consultant at the Casualty, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I was somewhat at a loss to decide whether.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have been trying to instruct hon. members on the other side earlier today that the constitution vests certain powers in the Prime Minister of Barbados. How I exercise these powers or why I exercise them is not even a matter to be enquired into by the Governor-General or the highest court in the whole commonwealth. It is highly improper for the hon. member to make the statement which he has just made. I had to ask the Leader of the House just now if he really had such a Resolution and I was out of the Island. He told me that I was out of the Island and he mentioned it to me on my return. I think it is highly improper for a member to get in here and discuss matters which are not even within the competence of this Chamber, or the Governor-General, or any court. If he wants to discuss the administration of the Hospital, I am sure that you will allow him to do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister thinks he is the only person who has studied law; he thinks he is the only person who can read something and understand it; he thinks that he is the only person who can behave with proper conduct, and that everybody else is doing something improper. That is the Prime Minister's attitude, Sir. I have never said that the Prime Minister changed a Minister because I brought a Resolution here. I said purely by coincidence I brought a Resolution here. Having seen and heard the announcement that the Minister of Home Affairs was now the Minister of Health and the Minister of Health was now the Minister of Home Affairs, I was wondering whether the Minister of Health was moved because of inefficiency, or whether the Minister of Home Affairs was moved because he bears the name Rameses which has some tendency to being the name of an Egyptian. 5.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member is out of order and he should be put out of the House for his indecent behaviour.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to the Prime Minister accusing me of indecent behaviour. I am objecting to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the Chair accused you?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Sir; the Prime Minister has.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As soon as the Chair accuses you, the Chair will ask you to leave, but until the Chair accuses you for indecent behaviour you will carry on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am objecting to the remarks of the Prime Minister accusing me of indecent behaviour as being unparliamentary. Will you rule? I will accept your ruling.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, he is getting instructions now. He says he knows as much law as anybody else. Why is the member for Christ Church West now instructing him? What does he have to instruct him for? Is he a solicitor? I am on a point of order and the member for Christ Church West is now instructing him to abuse me, but I think he should take counsel from himself.

The point of order I am making is that the member cannot come in here and accuse any Minister of the things he is accusing him of, and it is irrelevant to discuss why a Minister is getting another portfolio or anything of that nature. It is not the business of the House; it has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have not advised anybody to abuse anyone. The Prime Minister is great at misrepresenting the facts and lying about hon. members.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I am asking the hon. member to withdraw. According to Standing Orders I have to object immediately the accusation is made, and he will withdraw that or we will have it out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. member for Christ Church West to withdraw the remark "lying" according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. FORDE: I believe so. If you tell me to withdraw, I will withdraw it, but he is guilty of terminological inexactitudes which is the same thing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must withdraw the remark that the Prime Minister is lying.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member says that he will withdraw the word "lying", but he believes it and he said something about terminological inexactitudes which is the same thing. I can refer you to a case in the House of Assembly of Barbados in 1935 on the same point where a member accused another member of terminological inexactitude, and I think it was Sir George Douglas Pile who made the hon. member withdraw. Even if he did not know about that case which I know being a St. Georgean you know, out of his own mouth he said the expression he is going to use in the same thing as "lying".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Since he has told me that it means the same thing, I will ask the hon. member also to withdraw that remark.

Mr. FORDE: Sir, again I will withdraw the remark, but it does not change my opinion of him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am nothing to do with your opinion so long as you withdraw the remark.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As long as the hon. member keeps his opinions to himself and does not bring them in here, nobody cares about his opinions legal or otherwise.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would never accuse the Prime Minister of terminological inexactitude. I would use another Bajan saying that his mouth is no Bible, and you know what I would mean.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now the Prime Minister talks and accuses me of indecent behaviour, but I only want to tell the Prime Minister.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That matter has been closed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You believe so, Sir, with all due respect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as I am concerned. I have ruled and therefore you will carry on with the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am carrying on. When I was speaking the Prime Minister accused me of indecent behaviour, but what I would like to say is that nobody has ever accused me in here of having a perverted mind, at least none of my colleagues, and the Prime Minister says the same thing. As I was saying.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I cannot say the same thing, Mr. Chairman, because nobody has ever accused me of having a perverted mind inside this Chamber or out of it, except perhaps the other members on the opposite side on a political platform, but the electorate don't take them seriously, but nobody has ever accused me in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All I would say is that I wonder whom the Minister of Communications meant the afternoon when he talked about the most perverted mind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the Resolution. We are dealing here with four items; let us get back to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You seem to be getting angry with me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister of Communications. My problem with the Minister is that I happened to be sitting in the next seat. If I moved to that seat perhaps the Minister would feel better, but it is because I am sitting in the first seat that he is a bit peeved today.

As I was saying, Sir, I do not know why a change was made, but as I said, we have had people propounding their Jewish faith and Jewish background and it may very well be that one whose name has a resemblance to an Egyptian was not suited to be Minister of Home Affairs, and that is probably why he was moved. But I do not believe .....*(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking all hon. members to be silent. I am waiting to hear the points before I can stop the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, with regard to what has gone on in the last ten minutes, what has it got to do with this Resolution? I am submitting that the hon. member is irrelevant. He is only carrying out instructions, but he irrelevant. He came in here today with people's business.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I object to this. Let us get something straight. Only the Prime Minister can come in here and talk about carrying out instructions. The only persons who carry out his instructions are those gentlemen down the front line. I do not have anybody to instruct me to carry out instructions. If he wants me to tell him who is carrying out instructions, I can tell him. I am not one of his lackeys, one of the people he dangles on his fingers, or one of the people that is afraid to tell him what they think.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Question be now put according to Standing Order 32.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In my opinion I do not feel that the Question should be put. You must stick to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I will stick to the Resolution now. Do not mind the Prime Minister backing the Chair. This is a classic example of trying to stifle debate on the Resolution. Why is it that this Government is afraid to have a debate concerning the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Why is it that after the Minister of Communications got in here and said he was acting as Attorney General and gave this House the assurance that they would have an enquiry where counsel would be allowed to attend and ask questions, the Cabinet took a decision to back down from that, and the Minister of Communications did not have the decency to apologise to the House for misleading the House and misrepresenting the position. The Minister deliberately got in here when it was asked.....

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, what is all that to do with the Resolution? I would like to move that Standing Order No. 32 be invoked.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot move it a second time. I am going to ask the hon. member now to deal with the items and not to generalise on the Hospital.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with the consultants fees in the Casualty and the operation of the Casualty under which falls ambulance services.

5.20 p.m.

Let me state here and now that it is grossly unfair, at the time when the Minister got up in here and talked about having this enquiry into the operation of the casualty for which we are now asked to vote money for the consultant – I must be able to talk about the department over which the consultant is head, so do not look at the rule. Let me draw your attention to the Head because you seem to be in some difficulty, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I already know the Head which has four Items and you will deal with those four Items.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You will note that the consultant who deals with the consultant department is the consultant in charge of the casualty, and if you are going to vote money for him I am entitled at this stage to discuss his conduct and to discuss whether we should vote the money that is asked for here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That might be your opinion but it might not be mine. The House is being asked to vote this money, and if you are not going to vote for it you can state that quite distinctly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Am I not in the circumstances entitled to state my reasons why I am not going to vote for it? *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, the uncouth behaviour of the members on the other side...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no uncouth behaviour to the Chair, when uncouth behaviour becomes noticeable to me then I will deal with it. No hon. member in here is going to tell me how I must rule, when I hear it I will deal with it. I will ask you to get along with the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, it is to deal with the temporary post of Consultant – Casualty and to state whether or not I am going to vote for that money I am entitled to state my reasons why I am or am not going to vote for it. In an effort to do so I must advert to the operation of the Casualty Department. Part of the Casualty Department concerns the ambulance service, therefore in those circumstances in discussing whether or not we are going to vote for this we must discuss the operation of the department over which this consultant is in charge.

As was expected, in an effort to hush up and to minimise what took place recently at the Casualty Department, the enquiry that was promised where counsel on behalf of the deceased persons would have been allowed to attend and ask questions, that whole decision was made null and void and as you know now, Sir, an investigation was held which amounted to an investigation which was not made public and which was sent on to the Cabinet. As a result of this I understand that certain people working in the Casualty Department are supposed to be censured. The whole thing here is this, I do not think that it is fair – and the Minister said that if heads must roll, let them roll – but do not pick on the small heads and not the big ones, because it is unfair that one or two of the orderlies working...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it was the same hon. member who started this investigation on the ambulance service. We held an investigation into the entire thing and because it revealed that an orderly is involved how can he turn now and criticise the Government for firing the man? What is he telling the Government now, to be a chameleon like him?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not hear the last part of what the Minister said, but I would not object to anything the Minister says, what I was saying is that I think it is unfair merely to fire an orderly when the Government should come out and tell the people that the real fault lies in not having an emergency service at the hospital, and that is why you did not have a public enquiry, because a public enquiry would have shown quite clearly that the Government itself is at fault for not having emergency services at the hospital.

I am not telling you that you should not fire the orderly, but you should not have fired him alone, why do you not be honest enough to publish the report? The report would show that you do not have an emergency service at the hospital.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: How could you publish the report when the matter has been referred to the Public Service Commission for action?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not going into all this again, Mr. Chairman, this is why I asked the Minister when he was acting as Attorney General to have a public enquiry and not something you can hide behind and fire the orderly alone.

Let us look, Mr. Chairman, for a moment at the statement made by the Acting Minister of Health, and you will see how the Government backed down from the position which they adopted in here.
5.30 p.m.

The Minister in his statement last week said that on the 3rd October, 1972, this House was informed that the Minister of Health had instituted an investigation into all the circumstances surrounding the deaths of Miss Oughtna Neblett of Observatory Road, Clapham, St. Michael and of Mrs. Sybil Worrell of Lennox Avenue, Goodland, St. Michael, and the non arrival of an ambulance to their aid when requested.

A thorough investigation into the Ambulance Service at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the circumstances surrounding these deaths was conducted at the Senate Chamber...

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, Mr. Reid, who was doing the inquiry, stated that his only function was to look into the non arrival of the ambulance and not into the circumstances of the death. If the inquiry were held in public other things would have been investigated.

On the 17th August a man called Frank Thorne from Lodge Hill, St. Michael, called the Hospital at two o'clock in the morning for an ambulance, because his wife was having a miscarriage and the ambulance arrived at five minutes after five after the woman had already died. The Minister should investigate these matters. Sheila Thorne died of a miscarriage because she could not get an ambulance to take her to the hospital in time. You should hold a public enquiry and tell the public that you do not have an emergency service at the hospital. Instead of doing that, you hold an investigation, send a report to the Public Service Commission, and some Orderly will be fired in the end. That is the end of the matter, so far as the Government is concerned. You must accept responsibility for the failure to provide an emergency service at the Hospital.

Let me go further and say that, in the case of Sybil Worrell, there was no investigation into the late arrival of the ambulance. She went to the Hospital on two occasions. On the second occasion when she was taken there on a stretcher she asked the doctor to admit her to the Hospital. Her boy friend asked the doctor to admit her to Hospital, and the doctor said he would have to get in touch with another doctor. After the boy friend remained there for 45 minutes, he asked the nurse why the doctor had not admitted the patient, and she said that the doctor had gone home.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that this is one of the cases which was investigated and referred to the Public Service Commission. Instead of the hon. member coming here since he knows so much about the matter, he should have gone and given evidence. I am sure the Magistrate would have been very glad to hear him, but he wanted to appear as Counsel. He is coming in here and making statements as if he were an eye witness. This matter is *sub judice*, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am about to allow the hon. member to know that I am well aware of the matter, and I am not going to allow it to go any further. I have heard all of this argument already in this Chamber. It has been completely thrashed out in here, and I will ask the hon. member to discontinue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What has been thrashed out in here, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I direct that you discontinue your speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On the Hospital?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept Your Ruling.

The question that Head 38 – Queen Elizabeth Hospital – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 41 – Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 41 – Item 37 – Furniture and Equipment – hon. members will recall that only recently the staff at the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce have been increased by the creation of the posts of Chief Price Control Officer, more Price Control Officers, Clerical Officers, Stenographers, etc. This amount is to provide furniture for the new staff which have only recently been appointed. The purchasing will be done through the Central Purchasing Department. I cannot give you the list, because I do not have it here.

I beg to move that Head 41 stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

ANNEXED ESTIMATES – POST OFFICE – WAS CALLED

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is set out in some detail with respect to the request which is before this Honourable House. If hon. members have read the Addendum to this Resolution, they will see that the requests are reasonably necessary and needed. Unless hon. members wish to raise any other points, I will move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with Item 21 – Auxiliary Postmen. Some time ago there was a statement made in this House that the Post Office was one of the most efficient departments of Government which was being operated in this country. I was not present in the House when that statement was made, but I was most flabbergasted when I read such a statement.

I have drawn to at least two hon. Ministers on private occasions the dissatisfaction which many people are experiencing with the delivery of mails in the country districts. For instance, I personally have evidence of letters posted from

the Ministry of Education on a particular day that took four days to reach my house in St. Philip. I am not the only person, because others have been complaining quite recently that mails posted in Barbados are taking as much as 6 days to be delivered in an Island which is supposed to be 14 by 21.

Mr. Chairman, mails are coming into the country; they are date stamped on the date of arrival in Barbados, and they are being delivered three and four days late. I cannot see why this should be so. We have an up-to-date Post Office, and mails being posted from Government Headquarters do not reach people until four days after! A specific instance of this is that when the Book Week Exhibition was held at the Union's Headquarters, several persons received their invitations well after the opening date. I would think that this is something which the Minister responsible should look into. I do not see how you can have such an efficient Department with all of these complaints.

Quite recently people have been complaining that letters sent to the United States have taken several days to reach their destination; they come back here and take several days before they are delivered. I hope that the Minister will look into what is happening in the Post Office and, at least, speed up the delivery of local mails so that they will not take four days to travel from Bridgetown to any part of the country.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue for the Minister. I am sure that my organisation receives more mail than the hon. member who has just spoken. You can get slow delivery of mail, but it depends on the day postage takes place.

5.40 p.m.

If you post mail over the week-end, there is Saturday, Sunday and then Monday, but I do not know about these exaggerations of mail taking a long time to be delivered. My office is in the city and we receive mail twice a day. Far from local mail taking six days to be delivered, the postal arrangement here is such that we have received replies within six days going as far as London and coming back from Brussels. Sometimes it depends on the air service that you get, but it would be an indictment on somebody that mail posted at a postbox would take six days to be delivered. Something would have to be wrong. Sometimes you get post-marks one way, but again this is something you can enquire about from the people, but this is a regular feature. I am a regular receiver of mail daily, and it runs into thousands per annum; so we cannot say that we get any six-day delay of letters being posted coming to us here in Barbados. That would be an exaggeration.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I just rise briefly to reiterate that we have sone of the best postal services in the Caribbean and the world, and you will hear of the few letters that go after six days, but what about the thousands of letters that arrive the same day. I have read of English Post Offices and Australian Post Offices where a person gets a letter 27 years after it was posted. These things happen, but let us hear about the thousands of letters you get in St. Philip every day that are posted in the morning. Do not let us hear of the one or odd letter that takes a few days to get to you. That is why I say that these services are so easy to criticise when one letter goes wrong, but for the thousands that you receive day in and day out no praise is given to the postmen for that prompt delivery. I do not say you did not receive it late, but it can happen; so that is no indictment of a system where millions of letters are passing through the Post Office. Some must be delivered late sometimes. Do not let me hear you say that again. I will reiterate that we have one of the best postal services in the West Indies if not in the world.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it looks as if this afternoon is turning into a dictator's evening, because when the Hon. Minister is going to say not to let him hear somebody say that again, that really sets my spirit up. Nobody is saying that every letter that is delivered by the Post Office comes six days late, but what I am criticising is not what concerns me personally; I am criticising what people have been complaining about, that letters posted in Bridgetown are arriving in the houses of the recipients in St. Philip four, five and six days late. I know of a particular case now where a lady got a notice of a letter at the Post Office and did not receive it until a week and a half later; so there is no question of not letting the Minister hear me say that again. Is it now the pattern that you must not come in here and say anything at all which offends the Government? That seems to be the pattern of the afternoon; but as far as I am concerned, I am not like other persons. You have to beat me into the ground to stop me from talking. I am not afraid even of a fistic combat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the Chairman must beat you to the ground?

Mr. BOLDEN: No, Mr. Chairman. That would be a misuse of words and time. All I am saying is that I am entitled to say what has been reported to me, and I have said that people are complaining about the lateness of arrival of letters. I can get up

and say too that I have written off to England and have had replies come back to me in six days' time only to have the results frustrated by certain Ministers of Government. I am not afraid to say that either, but I am talking about the general complaint of people who talk about mail coming four days late.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I very seldom speak on post office topics, but I just want to say something very briefly this afternoon. The Minister of Communications and Works is perfectly correct in saying that we have one of the best postal services there is. It is no particular credit of any Government. It happens that we have a large number of postmen, a very densely populated territory, a small place in which it is easy to get about and post letters, therefore in the ordinary way of things, granted ordinary efficiency and a sufficient expenditure on postmen and postal services, you must have a first-class postal service. But I do not think that any purpose is usefully served when legitimate complaints are raised as they are by the hon. member for St. Joseph merely to get up and say that we have a first-class postal service. We should have it. Barbados has had a Post Office for a very long time. The Barbados Post Office Guide of 1932 is widely regarded in postal history as one of the great models because as long ago as 1932 the mail deliveries were so good that times were predicated within which a postman would pass a certain spot delivering letters on an afternoon. In those days you only had ten to deliver as the hon. member for St. Michael West said. I am not saying that the service was better then than now; I would not like the hon. member to misunderstand me because there are more postmen now to deal with the increased number of letters, but the point is that when something goes wrong, those responsible must pay attention to it.

Now I can cite examples on both sides. In fact only last week I had to cite one of the most remarkable examples ever, and I believe it more illustrates the point *vis-a-vis* the United States and *vis-a-vis* Barbados. I sent a registered letter to the United States on Monday of last week and got back a registered reply on Friday. Now this is exceptional. Exceptional things must have happened in the States for that to have been made possible. *(Asides)* It is normal here. I am just mentioning this as an example which hon. members have been drawing of remarkable deliveries. But when it goes out of the ordinary is when we have to sit up and take notice. There is no reason I can think of why a letter should ever take four days to get to St. Philip. It is known at the present time and I am sure hon. members have mentioned this in here before now that people have suspicions sometimes; they say the postmen interfere with letters. I do not believe it necessarily; but what I am asking is for the Minister to take note. He must protect his postmen. When a letter is delayed people have suspicions of the postmen. The postmen must be protected by the Minister and he is not protecting them merely by saying that 95% of the time everything is all right. It is the 5% you worry about.

Mr. Chairman, we aim at a high standard of postal service here. It has not come along by accident. When I hear the Minister talking about how much better the postal service here is than in the United States and Great Britain, do you know what the true logic behind that is? That these are big important white people in England and America and yet they do not have as good a postal service as ours. I do not look at it that way. I look at it that we have conditions here...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The hon. member is not getting away with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. member risen?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, I am objecting to that. I did not import any white people, black people, blue people, purple people or grey people. I made a statement of fact without reference to ethnic origins. He cannot tell me what to say in here. How could he import white people from up North? I have not said anything so, neither did I intend or insinuate it; so he must speak for himself. He would know why he referred to whites from up North.

Mr. ADAMS: The lack of comprehension of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central never ceases to astonish me. I have been in here a year and he still retains the power to astonish me by his lack of understanding and his complete inappropriateness in interjections, speech and otherwise. The entire point, and I am telling the hon. member this if he does not know it about himself, is that when you compare Barbados favourably with England or America, you are comparing it favourably because implicitly you believe that the English should do things better than us. That is the psychological background to such a comparison.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I did not say England alone; I said in England or the world, and China with 700 million or 800 million people.

Mr. ADAMS: The point is that we aim in Barbados at a high standard of efficiency in the Post Office.

5.50 p.m.

We aim at a system of, I think, two deliveries in Bridgetown – we are not getting that incidentally, Sir, the postman only comes to each address in his route once, but that is only by the way, that may be some kind of overload of mail or understaffing, I do not know – but you aim at two deliveries in Bridgetown and you aim at a delivery of mail posted by a certain hour in the country the same day. That is our standard, and when an hon. member draws to the attention of the relevant Minister that that standard has been departed from his remarks should be treated with respect and an investigation ordered where appropriate. Suppose they are not true, the Minister to my mind would get greater credit for proving they are not true merely than from saying that they should not be true, because that is all he is saying, that they should not be true. I am suggesting that especially at a time like this when rightly or wrongly complaints are coming about about the postal service – and I believe generally wrongly – there are more people getting letters now, and therefore there are in the nature of things more complaints, the Minister should be concerned to investigate every single one; apply a little analysis to his Ministry rather than bombast. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, just one brief note. I wonder if he would convey his sentiments to the Leader of his party who accused the same postmen last year of throwing away circulars during the election. How suddenly he turns around now and finds it is the best postal service when his party went on record as saying these postmen threw away circulars belonging to the Barbados Labour Party? He cannot deny it, it was in the Press, so how now suddenly he is telling the public we aim at a high standard of service and then set down as one of the reasons why circulars did not go out was that the postmen were sabotaging them? Let us start being factual now.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know who he means when he says convey to the Leader of the party, but since he is asking me to do that, I will just tell hon. members something. A postman told me – and I would give the hon. member his address privately if he gives me his confidence that he will not disclose it – that he threw circulars in a well at Brittons' Hill. I am not calling that postman's name, if the Minister wants the name I will give it to him in writing in confidence, I am not saying it on the floor of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I could not accept something like that in confidence which is an obvious breach of the Post Office law, which is dereliction of duty, which goes to the root of the service. How could I accept that in confidence? Tell it to the House. If you know it is a fact you are condoning a criminal offence, tell it to the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not think I can support the Minister who has just sat down that the disclosure should be made in the House because these things are uncorroborated at this stage, especially coming from the other side, but if the hon. member has some information he should give it to the Director of Public Prosecutions. They seem scared of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and according to the Constitution he is the only independent person in the whole of Barbados. He is more independent than me or the Attorney General or the Chief Justice, because I cannot appoint him, I can appoint the Chief Justice and the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. ADAMS: I will give it to the Director of Public Prosecutions on the same day as the Prime Minister gives to the Director of Public Prosecutions his complaint against BWIA for charging illegal fares.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is three years too late, because I forwarded all the information to the Attorney General's Office who sent it to the Director of Public Prosecutions, but then the people would not come to give evidence. They complained about the fares but they would not appear in court, and we will find the same thing that the hon. member would not appear in court to give the supporting evidence either.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, nobody need take the Leader of the Opposition seriously when he says that a man came to him with a name, he will never produce that name that you will find as a postman. You will go through all the records of Barbados and you will never find that name, he will give you a name that does not exist, so there is nothing wrong with him giving you the man's name. This is so much a habit with the hon. member that the hon. member told me last week that he has a paper showing that a man got $232,000 to get rid of George Weeks in Trinidad, and he will never be able to show me that paper either. This is something with the hon. member, whenever he comes with this sort of thing it is one of these old-fashioned lawyer tricks. We are accustomed to all that, so it is not a question of bringing any name, he will be worse than the postman who could not find anybody in St. Philip in six day's time, so I do not take the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seriously. He will give his greatest antagonist something in

confidence that is criminal in intent so that they will both be party to a criminal conspiracy.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael West must speak for himself. As far as the matter of the man not being a postman is concerned, I cannot tell if he is a postman or not, I only saw him wearing the Government's uniform, riding the Government's motor scooter, carrying the Government's bag and holding letters in his hand when he spoke to me, I do not know if he is a postman. I have only seen him in the yard and in the Post Office many times, I have only seen him delivering letters with my own two eyes, but I do not know if he is a postman. He may not be a postman, it is possible that the hon. member for St. Michael West is right.

The question that the Annexed Estimates – Post Office do now pass 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 $561,160 do now pass.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No.14

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This Resolution is for the sum of $118,508 to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government. It is Head 103 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – Capital. The various amounts have been set out in the body of the Resolution: Mental Hospital $19,759; Nutrition Centre $46,959; Sewerage Disposal $23,155; and Communal Baths and Latrines $28,635. The notes appear to be explanatory, and if there is any further information needed the Acting Minister of Health and Welfare is willing to give it. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

6.00 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 17

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of $170,000 to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part II – Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1972-73 No. 17 which form the Schedule to this Resolution. As the Addendum sets out, this Resolution is to provide funds in order to complete the purchase of a residence for the Governor of the Central Bank. The Central Bank of Barbados proposes to acquire the property known as "Medmenham", Pine Hill, St. Michael, to be used as the residence of the Governor of the Central Bank.

The purchase price of the property is $150,000, and a deposit of $15,000 has been paid towards the purchase price. It is envisaged that when the property is acquired a sum of $35,000 will be required to be spent for renovating the premises.

With special regard to the purchase of "Medmenham" funds provided under Part II – Capital Head 108 – Ministry of Finance, Item 4 Central Bank will prove to be insufficient for the remainder of the financial year. For that reason supplementary provision of $170,000 is now being sought for the purpose of purchasing the property "Medmenham" and for renovations to the premises.

I beg to move that Head 108 – Ministry of Finance – stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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 Your Honour do now report the passing of five Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of the Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by the Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the 5 money Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item on the Order Paper is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to make new provision for the

improvement and efficiency of the Public Service of Barbados by means of training ...

I am sorry, Sir. We had better do the one above first.

FOREIGN MAINTENANCE ORDERS (RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision for the reciprocal enforcement of foreign maintenance orders and maintenance orders made in Barbados and for connected purposes.

This Bill would make provision for the reciprocal enforcement of foreign maintenance orders and maintenance orders made in Barbados having regard to Barbados' accession to the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance done at New York on the 20th June, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, on the 20th June, 1956, the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance was done at New York, United States of America. The main provision is set out in Article 1 which states:

> "The purpose of this Convention is to facilitate the recovery of maintenance for which a person hereinafter referred to as the claimant who is in the territory of one of the contracting parties claims to be entitled from another person hereinafter referred to as the respondent to be subject to the jurisdiction of another contracting party, and this purpose shall be affected through the offices of agencies which will hereinafter be referred to as transmitting and receiving agencies."

In Article II, the designation of agencies is set out. The whole object of the Bill is that at present, as far as Commonwealth countries are concerned, maintenance orders can be enforced on a reciprocal basis, but in the case of foreign countries like the United States of America maintenance orders cannot be enforced on a reciprocal basis. However, the passing of this Bill will enable us to do so.

According to the Attorney General at the time, the present Minister of Communications and Works, the benefits from subscribing to the Convention will be merely to facilitate recovery of maintenance orders in countries outside of the Commonwealth. As far as countries within the Commonwealth are concerned, we already have reciprocal arrangements for the enforcements of orders, judgments, maintenance orders and so on.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and stood part.
6.10 p.m.

Clauses 8 to 14 inclusive were called and stood part.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE TRAINING ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 3 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister is to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the improvement and efficiency of the Public Service of Barbados by means of training and for connected purposes.

Under the provisions of the Training Scheme Fund Act, 1953-6 as amended by subsequent legislations, awards from the training scheme fund are made by the Governor-General acting on the advice of one of the Service Commissions. The Chief Training Officer is accounting officer for the fund, but the Minister in charge of training is by the Act denied control of the fund. The existing arrangements are a carry over from the

pre-independence era and from a stage when Civil Service training was not really institutionalised, and the fund itself was created from money left back from the scheme by which Barbadian nurses were trained for work in hospitals in the United Kingdom. It is felt, Sir, that the Minister should control the fund and should control all funds provided by Parliament for the training of Government Servants, and this Act should be brought into line with accepted modern practice. The actual selection of Civil Servants for training will by regulations continue to be done and be the concern of the relevant Service Commission. The Public Service Commission and the Police Service Commission have both agreed to the proposals but no reply was received from the Judicial and Legal Service Commission in this matter.

The position is simply that the Minister will be in charge of the fund, but that as far as the granting of leave is concerned, this will fall in the hands of the Service Commissions, and the accounting for the funds is done by the Chief Training Officer. But the Minister is responsible for the fund and he should have the power, and this should be brought in line with other Acts since independence.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of subjects which by a wide self-denying ordinance Governments, although they have the power ultimately to take them into their hands, they leave them in the hands of independent bodies, and one of these subjects is the promotion of public servants, members of the police force and members of the Judicial and Legal Service of this Island, and indeed of many other Islands and countries, and I daresay, continents throughout the world. I do not regard the Public Service Commission control over the public service as being a carry over from pre-independence days. I regard it as a very real freedom enjoyed by the people of this Island, and I am unaware that at the independence conference any voice was raised against the day to day control of the public service being left in the hands of the three Commissions which have been adverted to in the speech of the Leader of the House, and I am going to suggest to hon. members that the selection of public servants for training courses is as much a part of the day to day administration of the public service, the police and the judicial and legal service as is their promotion, demotion, discipline and all other matters which are handled by these Commissions.

The Constitution of Barbados in Articles 89, 90 and 91 set up the three commissions. Articles 93, 94 and 95 and indeed 96 and 97 dealing with the police and subsequent articles give the commission power to make appointments to the offices to which these sections apply and to remove and to exercise disciplinary control over persons holding or acting in such offices, and this power is to be exercised by the Governor General acting in accordance with the advice of the appropriate commission. It seems now, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is chafing under the army of occupation.

Mr. Speaker, there may be legitimate complaints against the army of occupation. During the last Estimates we heard the Prime Minister set out a number of things which, if true, would reveal a situation that all hon. members of this House would very justifiably take umbrage at – of situations, because he did not refer to only one; situations where it appears that the decisions which Government took or wished to take were frustrated sometimes not only by acts of omission, but by acts of commission as well on the part of public servants, but there is a remedy for all that. You report them to the Public Service Commission; you deal with it that way. But it seems that the Government at the present time is dissatisfied, this is my view of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, with the amount of control which it exercises over the public service.

6.20 p.m.

It seems that the Government at the present time is dissatisfied – this is my view of this Bill, Mr. Speaker – with the amount of control which it exercises over the public service, and it seems to me that this Bill is intended not so much to crack a whip but to hold out a carrot ultimately, the carrot of a Minister's approval being required before persons can be sent on training courses. This is the ultimate carrot that is being held out, and to my mind this is intended to some extent to make public servants more amendable to Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House said that the selection of persons for training will by regulation continue to be done by the appropriate Service Commission. I have no idea whether this is intended to show some conformity with the relevant articles of the Constitution, beginning with article 93, which say that disciplinary matters are in the hands of the Public Service Commission. A man can be disciplined if he is in line for training promotion and not given it; that is as much

discipline to my mind if he is denied the course which will give him the opportunity of advancing in the public service as it is if he is given a reprimand for some fault which the public service may find in him. My view is this, if by regulation the Public Service Commission is going to continue to select members of the public service for training courses, why is it necessary in the name of independence to make it appear from the Act that the Minister will continue to be responsible? This is what I mean about the carrot. This Act is going to tell public servants they must please the Minister or else they will not go on training courses.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go over the training scheme, there are many persons in here who are more familiar with these matters than me, the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. member for St. Lucy I have heard speaking on the training scheme showing some knowledge of it on an occasion earlier, and I would certainly expect to hear from the hon. member for St. Lucy whether he is satisfied that this Act is all that it seems to be on paper and nothing more. It cries out, Mr. Speaker, that this Act is intended to create a system ultimately of political patronage in the public service. This is the thin edge of the wedge of political patronage in the public service. The regulations today say that the Public Service Commission will continue to select persons for training, but subject to the Minister - they have to pass through the Minister's hands now - whether they select them or not it is the Minister who has to make the recommendation, and I quote from section 4(2) of the Bill:

> "The Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, make loans from the Loan Fund to any person mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (e) of section 3(2) for the purpose of assisting that person to pursue a course of study or training course approved by the Minister."

The Minister may make loans from public funds. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Look at the category of people). I will invite the hon. member who is heckling and saying "look at the category of people", does the hon. member know who the category is? I challenge him to get up and say who category (e) is of the people. Category (e) is every citizen of Barbados, indeed of any country in the world. Category (e) is such other persons as the Minister determines. That comes after public officers, public employees, teachers, officers of statutory boards and such other persons as the Minister determines. I think that the Minister responsible for training has better send the Minister of Communications on a course for understanding the Queen's English because he will be able to do it under this Act. Look at the category of people. That means in plain language - because there are no connecting words to bring in the *eiusdem generis* rule - that the Minister can select anybody in Barbados.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member will give way, if he were to refer to the existing Training Scheme Act he will see that permission has been given already for such persons to be awarded scholarships. It is not a delegation, it is just repeating what the old Act says.

Mr. ADAMS: It is not me who raised the point, it is the hecklers who raised the point, telling me to look at the category. I know the category, it is not me who raised the point. The Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, make loans from the loan fund. That is the germ of the Act, and a germ it is indeed, Mr. Speaker. I repeat my arguments - I do not want to dwell at length on this, I think the point has been made - I repeat my arguments in summary form as briefly as I can, either the Public Service Commission is the proper body to make these appointments or it is not. If it is the proper body do not amend the Act; if it is not, how can you make regulations saying that the Public Service Commission will continue to administer the Act? It is a straightforward matter of logic, Mr. Speaker.

I heard something about granting of leave to be controlled. What is going to happen when the Minister decides to award a training loan and the Public Service Commission refuses to grant any leave? That is still within the competence, as I understand it, of the Public Service Commission. Why do you seek an area of conflict when in fact there need be no conflict? For what purpose has the Act been passed if the Public Service Commission is going to continue to do it? I cannot believe the argument that this is a hangover from pre-independence, if this is a hangover from pre-independence the Public Service Commission is a hangover from pre-independence. All we need to hear now is that the Constitution is going to be amended to abolish the Public Service Commission but to re-appoint the same persons to carry out the same functions. A Bill in those terms would be logically similar to this particular Bill which is before the House. Sir, the Opposition cannot vote for this, we cannot see in any way that it is going to make new provision for the improvement and efficiency of the Public Service of Barbados. Does anybody on that side honestly and deep down in his heart believe that you improve the efficiency of the Public Service by making people jockey behind the Ministers in order to get a training grant? Will that increase the efficiency of the Public Service, or will that prevent the Minister from getting good advice if the person who is to give the advice thinks

that it is against the Minister's present or instant opinion? Will that encourage civil servants to carry out their duties, or will it encourage them to spy on each other and carry tales to the Minister to stop a man from getting a training grant in the hope that they can get it themselves?

All this strife can be introduced by this Bill, Sir, and I have grave doubts myself as to its constitutionality. I have grave doubts certainly. I cannot say more than that because we have not had a constitutional case so far in Barbados, so nobody can tell what view the judges will take, they may take a liberal interpreted view or they may take a restrictive interpreted view. I have every confidence that in the United States such words "to remove and to exercise disciplinary control over persons holding or acting in such offices", coupled with the regulations which say that all matters of promotion and discipline are in the hands of the Public Service Commission, I have every confidence that a court constituted and practising, such as the United States Supreme Court, would hold that to take training out of the hands of the Public Service Comission is to act in breach of the Constitution, but as I say, I can only express an opinion.
6.30 p.m.

I cannot give it as a legal opinion; I am giving it as a political opinion that this is against the spirit and the letter of the Constitution. If it is wanted to end the political independence of the civil servants or the Public Service, I believe the Government can do so because they have the numbers. The numbers are there, and it should be done openly. Do not come here with a Bill that says that you are ending independence in one respect - you talk about the control of all funds provided by Parliament. You are ending the independence with one hand and you are giving it back with the other.

The Leader of the House says that a Minister must control all funds provided by Parliament, but you do not control the civil servants' votes even now. A Minister cannot stop a civil servant from getting his salary. He cannot control it after it has been voted by Parliament. You cannot fire a Permanent Secretary, so the Minister does not control his salary. Parliament cannot fire a Permanent Secretary, so that argument does not hold any water.*(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Any members who are sitting, I expect them to remain silent.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find the part dealing with pensions: The power to grant any award under any Pensions Law for the time being. All of that is in the appropriate Service Commission. My point is as obvious to members of the House as I believe it will be to the Public Service and the people of Barbados in due course. I heard something about writing to the Public Service Commission and to the Police Service Commission. I think it much more undesirable in the case of the Police than it is in the case of the Public Service. I would suggest that it is the least undesirable in the case of the Judicial Service and Legal Commission although the Judicial and Legal Service Commission has not expressed its views. I do not think so much harm can be done there, but I think that very serious harm, indeed, could be done to the Police.

Mr. Speaker, I want hon. members to recall that the interests of all Ministers are not identical. All Ministers are members of the same Party, but they have their personal feelings one way or the other as well. I should like all Ministers and all hon. members in the back to ask themselves if they can confidently put themselves in the hands of every single one of their colleagues and rely on them absolutely and in all circumstances and feel safe in turning their backs on them. Anyhow, that is only by the way, Sir.

We have heard about the Commissions being written to. What about writing to the people involved? Has the Civil Service Association or the National Union of Public Workers been written to? Has the Barbados Workers' Union been written to? That is why I have asked, particularly, that the hon. member for St. lucy should make some contribution to this debate. You ask the Commissions, but you do not ask the representatives of the people concerned.

Earlier this evening we heard in the House that they cannot change the Police uniform because the two Ministers at different times have both consulted the relevant persons. Has anybody consulted the Public Service about this matter? The Training Fund is increasing every year. If there is one thing the previous Government had instituted which I have never heard criticised, it is the Training Fund Scheme. It is well appreciated by everybody in this House. Have the people affected by it been asked a question as to whether they agree with it? Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the Opposition cannot vote for this, and I think it is a retrograde step.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition, especially in his closing stages. The fact that he says the previous Government has done this - this is a matter of policy. The civil servants in Barbados were not born with any Training Scheme. When I

entered public life there was no Training Scheme in the Public Service. I can say with pride that I take some responsibility in a matter like this, because I objected to sending civil servants overseas, and I still object to giving them leave passages. I say that the money spent on giving civil servants leave passages should be spent in providing training for them. I am diametrically opposed to recruiting a man in Barbados, and then tell me that when you give him a holiday you have to send him home. Where? St. Andrew or in London? If you think that home is in London, then let the English people recruit him and send him here for a holiday.

With regard to the Training Scheme, I am surprised to hear what the hon. member had to say because the Leader of the Opposition is a lawyer. Do not wonder if it is something against the Constitution. If the Government is doing something against the Constitution, then bring a test case and go to the Supreme Court with it. Do not come in here and talk about it. You have six members of the Opposition and four of them are lawyers, so you do not have to go and spend any money. You should be able to do this as a sort of public service and as a Parliamentarian in your own country. I would do that. You should go to the Court if it is something unconstitutional. You do not have to be a lawyer to realise that there is nothing unconstitutional in this, because a Training Scheme is a matter of policy.

I understand that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is the Shadow Minister of Finance. What kind of bogus Minister of Finance he is going to be or he would be if he is the Minister of Finance and he has no control over the purse strings in this country? I do not see there is anything wrong in this. If I had my way I would not allow any of these people to be trained in England or anywhere else until they reach the age of 21, because it seems to me that all of them have been brain-washed with the education they receive in the United Kingdom. They will go to England and see Ministers with authority and power given to them by themselves in an independent country, and when they return to Barbados they do not want to give a Minister the power to do certain things. What is the difference between a Minister of Barbados and a Minister of the United Kingdom? Do you believe any Minister in the United Kingdom would get up and talk the nonsense the hon. member has given us here when he talks about giving a Minister too much power?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I never used the words "Giving a Minister too much power." Is the hon. member suggesting, or is it a fact, that I said that in England Ministers recommend civil servants for training? The hon. member would only be revealing his ignorance.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: In the United Kingdom the Government can do whatever it feels. It is the Government of the United Kingdom which decides if they are not going to take that power. In the United Kingdom the Ministers control everything, from the Queen back down. They decide as to their Civil Service Commission. In the United Kingdom tomorrow or now the Parliament can pass a law that there shall be no Civil Service Commission and that is the end of it. You seem to forget the supremacy of Parliament.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, is the hon. member suggesting that the Parliament of Barbados cannot pass a law abolishing the Public Service Commission?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not suggesting that. All I am telling you is not to begin to talk about the power of the Minister vis-a-vis anything. Training is not a matter of policy that you are going to talk about things being something to do with the Public Service Commission. If past Governments gave training to the Public Service Commission, this has nothing to do with any intrinsic right that the Civil Servants possess and you are now taking away that right from them. They have no right in so far as training is concerned as to who is going to grant training, or if training is going to be at the hands of the Minister or at the hands of the Public Service Commission. Let the hon. member get it straight if he is not aware of what happened in Barbados before. The Public Service Commission came in as a result of giving public servants security of tenure. The whole theory of the Civil Servants getting security of tenure and not being under the behest of a Minister dismissing them was on the basis that a public servant as such does not work with a Minister per se. A Minister does not employ a public servant by paying him money out of his pocket. As a public servant you must give him the freedom to be able to enjoy the rights in the public service without being dismissed by a Minister, so that you do not have to go up under the Minister's window on mornings, or go to the back-yard at night and have to salam to the Minister and ask him favours, or go and carry out his children, or do any of those mean services in order to get the Minister's favour.

Now when it comes to training in the public service in so far as this Act is concerned, since independence, I would expect to hear from the hon. member if there are any improprieties...

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to read the speech the hon. member made when the first Bill was introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of interruption.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot read it now. I do not know what the situation was when it was introduced. You do not expect me to go back to 1953 when it was introduced, but in 1953 we did not have independence. If you want to read something I said then, you can read it, but it is not going to prevent me from saying what I am saying, that the Minister should have power, and in the same way the Ministers in the United Kingdom have power, the Ministers here should have power too. If there is something wrong with the Minister doing it, then you will take it away and come to Parliament and deal with it. If the hon. member is reading something from 1953, there might have been a good reason for what I said then, because the Ministers or the people who were running it to my way of looking at it might have been corrupt and I might have been cautious; so if you tell me I was cautious in 1953 because I could see what was happening, now the dangers have been removed, and those persons who were controlling it in 1953 no longer control it now; so that could be only a precaution. I would like the whole of the speech read because I have always been in favour of full ministerial government, not half-way ministerial government. All I am saying now is that if the hon. member is objecting to the Minister having the power, I do not know why the Minister cannot have the power in so far as determining these matters about training, because it is a matter of policy. In the United Kingdom the Overseas Department, training and whatever is done, is done by the policy of the United Kingdom Government. The Ministers are responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to this Chamber that the United Kingdom Government has so much power that Mr. Greenwood was appointed to be a Chairman of one of the nationalised Boards, and when the Government was changed Mr. Greenwood was told by the succeeding Government that they were sorry but he was not going to take up this appointment because that was the policy of the Government; so there was no question about that. The hon. member said that he is going to raise a question about the Constitution; well he can do that. If the hon. member wants to read my speech of 1953 and hear what I have to say now, he can listen and I will tell him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot anticipate what another hon. member will say. Let him get on and speak on the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way, I will read it.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot speak. If the hon. member speaks again in here I will have to be put out, because he has spoken already. So far as ministerial status is concerned, the Government should send down a Bill changing the whole constitutional position about ministerial responsibility and make Ministers in Barbados have the same power and responsibility as in the United Kingdom so that they should go when they make any bogus and foolish mistakes. They should have the power, not any kind of power where you have to talk about the total situation before you can decide on issues. It is time that the Constitution of this country come to terms with what is reality, if not you will find that a Minister cannot deal with things on the spot until ten years when it comes to him, because he does not have the functional authority to deal with it. You have a situation in Barbados now where the Leader of the Opposition can get here and say you cannot dismiss a Permanent Secretary. Nobody is out to dismiss a Permanent Secretary, but what we want a Permanent Secretary or any public servant to understand is that he is not above the public and can do as he pleases and no one can do him anything, and for that reason, if this Bill in dealing with training seeks to give a Minister authority that the Minister does not now possess, I would like any one to seriously say why he is against a Minister in Barbados getting that authority. I am not talking about the Minister of Education; I am talking about all the Ministers. You have agreed to independence after five years, but you have agreed to independence with the proviso that the Minister who is independent in an independent country should not have power to say who should go for training. A simple matter of dictating who should go for training, who are the people, what are the offices, what are the things you should do for training, is something you feel the Public Service Commission should deal with. The Public Service Commission is appointed by the Government and the Government can remove it; so the Public Service Commission cannot be above the powers that be. I believe this is a point the hon. member raised as a means of showing that if you gave this authority to the Minister, the people would not have any say.

6.50 p.m.

The point that the Hon. Minister raised about the organisations in so far as policy is concerned, the hon. member knows that policy matters as such are not matters that sectional organisations

can insist that they have to be consulted about before the Government proceeds with it. The Barbados Workers' Union is interested in training, but the Barbados Workers' Union cannot determine the policy of the Government in so far as training for the public service is concerned. That is the function of those who run the Government; if we run the Government we would decide what the training for the public service will be and that would be the end of it, but whoever runs the Government has the authority to determine policy, so it is nobody else's function to determine policy.

When it comes to certain details we would expect like any other organisation to know what are the details for training; when a man goes on training what are you going to pay him, what are the things you are going to offer him, what will happen to him when he returns. Those are the things you will expect to discuss with the sectional organisations because these are the people you are sending. These are the details you would expect to discuss with people. The amount of money which you are going to spend on training – this resides with the people who have to provide the money – it cannot reside with the people who are going on training, and that is known all over the world.

What I am surprised about is that in Barbados in 1972 we still have this pin-pricking idea about the powers of Ministers. You would think that we had passed that stage since 1966 when the people were told that we were going in for independence, and in 1971 again they were being told the same thing and the people reaffirmed its confidence in us in no uncertain terms. I thought we had passed that stage now about independence; today we are at the stage where we could talk about a Republic, not the question of how much power a Minister should have, we should be talking about whether or not we are deciding to become an independent Republic. That is within our province, not within the province of anybody to determine, that is our right, the people gave us that right to say these things, so I do not think there is any question of saying what a Minister should do. I am surprised to hear a young politician in 1972 who is questioning the validity of the powers passing on to the people when all these powers were in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The hon. member's father, who was the first Premier of this country – he should go back and read some of his own books – before Ministerial Government was taken in this country made it this way, that the same power of the Governor-in-Executive Committee was being passed on to Ministers, and whatever power the Governor-in-Executive Committee had before the Ministers took over because the Governor, prior to independence, was the Prime Minister of Barbados, therefore he had powers which nobody questioned, so Mr. Speaker I do not know why they are questioning these powers.

The hon. member asked if the Ministers had to put the power in somebody's hand if they would question them. That is a personal question. There are only six on the other side, and I do not believe all on the other side if they had to put all their lives would trust each other, but we know what each of them said about the other and that is why they ended up with six because there was too much mistrust among them. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had to put all his power in the hands of the hon. member for Christ Church West we know what would happen, but they have to carry on a facade of unity. It is known, it is public property and it is public knowledge tht the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was surprised that the hon. member for Christ Church West was not defeated, and he was not too sorry that the leader of the party was defeated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please confine your remarks to the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I was surprised when the hon. member for St. Michael West was not defeated, because I have seldom seen a more unpopular candidate succeed at the polls.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The most unpopular part is the part that caused you to have six, because the voice reduced your numbers to six. If I had run in St. Thomas, you would have been a memory.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition sought, when he was speaking, to make me join in this debate, for what reason I am not sure, but I want to take him up on one point which he made towards the end of his speech. It related to the fact that the kind of advice which the Public Service Commission would give on the question of who should qualify for loans would now be amended as it were and that the Minister responsible for this fund would have to make this decision. I want to relate to this House a personal experience, because I think that this would throw into focus the whole idea behind the operation of a fund of this nature as I see it.

I went to the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill, in 1963 and there were a number of us there who made application to the Public Service Commission for leave and indeed for a grant to enable us to complete our studies there. This was turned down, and from then until 1966 when this party in its manifesto of that year made it as part

of Government's policy to assist people who wanted to go to Cave Hill in order to get some training so as to assist with the development of this country, and made it an instrument of policy that people who were going up to university would have been able to benefit from a scheme of this nature. I have absolutely no qualms of conscience in this when I see a Bill of this nature coming down here where a Minister can determine what policy is going to be pursued when it comes to training, because if an important matter like this is left in the hands of a reactionary group like the Public Service Commission, you can very well imagine what would happen in this country.

I am not too sure whether the hon. member for Christ Church West was not a member of the Public Service Commission when the demands which were made on the Public Service Commission by the people who wanted to have access to training funds made application to the Training Scheme Fund. This, I think, is a very important move towards getting the required number of people and the type of people who would be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the improvement of the Public Service and thereby make a contribution towards the further development of this country. I think that in the whole scheme of things one has got to have a clear identification of the needs of the Public Service, and in doing so this would put into focus the kind of training which would be necessary, and this of course as the member for St. Michael West has pointed out, must be a matter of Government policy and I cannot see how a person like the Leader of the Opposition could get up and say that this is something which should be done on the advice of the Public Service Commission or of any Commission for that matter.

Another point which I should like to make here, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that in the disbursement and in the granting of funds of this nature, – Training Scheme Funds – one must have the type of controls which will be necessary to ensure that any grant which is made will be repaid. 7.00 p.m.

We have heard of instances where people have had loans – whether public servants or not – and sometimes they do not return to the Public Service and so on. I think we will have to make sure that the penalties which will be laid down for the defaulters will be so stiff as to prevent or to discourage people from taking advantage of a situation like this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a misunderstanding which I should like to clear up. It is not generally known in this House that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister is the person who is in charge of the Training Scheme Fund. I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest. Nobody seems to realise that there is a Minister in the House and that the Prime Minister has been operating the Training Scheme Fund ever since 1961. The position is that at the moment the Minister has the power to designate the types and categories of persons even outside the Public Service, and this is nothing new, who may be the recipients of loans or grants from the Training Scheme Fund. That was in the Act of 1953-6, as far as I can remember. We are always very deficient of the Laws of Barbados in this Chamber. The 1953 law is the most official guide, but I do not have a copy here. I will try to get one from the Clerk.

Under the provisions of the existing legislation, Mr. Speaker, awards are made by the Governor-General acting on the advice of any one of the three Service Commissions. The Act of 1953 has five short sections. Of course Section one gives the description of the Act as in the present one before the House. Section 2 is the interpretation section. Section 3 establishes the Fund. Section 4 deals with the powers of the Governor or Governor-General, having obtained the advice of the Public Service Commission, who may in his discretion award scholarships and training courses out of the Fund subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor, after having obtained such advice, may in his discretion determine to any one of the following persons or classes of persons.

Section 1 is the Short Title. Section 2 is the interpretation section. Section 3 is the same as Section 3; it deals with establishing the Fund and saying where the money should come from. Section 4 deals with the Training Loan Fund and the amount of money referred to in Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 as well as the Regulations and the date of operation.

If you will look, Mr. Speaker, at the two pieces of legislation, you will see the people who can benefit from the fund. Scholarships and training courses may be awarded on such terms and conditions as the Governor-General may determine to a public officer, public employee, teachers, officers of Statutory Boards and such other persons. There is only one difference between the 1953 Act and the new Act in so far as this Section is concerned, which is really the operative Section of the Act. The power to make Regulations is one which is inherent in the person to whom the Legislature vests that authority.

Mr. Speaker, all that has happened between this Act and that Act is that where we said

parochial employers in 1953 we now say officers of Statutory Boards, because such other persons as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine is in the existing legislation. The hon. members are claiming now to take it from the Governor-General in the year of Independence. Hon. members are now claiming that to take that power from the Governor-General in the year of Independence and allow it to reside in the Minister, who at the time is your humble servant, is something unconstitutional and that the Minister will give things to his friends and, therefore, it will be done on a basis of fear and favour.

The Bill before us makes no change of any substance whatsoever to what is going on now. The Governor-General does not send people on courses of training. That has been done by the Minister ever since Independence. I can tell you of two cases in which the Minister exercised that power. There are cases from the Employers' Confederation. We had to send a worker who came form the Government, and a Manager on a course, and I had to designate that Managers were people who could come under the Act. He is somebody I have never known in my life. He never had to worry to write me a letter thanking me for designating him, because under the existing law and under the Bill which is now before the House, it is the Public Service Commission that makes the selection of the person.

A Minister says that a Manager can benefit from a course because I.L.O. or some other Organisation says that they can offer two scholarships and the Government will have to provide a Manager and a worker. Now, the worker can be taken from the Government, but we do not have any Managers in the Government. Therefore, somebody from the Employers' Confederation would have to be designated to go.

Let me tell you about the Public Service Commission now. Hon. members talk about the Constitution and not trusting politicians or Ministers, but they do not understand what Ministerial Government is about. The trouble with our Constitution is that the Ministers do not have enough power. The Attorney-General in Barbados does not have the power that he has in Jamaica, Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago. The Minister in Parliament surely does not have that power. I am saying that the Ministers in Barbados do not have the power of the Ministers in Colonial Territories like Antigua, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and, I suppose, Montserrat. In each one of those places the Premier has dismissed by his own writ sometimes 34 civil servants in one day. Heads begin to roll from the top, all the way down the list from Permanent Secretaries. Those places are still Colonial Territories, and no Minister in this Government, including myself, has any power to do that. If we had that power, the Government would have been running more efficiently, and we would have got rid of some of the "yard fowls" from the ancient regime. We would have had a lot more efficiency in the Government, if the Minister were entitled to act as Managers – Managers to say that this man is in a pivotal position and he is sabotaging the Government Service. I have no power to do that. 7.10 p.m.

Take for example the Commissioner of Police in Grenada; similarly in Antigua; the Head of the Civil Service; the Chief Customs Officer – no Public Service Commission told the Chief Customs Officer that he was not to turn up for work – the Minister told him he did not want to see him about there, and when the Public Service Association started making trouble, they put him before the Court, but if they had kept their mouths quiet, the fellow would not be facing criminal charges now. You talk about the Constitution and the Minister. Let me tell you something, Sir. I should not say that, but I just want to advise you on what goes on. This Public Service Commission, after the Cabinet decided - when I say "this one" I do not mean the members now, I mean since independence, the Cabinet decided that we did not want to have any law scholarship given to public officers to go up to the United Kingdom and get full pay and get money for legal scholarships. This is Government policy. Even the lawyers in the Cabinet who do not have to jump into the ring and contest for private practice agreed that the quality of the product we get is not up to standard, and we did not need them in Government. We are saturated with lawyers. The Public Service Commission took up a gentleman from the Registry and gave him full pay because he was related to a former Premier of the Island, not related to the Leader of the Opposition on the opposite side; but you know who it is too. The hon. member just told you. "Live forever"! Just what you told him is right. You know how that quotation starts off! They sent him on a course for three years. We did not make any specification about any particular person because we did not even know that the young gentleman was interested. This is some one year or eighteen months after the decision was made. Shortly after another youngster who is very enthusiastic and has been working in the Courts for a longer time than the first fellow, applied - you talk about impartiality - and up to today he cannot get time to go to Cave Hill far less to go to England, and if he does go to Cave Hill he could not get anything more than the leave he is entitled to, and we all

know that you cannot write law in a night school. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition the name after. His colleague has told him the first name and I will supply the name of the second and then we will even up. I will tell you outside. (Mr. BOLDEN: I want to hear too.) Well he can tell you. Prime Ministers do not deal with backbenchers.

Mr. ADAMS: If the Prime Minister would give way for a moment. ....

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, truthfully it is a point of interruption, but I believe the Prime Minister would give way. Can he categorise any of the officers concerned as being inefficient or otherwise? I would be glad if that could be made clear because a man cannot be responsible for.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member would be working closer with the particular gentleman after he has qualified; so I do not know if he is efficient or not. I am just saying that the fact that he was related to the Premier is just a coincidence, but the Public Service Commission decided that he could go, and another young officer working in the Courts who wanted to take time off at half-pay could not get that time off at all. So when you talk about impartiality and separation of powers, it appears to me that the Public Service Commission can be more inconsistent.

The point which I wish to establish is this: there is no difference between the old Act of 1953 and the Bill which is before the House except that we have changed the people who are described as parochial employees to employees of Statutory Boards because we do not have parochial employees anymore. The power to add to the categories of persons was formerly vested in the Governor and then the Governor General technically, but in truth and in fact has always been exercised by the Minister responsible for training. Now whether the Governor General then tells the Public Service Commission that the Minister told him that Bank Managers or Managers of Biscuit Companies can also get grants from the Training Fund I do not know, but I know it has to be done on my advice; but the selection whether under the old Act or under the new Act is still vested in the Public Service Commission, and people have to put in an appearance before the Public Service Commission and I suppose be interrogated as to why they want a course. Sometimes on the basis of selection you will find that an officer may not want to go on a course, and he is recommended by the Department that he should be trained, and therefore he has to go. So I do not see what all the problem is about. I am the person that has problems because the Public Service Commission is sending out people that we do not really want trained as public officers. The only discretion that I have at the moment or will continue to have is that I say I do not think this is a category of person that we want to send on a course because I do not think they can benefit or it is no good to the community, but we have definitely decided that we should not support the application of people who want to study law. We have over 200 of them at Cave Hill. Why should the Government spend taxpayers' money saturating the country with a lot of unemployable lawyers?

I know a case now of a young Civil Servant who wants to go to Cave Hill and has not been given any permission to do so because they have said we are not worrying to send people to do law, but next week they will send somebody else. That is what has happened. So the actual recipients of these grants and courses are unknown even to the Minister who is in charge, that is myself, but from 1966 I certainly have been describing the categories of persons from time to time as occasion may arise. I do not go around or sit down and think out whom I should add to this list, postmen or auxiliary staff or anything like that. Specific courses of training are mentioned - probably afforded by some outside agency - and then the Chief Training Officer says this particular class of officer or person outside the Government has not been specified, will you so make the Order that persons in this category can benefit from this fund. It is as simple as that.

The Bill has eight short clauses which are substantially the same as they were before, and if they object to a Minister saying what categories of persons, let them take it back to Government House and let the Governor-General who knows more about Civil Servants I suppose than I know and knows more about man power budgeting and man power requirements of Barbados or the Chairman of the Public Service Commission do it, because all the power I have now does not make any difference to me. I do not know if you heard the story about the young man who told his prospective father-in-law that he would give up drinking, smoking and women in order to marry his daughter at the father-in-law's request, and then the father-in-law said, "Well I have one final question; would you give up your life for my daughter?" He said "yes, that kind of life." That is how I feel about the Ministry.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the points made in discussing what

is certainly a short Bill. Let me say at the outset that as I understand the speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the gravamen of his charge was certainly not against vesting in the Minister the power to state what categories of persons should be selected for training overseas. The gravamen of his charge as I understand it was against vesting in the Minister the power to award free scholarships and training courses subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed. There is a fundamental difference in this Bill, with due respect, from the last Bill which is now being repealed by this Bill before the House, and it is that nowhere in the new Bill which is before this House is it stated that the Public Service Commission is the body for selecting the persons who are going on training.
7.20 p.m.

This is not the first time that this point has been debated in this House. Indeed in 1952 when the principal Bill, the Public Training Scheme Fund Act, was debated in the House the hon. member, Mr. Lewis – I think he was the hon. member for the City at that time – asked to amend the section to give the power of selection to the Governor-in-Executive Committee after acting on the advice of the Public Service Commission, and at that time Ministerial Government was contemplated and the hon. member who was then, I think, the hon. member for St. Peter and who is now the hon. member for St. Michael West, spoke very strongly on that occasion against giving such a power to a Minister, and indeed himself as well as the hon. member for St. John voted against that suggestion. It is interesting to see how politicians change their views as time progresses. I am not sure whether the hon. member for St. Michael West has done so out of growing increase or decrease in wisdom, but certainly in the debate of this House for the session 1951-54, on Tuesday, 14th October, 1954, his views then were significant. This is what he says on page 669 of that debate:

"Mr. Chairman, – I have kept out of this debate because I thought that honourable members were not serious about these points they were making. It is just one of those small Bills dealing with the Civil Service that everyone has been asking for. Now look at the argument used by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. He is arguing that if we get ministerial status the ministers must be placed in a position to recommend to the Governor who should go for training. What type of minister would that be who would know what people should go for training from within his particular department? The natural thing would be that he would recommend the people who work closest to him, and that is one of the dangers that the Civil Service has always complained about. They always complain that Civil Servants who get a chance to work in the Secretariat are usually favoured above others who do not work in that department. They are nearer to the Colonial Secretary and people like that and therefore are more favoured, is the complaint. The honourable member's suggestion would place ministers in the position to be regarded as favouring people. You may as well say that the ministers should be responsible for appointing people to the Service. You will be asking a minister – who will not have a Civil Servant's personal file before him – not to deal with this matter of training on the basis of policy, but to say that John Brown in the Audit Office should have a scholarship rather than another man from another department. The Government should lay down the policy as regards scholarships and training, and leave it to the Administration to select the trainees. If you think that without putting ministers in charge of selecting people for training an abuse will still be made, then you can argue that an abuse will be made as far as all other matters in the Service are concerned. I do not know if the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and the honourable junior member for the City are quite serious. The former has talked about backroom boys. That does not apply to Barbados at all. If you follow their arguments logically, it will mean that a man's success in the Civil Service will depend mainly upon his political complexion. I would object to that. Every man has a right to live. The honourable member talked about back room boys in England. What back room boys do you have making policy in Barbados? There has been talk about the Public Service Commission. Those remarks do seem to me to be more or less a matter of personality. It does seem to me that certain names always seem to rile some honourable members. But when you tack on an administrative function to the Governor-in-Executive Committee what are you doing? How can a minister with all his work before him turn down the advice of the Public Service Commission? Ministers will not have the personal files of Civil Servants. The honourable members' suggestions constitute a grave danger, and I do not believe that any Civil Servant would like to see these suggestions put into effect. There is a danger because a Socialist Government might not be in power for ever. I hope that honourable members will see that what they are asking for is dangerous to the Civil Service as a whole."

That is the speech which the hon. member made, and I want to adopt it because it seems to

me that in 1954 he displayed more sense than he has displayed on this occasion. That is the position. Indeed his knowledge in 1954 of what was the situation in England was more accurate than his knowledge is today, because a little later, at page 670, this is what the hon. member then in his wisdom said:

"Even in Great Britain Mr. Churchill or Mr. Butler do not decide on who is to enter the Civil Service. There are Appointment Boards to deal with that. There are about three grades at which you can enter the English Civil Service. We will have ministerial status. But will it be the function of a minister to interfere with personnel matters? How will you decide which man is worthy of a scholarship? What Socialist policy would there be in that? It is like saying that the Government must decide who will be the headmasters of the various schools in the Island. Is that a function for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to perform? Are we going to decide who will succeed Mr. Hammond? The honourable member talks about shirking responsibility. There are other countries in the world with responsible government and in none of those countries does what the honourable member suggests happen. Are we to have a unique form of responsible Government? The only system I know of that can operate like how the honourable member would seem to like ours to operate is the American system where if the Democrats win the election today, all the Republicans lose their jobs and vice versa. If you want to introduce that system in Barbados you can do so by adopting the ridiculous amendment that has been suggested."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Thomas was then Mr. Ronald Mapp, and the hon. junior member for the City was Mr. T. T. Lewis, and the hon. member for St. Michael West then in his wisdom saw the dangers of giving to political Ministers the power in the system of Government which we operate to select people for training, and I submit to this House that he was right then but he is wrong today. It is significant that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister who was then in the Government voted against such a suggestion in 1953. (Asides) If he intends to vote against it, he should make it quite clear in this Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member again gets hold of an old discarded bone and is tossing it about. The hon. member does not do his homework, I said here in my first intervention that the Bill is exactly the same as it was before, and under the existing provisions the Governor-General no longer makes the designation, it is the Minister who says any additional class of persons, and he should know, because he was on the Public Service Commission, that it is the Public Service Commission who makes the appointments. What the former member for St. Peter, now the member for St. Michael West, said on that occasion is absolutely correct and I feel the same way. I am not going to get involved, but I am saying if you want to talk about partiality, even if there was some such power in the Act, you have to look at the way in which the Public Service Commission has discharged its functions under the Act, and I will read to the hon. member now from...

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a point of elucidation and the hon. member has made his point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not fully made it, Sir, but if he continues to give way I will let him speak after me because he is entitled to speak. I pointed out before that we are changing the power from the Governor-General to the Minister, and I have never been in favour of being burdened with the responsibility of selecting persons, and that the Public Service Commission makes the selection and the Public Service Commission has insisted, quite rightly, that before they make the selections the release of the funds should be granted. Even the Training Minister, who is myself, your humble servant,....*(Asides)*. Bank Managers can do it, but there is a danger that if the Public Service Commission then appointed a Bank Manager that the Minister did not approve of – this is all the member for St. Peter was saying then and this is all I am saying today, that the Bill has made no change from what he objected to on that occasion and which I supported and still support, so they are really tilting like windmills. The Public Service Commission here by letter has said "we agree with the proposed changes, we will continue to appoint the particular trainees, officers or whoever they may be, but we want it to be clearly understood that the Minister will release the funds before we make the selection." 7.30 p.m.

The Minister is not in a position to say "I do not approve of so and so." In this document I have before me, the Drafting Instructions given to the Attorney-General, it says: "The Prime Minister has stated the policy for the authority for making awards from the Training Scheme Fund should now be vested in the Minister in charge of Training rather than in the Governor-General on the advice of the Public Commissions." In general, the effect of the

change would be that the Services Commission would continue to select individuals for study leave. Where expenditure from the Training Scheme Fund is involved, the Minister's approval will be required. Where a training award does not include leave from the Public Service, the Services Commission would not be involved and, in general, the use of the Training Fund would be the concern of the Minister who, on occasions, would be advised by the Services Commission.

The Public Service Commission cannot tell me whether somebody from the Employers' Confederation or people from the Union should be eligible. I allow the Confederation or the Barbados Workers' Union to nominate the people. Those people are outside the aegis of the Public Service Commission altogether, and that is why the power is vested in the Minister. The Services Commission are authorised by statute and by the Constitution of Barbados to carry out certain functions of appointments, dismissal, training and so on, but the Public Service Commission cannot have more authority than the House of Assembly over the generality of citizens in this country. They do not see the point, Sir.

The Minister can say that I.L.O. or U.N.E.S.C.O. have given a course of training and, on the advice of the Barbados Workers' Union, I nominate Mr. Small better known as Lord Blakey to go on the course. Do you expect that the Public Service Commission can tell me whether Small is a fit and proper person for the course? I know more about what is going on in Barbados than they do. In so far as the little, sacrosanct, inviolate and untouchable public officers are concerned, their position remains the same. No public officer is going to be selected by me, and I do not wish to select any of them. After the presentation has been made, the Public Service Commission makes the appointment and grants the necessary leave. There would be a dichotomy if I had the power to appoint the officer and the Public Service Commission who has the power under the Constitution refused to grant the leave and vice versa. They could refuse to grant the leave, and we could refuse to make funds available. We decide that money will be made available for such and such a class of officer, and they will make the selection.

You could not be serious in telling me now that the Governor-General, who is appointed by the Queen on my recommendation, is in a better position to decide on people outside of the Government and specific persons who are capable of benefiting from schemes such as this. There is no difference in what the hon. member voted for in those days and what I voted for, and what we are doing now.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the assurance of the Prime Minister that what was intended in the Draft Instructions is that the Public Service Commission should still retain the right to do the selection of the particular candidate. If that is so, then the Bill which is before this House does not carry out those instructions. I would refer particularly to Section 3(2) which says:

> "The Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, award free scholarships and training courses out of the Fund to –
>
> (a) public officers;
>
> (b) public employees;
>
> (c) teachers;
>
> (d) officers of Statutory Boards; or
>
> (e) such other persons as the Minister determines."

We are being made to understand that the only change in the Bill arises from the fact that there are no longer any parochial employees and it has only been necessary to amend the Section to deal with officers of Statutory Boards, but that is not so. Before the Minister can set out policy in relation to training, but the person selected and conditions under which they went on their courses were laid down by the Public Service Commission. They would be given leave with pay; leave with half-pay, and leave without pay. Now, that power is in this Section being vested in the Minister. Unless there is some other Clause in here, or unless the Minister, by Regulations, stipulates the Section or prescribes the Section dealing with appointments, it seems to me that the power must be there.

It is that part of the Bill to which we object. No one can seriously object to the principle of the Bill if the Minister, for instance, is stating that because of his management surveys he wants more people who are trained in Business Management, or trained in Customs Administration, and that he wants 10 people to go on a course this year. The point is that 10 particular officers are from time to time the people who are selected by the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission does not determine that matter of policy. It carries out the Minister's policy and at the same time

selects the candidates on the basis of their performance, looking at their personal files and their suitability for the course. This Section as drafted, with respect, does not make this clear. As I understand it, this is the gravamen of the argument which the Leader of the Opposition has advanced in this case.

Perhaps, if the Minister says that he intended otherwise, he should try to have this matter re-drafted. I would ask him, therefore, to ask that this matter be held over so that, in due course, it can be re-drafted. I do not think that anybody in 1966 or, indeed, in 1952 should have objected to the principle of the Minister, or the Cabinet, or the Governor-in-Executive Committee in those days, selecting the categories of persons who should be trained. It is a particular appointee. In this respect, the hon. member for St. Michael West has changed his position.

Now, you have the power under Section 6 to make Regulations. If the Regulations are to vest the power in the Public Service Commission, then do so. Under the 1961 Act in the particular Section it was the Governor acting on the recommendation of the appropriate Service Commission subject to such terms and conditions as may be recommended by such Commission to award scholarships and training courses out of the fund to any of the following persons or class of persons.

I agree with the Minister that it would be more appropriate to the Minister to have the power to state who are the "such other persons" rather than to give this power to the Public Service Commission only in terms of categorising the categories of persons. In my view this is a matter for the civil servants.
7.40 p.m.

It seems to me that this is beginning in the Civil Service just what the hon. member for St. Michael West spoke about, the chances of political patronage. If the section is not properly drafted, and with respect I would ask the Minister to take the point seriously, and if he intends the power of selection of the particular person as distinct from the categories of persons and the areas of training to be given to the Public Service Commission, he should say so clearly, and reserve to himself all the other powers in relation to the training scheme. I really cannot accept that if we were merely coming in here to make a slight change from parochial employees to officers of Statutory Boards that this could not have been done by a slight amendment to the Act, and already that amendment was made by subsequent Acts when the Local Government Act was abolished in any event. So on those grounds I think that unless there is some safeguard in the Act itself, we cannot vote for the Bill as it stands.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just tell the hon. member, he is always talking about safeguards just as if this Government was elected from Star Trek and we came down here on the star ship Enterprise and therefore you have to safeguard the people on earth. They are very happy with their six members and we are happy with our eighteen. They can keep their six; we really do not want any more, and we will keep our eighteen. But we are an independent nation now. We issue drafting instructions and we had correspondence with the Services Commission. There is no officer in the Government Service according to the Constitution of Barbados who can pick up himself and go on leave. Suppose everything he said was true, that the Minister was going to exercise favouritism and select somebody that he likes, as if I like any of them at all – but that is another matter; I do not like or dislike – before that officer can leave the shores of Barbados he has to get leave from the Public Service Commission or give up his job altogether. It happened to Mr. McChesley George in Antigua when I was there. He was head of the Extensions Service and they did not give him leave and he gave up his job. It happened to the Deputy Financial Secretary here in Barbados. He gave up his job and went on his course; so there is no officer who can go and be favoured by anybody unless the Public Service Commission approves. So you don't need to draft that. That is in the Constitution and it is the point I have been trying to make all the time, and if the hon. member still after all that explanation that the Public Service Commission has the final say, says no because they can say so in so far as Government employees are concerned, I still maintain that the Act has got to be drafted in this manner because they cannot tell me about people in the private sector. What happens with people in the private sector – and I mentioned the Employers' Confederation, but it was the Manufacturers' Association who sent a worker and a manager or assistant manager away – is that normally the Chief Training Officer would say that there is a certain course going in Paris, London, Geneva or wherever it is, we would like you to nominate a person for this course from your Association or business, and invariably, certainly in every single case that has come to me, I accept whether the nomination is from the Barbados Workers' Union, the Employers' Confederation or the Y.M.C.A. It is as simple as that; so there is no question of favouritism either in the Government or outside the Government,

because I cannot tell the Manufacturers' Association the best type of person to send. I may not approve of the person's politics, but they have nominated him, and that is the end of it.

I do not see any need to send this to a Select Committee or amend anything. They really do not understand the Constitution and that is their problem. They are not talking about safeguards against the economic exploitation by employers; they always talk about safeguarding the country against the Ministers that the people put there to run the country for the people. I have never heard one of them come in here and ask for safeguards against the unscrupulous solicitors they have in James Street. You are not going to hear that from them. You know the conveyancing practices that go on there where both sides pay the same solicitor the same kind of fees. They feel that a Minister may take somebody who is a D.L.P. and send him on a course, but even if that were so, which I do not concede is so, it would be one of the majority they were sending, not one of the minority.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. LOWE; Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mr.SPRINGER and Mr. WALCOTT – 8.

NOES: Mr. FORDE and Mr. BOLDEN – 2.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to repeat the arguments which we have given before on this Clause. It is not Clause 3(1) but Clause 3(2), and because of that we will vote against that as it stands.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. WALCOTT – 8.

NOES: Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE – 2.

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

7.50 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I think at this stage we will suspend the sitting. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

On resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, National Insurance and Labour and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, 1971.

THE SEVERANCE PAYMENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in October last year when I assumed responsibility for labour, I set up a committee to work out and advise on the implementation of a Severance Payments Scheme. That committee comprised representatives from the administrative section of my Ministry, the Department of Labour and the National Insurance Board. The committee reported and advised that before this scheme is implemented certain amendments would be necessary.

We have before us this amendment Bill, and in introducing this Bill, I do not intend to go

into the details of the working of the National Insurance Scheme, because this had been done at the time the principal Act was presented last year for the consideration of this Hon. Chamber. When we have gone through all the legal jargon on this Bill we will find that it is basically a very simple scheme. It provides severance payments for persons who qualify for two years with the same employer, in respect of redundancy, being laid off or kept a short time, or dismissal because of some natural disaster.

In this scheme there are certain persons who are not permitted to qualify for severance payments, and we call them excluded classes. They are Government employees, persons who are under the age of 16 and over the age of 65, and of course persons who disqualify themselves if they are dismissed for misconduct. The principal Act also excluded persons to whom the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act of 1965 apply. We have had a good hard look at the scheme as well as a look at the possibility of integrating the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act into the Severance Payments Act and we find that persons who benefit under the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act would be better off if they were to qualify under the Severance Payments Act of 1971. For this reason we are proposing in the Bill to delete such persons from the excluded classes so that such persons can now benefit under the present Act. 8.30 p.m.

I give an example of how this Act is more advantageous than the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act. In the first place, under the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act such persons take three years to qualify. Under the Severance Payments Act of 1971 the qualifying period is two years. Again, Sir, the Severance Payments Act makes provision for severance payments over a wider area. There is redundancy, there is laid off or kept on short-time, and there is dismissal because of national disaster; whereas, under the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act such persons can only benefit if the factories have been closed.

Sir, these are some of the reasons why workers would be better off under the Severance Payments Act of 1971 than under the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act, and for these reasons we feel that such persons should take advantage of these better terms which we have included. One other reason is that under the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act their rate of compensation is three weeks per year, whereas under the Severance Payments Act of 1971 the rate of compensation is four weeks per year.

This Bill would change the rate of severance payments for seasonal workers as well as for regular workers and they now qualify in the same way. Previously, Sir, seasonal workers would have to be laid off for 35 weeks in any year. Regular workers have to be laid off for 21 weeks in any year. Under the proposed legislation if any of the workers, whether seasonal or regular, are laid off for four consecutive weeks or over a 13-week period – six weeks would have to be consecutive – such persons would qualify for severance payments. Again, Sir, in this respect the amending Bill has advantages for those persons who will qualify under the particular Act. The Bill also clarifies the position of seasonal workers in respect of which they must qualify for severance payments.

In the present Bill it limits their severance to during the season only. That was not clear in the principal Act, and we have clarified the position here. For a seasonal worker to qualify for severance he will have to be laid off during the course of the season. It also sets out that a person, who is a seasonal worker but is normally employed by the same employer, even though in a different capacity for a period of 35 weeks during the year, is no longer a seasonal worker. This Act provides that if at the start of the season a worker who has been in that seasonal employment during the previous year is not re-engaged within 8 weeks, such a person is entitled to severance payments if that person qualifies in other respects. In other words, if he were employed for a period of two years and is not below the age of 16 or above the age of 65. The Act also makes provision for the establishment of a fund which is to be financed by the money voted by Parliament from time to time as well as from contributions made by employers.

Now, while the Actuary, made available to us by the International Organisation, was reviewing, during the course of this year, the National Insurance Scheme, we asked him to advise us on what the employers' contributions should be. He did not have sufficient data on which to base his findings, but he has given us some guide lines. I should like, for the benefit of this Chamber, to state – because it would not be found in the Act or in the Regulations – that the category for which contributions should be payable corresponds roughly with the category under the National Insurance Scheme.

Hon. members will note, having gone through the Act, that we have tried to get this scheme parallel in a way with the National Insurance Scheme so that it makes for much

easier administration, because we believe, in due course, that the National Insurance Scheme should develop into a full Social Security Scheme that it is intended to be. The rates of payment would be as follows:

Category as worker	Employers' contribution
Persons earning less than $10 a week	– 3¢ per employer.
Persons earning $10 or less than $13 a week	– 5¢ ,, ,,
Persons earning $15 a week or less than $20	– 7¢ ,, ,,
Persons earning $20 a week or less than $30	– 10¢ ,, ,,
Persons earning $30 a week or less than $45	– 15¢ ,, ,,
Persons earning $45 a week and over	– 20¢ ,, ,,

It is intended, Sir, that the employers' contributions to the Fund, over a period of time, should cease. In other words, we hope that the contributions would enable the Fund to build up sufficient reserves. At this period of time the reserves would be indeterminable, but it is hoped that after the reserves have been built up sufficiently the employers' contributions would cease and all payments would be made from this Fund.

The administration of the Fund would be entrusted to the National Insurance Department. They have over a period of six years been able to build up an administrative corps. We would not want to duplicate any administrative overheads. All that we would be required to do is to give the National Insurance Department sufficient staff to enable them to administer the Scheme on our behalf. A very important feature of this Act would be the powers of delegation of the Minister.

8.40 p.m.

This Act makes provision for delegation of those powers to the Board or to the Director as the case may be. There will be some points in the administration of this scheme that might bother hon. members. One of the points that might bother hon. members would be what happens to persons who became redundant before they could qualify for national insurance payments as from 1st September 1969 and now. There are a number of persons that would have become redundant during that period of time, and in fact the companies that employed them would have gone out of business. Such employees would be entitled to make a claim from the National Insurance Fund for their severance payments so that they would not lose their benefits under the scheme. If those companies have gone out of business and there are no assets in Barbados, then the fund will have to bear it all. If however the companies are still operating but persons have been laid off before the scheme begins, then those persons would be entitled to be compensated by the companies and those persons would not be entitled to a rebate out of the fund.

I should like to explain as regards the rebate that under the scheme persons who have been severed and whose entitlement to severance payment therefore arises, will be compensated in the first place by the employers, and then the employers make an application to the fund for a rebate. It is proposed to limit the rate of rebate to 50% of the amount that the employer is entitled to pay to an employee. That explains why we are unable to make a rebate to employers in respect of employees who have become redundant before the scheme operates, because at that time they would not have made any contributions to the fund, and if they have not made any contributions to the fund, then they would have to stand the full burden of the compensation.

One of the problems we have to guard against is the exhaustion of the fund. I explained earlier that the Actuary did not have sufficient data to give us any projection, so that when claims are made on the fund, one of the dangers of it would be that the fund could become exhausted or depleted over a period of time. With this in mind, we have taken the precaution to include in the present Bill a provision giving the Minister power by Order to impose a limit on the upper category of persons of their weekly basic pay. In other words, it is possible for the Minister to impose or to limit the maximum amount of a weekly basic pay to, say $60 or $50 as the case may be, and this would only be done if the fund is in danger of being exhausted.

Hon. members will note from the amending Bill an amendment to the definition clause to "basic pay". Under the old Act "basic pay" did not include overtime rates or other payments or bonuses. We are now proposing that "basic pay" would include a person's normal weekly or monthly rates as the case may be, it will also include overtime payments, gratuities, commissions, holidays with pay, but it still

however does not include bonuses. Again in this respect the Bill is an improvement for the employees over the principal Act. We are also amending that provision relating to wrongful dismissal, and we want to make it clear that if the Courts find that an employee has been wrongfully dismissed but that he would otherwise have been eligible for severance payments, that the award that the Courts can make would not be less than the amount of severance payments he would receive. Under the present Act it would appear as though the award of the Court should be only the amount of payment that that employee would be entitled to under the Act. We want to make it quite clear.

I did mention that an important feature of the Act would be what would be delegated, the full administration of the fund including claims, rebates, disputes, and of course hon. members would recall that disputes would be handled by a tribunal which has been set up under the principal Act in respect of which this Bill proposes no change. Earlier today I circulated an amendment to Clause 23 of the Bill. It is now in the possession of all hon. members. In fact, in a sense I made open reference to it a few minutes ago when I referred to the weekly basic pay. During the Committee stage I shall move that we incorporate Clause 23 into the amending Bill. We are proposing that this Bill should come into effect and commence operation from 1st January, 1973. Collections would be by way of stamps. Now in 1971 when employment injury was added to be administered by the National Insurance Board, no new stamps were issued. What in fact was done is that the employer paid the additional contribution which I believe corresponded to a stamp of increased value. Certainly we do not propose to issue any stamps as distinct from national insurance stamps for the purpose of making collections to the fund. The value of the employers' contribution for the respective categories of course would be added to the stamps; so all this would make for ease of collection and administration of the fund. It would be important for us over the next few weeks, provided we know the final shape this legislation is going to take, to prepare pamphlets and other explanatory literature, and have talks on television and on radio in order to explain the workings of this scheme to the general public, and this is what we are proposing to do.

Mr. Speaker, this in short explains the Bill now before this Honourable Chamber. It is a far-reaching piece of social legislation which can have far reaching consequences on the lives of the workers and their families. It is a Bill that I commend to this House. I should be very happy to assist hon. members if they should need any assistance, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

8.50 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, just as when the principal Act came before this House the then Opposition voted in favour of that Bill which subsequently became an Act, so on this occasion we will be voting for the amendments which the Hon. Minister moved. It is quite true to say that severance payment or redundancy payment is an important advance in social legislation for dealing with certain situations where workers through no fault of their own have lost their employment either by being laid off or kept on short time or dismissed in certain circumstances, or have been dismissed because of a natural disaster. I think perhaps the Minister did not point out, but it should be pointed out, that our Bill goes further in this respect than the English Redundancy Act of 1965, and I think understandably so having regard to the different conditions which exist in this island.

There are those of us who anticipate from time to time the Government, regardless of whether it is this Government or some future Government, will be coming before this House on other occasions to move further amendments to this Bill. It is a difficult Bill for the normal layman to understand, I make bold to say it is a difficult Bill for even the legal profession to understand, and I will ask the Minister as has been done under the National Insurance legislation to use the expertise of some of the officers in his Ministry who have dealt with the National Insurance legislation to provide booklets for the information of employers and employees explaining in simple terms the provisions of the Act, and of course the Regulations. The National Insurance Board and its principal administrative officer, Mr. Walcott, and his staff have done a wonderful job in the booklets that they have put out on the provisions of that Act, and I trust and I am sure that they will do the same in relation to the provisions of this Act.

Perhaps it is too late, having regard to the time schedule which the Minister has on his hand to bring this Act into operation on 1st January next year, for him to take various points now, but I think for the purposes of the debate I should mention them and if he thinks they are of any significance or of any value he can look at them in future. I believe that the Act places a burden on the fund to pay out in circumstances

where the employer has been unable to pay either because of insolvency or for some other reason, and so it should, because in any event the employee should not be made to suffer, but I think the Minister should go a bit further. It is necessary to amend the Companies Act as well, and the Bankruptcy Act, to give to a severance payment a priority in ranking in relation to a company which has gone into liquidation, and also priority in relation to a Bankruptcy Petition, and also perhaps a priority in the estate of a deceased person where the personal representative does not adopt a contract of employment. This would mean certain consequential amendments to other legislation, but I ask the Minister to bear this in mind.

Section 14 of the Act has not been amended on this occasion but it seems to me that we should not follow England blindly in relation to the categories of persons who are excluded from the benefit of severance payment. There is a strong case for including domestics who may be related to their employer. I see no reason why if a person is related to you and is working for you and you choose to treat him or her as the category of an employee and then you sever him that he should be treated any differently from any other employee. I do not think that family sentiment should prevent this situation from occurring. I can see the reason for excluding husband or wife of the employer, and I am not even convinced that that is right in circumstances where a man is carrying a commission business and his wife may be employed with him and he severs her, there may be a matrimonial dispute and her situation is that she cannot in that context, although she had given faithfully of her service and he dismissed her wrongfully let us say, claim severance in circumstances such as those, and I hope that the Minister in due course when the Act has been in operation for some time will revise the category of persons set out under section 14.

Likewise, it seems to me that the case for excluding people who hold public office is really a traditional ground and probably based on some of the pension legislation and the right of the Crown to terminate, but I think we should begin to re-examine the whole concept on this point and really look at all the legislation properly to see why public employees and Statutory Board employees should be treated in any different way in relation to severance payment in circumstances such as these. As I said, the principle of the Bill is correct. To me I think we can widen the scope with experience, and I hope that people will comply with the Regulations when they are made as they have complied, I think, very well with the national insurance legislation which has worked satisfactorily in many respects. There are one or two difficulties in relation to it, but I trust that in this Act we will have no problems occurring.

I am glad too to hear that the Minister intends to have the Bill proclaimed by the Governor-General as from 1st January, 1973. I am aware of cases where one or two companies have gone out of operation and have distributed their assets and the shareholders have packed up and gone; they have severed people in circumstances where they will only get their rights at common law, and despite the fact that this Bill does have some retroactive effect in that notice of its operation is backdated to 1969, it may well be that those persons are at a disadvantage and the fund itself may have to bear this burden without ever being able to recoup the situation. I do not know if there are still any funds or assets as such of companies or individuals available and if the Minister will not bear in mind some amendment to deal with that set of circumstances. I know of several cases where people have come to me and have mentioned this point.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people in Barbados believe that the Severance Payments Act covers situations where a person has been employed by another for several years and has given faithfully of his time and industry and retires or because of illness has to give up his employment, but that is not so. In fact I wish sincerely that this was so, and I trust that when the Government is doing a review of all the various pension legislation, a review of all the various National Insurance Acts and Regulations and Severance Payment, it will consider whether the time is ripe to force on employers in this country to have a fund to remunerate a little greater too than the national insurance benefits which accrue; a fund to remunerate persons who have given faithful service and then have to leave their employment either prematurely or sometimes in their old age, because some of them may go on beyond 65 and if they are dismissed after 65 they cannot get severance payments under the Act. Some of them work till 70 and their employment may be terminated without a cent.

9.00 p.m.

I hope that, in future, when we are looking at social legislation, we will keep this large category of people in mind. I believe that the country is producing enough and is sufficiently wealthy that those of us who have should be prepared to pay more for those who have not. I make bold to say that it is by the efforts of a lot of people who have not got that some of us

today have arrived at where we are and this should never be forgotten. I hope that if the Government, in future, sees fit to extend the scheme this way that several of the employing classes in this country, regardless of whether they are capitalists, socialists, or anybody else, would take this in their stride, because I think this is a debt which we owe to the working classes in Barbados.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I should first like to congratulate the Government for implementing this forward piece of social legislation. It is something which is long overdue. I think I should point out that a person's job is a basic right, and when for one reason or another through no fault of a worker, he or she losses a job, then there should be some form of compensation. This is a basic principle behind the idea of severance pay. Now, this Act and the background surrounding it, I believe, have had an interesting history. If my memory serves me right, I think that one of the things which precipitated the hurrying up of the introduction of this Act was those two fires which took place in Bridgetown somewhere between 1968 and 1969, namely, at Cave Shepherd & Co. Ltd. and William Fogarty. The Act takes care of persons losing their jobs as a result of a disaster of this nature. The Act goes much further than some of the other Severance Payments Acts which are operating in some other parts of the world.

I remember when discussing this matter with a former Minister of Labour, one of the representatives of the employers did not see why a worker should be paid severance pay if the place of business where he had been working had gone out of operation as a result of a natural disaster. We are particularly happy to know that the people who suffered this misfortune two or three years ago will stand to benefit from this Act.

It is true that as time goes along we will be able to see more clearly where the loopholes in the Act are and, no doubt, the employers will want to take advantage of them. We are sure that the industry will be keeping an extremely close watch on the situation to ensure that the loopholes are not exploited and the worker will benefit from this piece of social legislation. The Minister has indicated that there are a number of amendments which he will be proposing to this Bill. One of the interesting things which I should like to congratulate him on is the fact that he has seen it fit to extend the scope and meaning of "basic pay" to include overtime payments and other things. One of the problems which one would, obviously, run up against is a case where overtime forms an important part in the persons wages. Let us think of the people who work in the hotel industry, for example – the service charge is a crucial part of the wages of the workers employed in that industry. One can see that these people will stand to benefit from this piece of legislation.

I am particularly happy that this Bill has been introduced, and I hope it will get off the ground as speedily as possible. There is no doubt in anybody's mind that it is an extremely long Act and it could be confusing. It is a serious admission by the last speaker on the other side, the hon. member for Christ Church West, when he said that he found it confusing even to lawyers. My first reaction when I read the Bill was that I thought the lawyers would make a lot of money out of it because of its complicated nature.

The Minister has given the assurance that the basic areas of the Act will be prepared for distribution, and there will be a lot of information given out in an effort to make everybody aware of the implications of the Act and his or her rights under the Act.

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

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

9.10 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 22 inclusive, were called and stood part.

Clause 23 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 23 be deleted.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 23 as circulated to hon.

members earlier today be the new Clause 23 and substituted for the Clause 23 which was deleted.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this section seeks to amend the old section 23 which is the First Schedule, and in the First Schedule there is a limit which is placed on the number of years which would enable a person to qualify. I think the limit which has been placed is 33 years and it would seem to me that this limit places some workers, particularly those workers who have been working for more than 33 years in a less favourable position than they would now enjoy if they were being paid severance pay under agreements which are negotiated now between the Barbados Workers' Union and individual employers, in that there is no ceiling which is placed on the length of time for which severance payment can be made. If one were to just take a simple example, if you took the 33 years and a person went to work at the age of eighteen and worked for 33 years, you would have a person who would be severed at about 51 which is still a relatively young age. The point I am making is that we would definitely like to see the discrepancy which is now in operation removed and that person be paid for the length of time he was working with an employer.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that, the Committee established to set up the severance payment fund recommended a period of only eight years' compensation for severance. Now when it was brought to Cabinet by the then Minister, the Minister proposed that the eight years was indeed too short a period and that the workers would not stand a benefit to any substantial degree, and that the eight year period should be greatly increased, and it was proposed by Cabinet that it should be increased from eight years to 33 years which would correspond to the period for which the severed sugar worker can get compensation. In other words, this is what obtains now in the Sugar Workers' Severance Payments Act.

I should like to state as well that this Act really sets down minimum requirements. It does not in anyway nullify or supersede any agreements that the Workers' Union or any other Union may have with an employer, so the Barbados Workers' Union can still continue to bargain for benefits in respect of severance payments that are indeed greater than the benefits allowed under this Act. I think this is an important thing to remember, that although the Barbados Workers' Union is at this very moment negotiating for terms that are in some respects greater, as I understand it that contract would in fact stand and this Act would not supersede it. What of course this legislation does not allow would be for a contract which is less than 33 years. If the Barbados Workers' Union is able to get for the people it represents a period of time in excess of 33 years, this Act certainly would not stand in its way. This merely sets out the minimum that would be required.

The question that the new Clause 23 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 24 and 25 were called and stood part.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with an amendment in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

9.20 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Order is Order No. 5, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Government of Barbados to borrow money externally by the issue of securities. It stands in the name of the Prime Minister.

THE EXTERNAL LOAN BILL, 1972.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are two Acts which deal with the borrowing of money by the Government of Barbados in which the rights of the lenders and the responsibilities of the borrowers, being the government, are clearly described, and these Acts are the 1933-7 and 1935-7. The first one is the General Loan Act of 1933, chapter 7, which deals with local loans and authorises the Government to raise money on local loans, and the second one is the Inscribed Stock Act which gives power to the Government to borrow money either directly or through what used to be described as the Crown Agents in London. In other words, what I am saying is that the Government of Barbados has now no power to borrow money in New York, Toronto, Bonn, Zurich or Frankfurt or any of the places where money is available, and since this Bill was given its First Reading I have been in touch with German sources from which I hope to raise between $12 million and $15 million in Deutsche

Marks at a rate of interest which is far more favourable and certainly less than five percent. Even with the kind of fees you have to pay commercial banks abroad for finding this money is one half of one percent as against, say, between three and four percent for commercial industrial undertakings, Finders' Fees. The effective rate will work out at less than six percent, and you cannot get money on the London market now at less than 9¼ to 9½ percent, and since the new rates of the Bank of England whereby the bank rate is no longer an instrument of fiscal or economic policy, where the bank rate is being declared now every Friday, and it is one half percent above the rate at which the Bank of England can borrow money, so this is the rate at which they lend the Discount and Commercial Houses.

That in turn reflects on the rate at which people are willing to take up even gilt-edged securities on the London market. With the last quotation of the bank rate it would come to something like nine percent if we were successful in borrowing money this week, so we have to look to other countries. This was the old colonial legislation of 1933 and 1935, but we are an independent country now with a Central Bank. Way back in 1967 I was thinking of diversifying the portfolio of investment with the Barbados Government even before the devaluation of the pound because I saw the writing on the wall, and of course the Bank of England and the Treasury came down with the Sterling Guarantee Act where they ensured themselves the fifty or sixty million deposits we have in London as reserves against any future devaluation, and that is the only reason why I left the money in London because there was a move away from the London Market between the countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean and a lot of other Sterling Countries.

To make matters worse, to show you how out of date our legislation is, from sometime either in July or August – I am not certain about the precise dates – we are no longer part of the sterling area although we are keeping 100% of our reserves in London, we are now what they call External Sterling whatever that means, and it means that only Ireland which is virtually at war with Britain and the United Kingdom itself are withing the Sterling Area, so all the protection we had before, we are now regarded as an External Currency. Unfortunately, until we can amend the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority legislation, we are still pinned and tied to the pound sterling at the rate of one dollar being equal to four shillings and two-pence whatever that is, because I do not know how many new pence that is, but I think it is twenty new pence English money. The Minister has reminded me that the role of sterling as reserve currency has been stipulated to be phased out as a condition of entry of Britain into the European Common Market.

I am making a disclosure here. I have a very good prospect of getting money at very favourable rates to carry out our development programme from West German sources in Deutsche Marks which, since we are now an External Sterling we can now convert any money we want on the English market in any other kind of currency that we require, so this Bill is a bit overdue. We should have had this since about 1967 but we did not have a Central Bank, and up to about 1966 conditions were not unfavourable on the London market, but there is no reason why Barbados should now in the fifth or sixth year of independence not borrow money in the cheapest market available. As long as we were restricted in this market we had to queue up with all the other sterling area countries and we were restricted in the timing of our flotations by the equivalent of the American Securities and Exchange Commission, that is the Capital Issues Committee in the United Kingdom. I do not remember going to the London market since about 1965, as far as I remember we had two loans raised since 1961. One was in connection with the Deep Water Harbour – it shows in the Estimates – and the other, part in connection with the Deep Water Harbour and part on the completion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am very pleased to say that ever since that time all the Government borrowings have been local borrowings, and the investment of public portfolio funds in Government Debentures, the Savings Bank, the National Insurance Board and other institutions like that are the sources of capital accummulation, you can call it compulsory savings if you like, but we have been living off our own fat, and a country that has an adverse balance of payments, quite apart from an adverse balance of trade, cannot afford to go on living off its own fat indefinitely and we must get some foreign currency imported into the economy of the country.

9.30 p.m.

That is all there is to it. There are two previous bits of legislation: the 1933 Act Chapter 7 and the 1935 Act Chapter 7; one is a General Loan Act and the other is an Inscribed Stock Act which gives authority to borrow in London. All this Bill is purporting to do is to give us the authority to borrow in centres other than in London either by ourselves or through the Agencies for Overseas Territories or whatever they might call themselves.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Government has taken the opportunity of tidying up the various Loan Bills and the amounts which are borrowable thereunder, and it has now introduced a structural Bill authorising it to borrow at large in foreign centres. We on this side of the House have no quarrel whatsoever with that. It is not an Act of which the mere passage will bring in the money, but I welcome the Prime Minister's assurance that he expects certain funds to be made available from West Germany – I hope whatever are the election results in that country. *(Asides)* It may be something to do with the election results, because fiscal policy and the level of the Deutsche Mark are election issues. It may well turn out that a change of Government in Western Germany may also bring about a change in the fiscal and economic policy, and the Germans may be less inclined to invest money overseas for the purpose of creating an outflow of money to match the constant inflow. Of course, the Prime Minister is in a better position to deal with those matters than I am, because I am sure he has inside information.

There are one or two questions which we on this side would like to ask. The main Deep Water Harbour Loan becomes payable on the 15th March next year - an amount of $12 million on the redemption date. He speaks of amounts very similar when he speaks of the German loan. Is it intended to re-finance this loan and to pay it off by second borrowing, or is it intended to sink some of it permanently? I know that some Governments are not fond of reducing the public debt unless they have to. You may have a Sinking Fund to reduce the rate of interest and to make the public debt a little cheaper. The loan for the Deep Water Harbour is still the biggest outstanding loan, and I wonder if the Prime Minister can tell the House what exactly he envisages in respect of that. I can anticipate that the level of local borrowing is hardly such as would allow us to redeem the Deep Water Harbour Loan as well as to use local borrowing to finance developments as we have been able to in the past.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question very simply, and I hope I will be excused immediately after this because I have another engagement. It is not proposed to use this loan as a conversion loan. We have between 1973 and 1977 quite a lot of loans local and overseas falling in. I am not dismissing the possibility of raising conversion loans, but whenever a loan is a conversion loan I will inform the House.

I think that our sinking fund resources by the time the Deep Water Harbour loan is due ought to be sufficient - it will be a million dollars subvention which the Government makes over and above the normal rate every year, and has been making for the past three or four years - to pay off that one. The loan we are now seeking is substantially to underwrite the cost of our Development Plan for this year and part of next year with such Budget surpluses as we may be able to allocate from time to time. It is not a conversion loan for the Deep Water Harbour, but I am not dismissing the possibility that if the rates of interest at which I can borrow money continue to be favourable to raise conversion loans even before the scheduled date of repayment of the debentures.

In other words, it would be cheaper for us to convert a 7% or 8% loan into a 5% loan. We can raise a new loan; pay off the old debentures, and keep paying a low rate of interst. I hope by this time next year the Central Bank will be managing most of these portfolios. The Central Bank will certainly require the powers to borrow outside which are contained in this Bill.

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

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called and stood part.

Clause 2 was called.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain to us if there is any reason why "fiscal

agent" is merely limited to any foreign bank, corporation or company? The term foreign bank was a term formerly used in the Licensing of Foreign Banks Act 1920 Chapter 1, which I believe was amended by the Banking Act of 1963. Outside of that it does not appear to be a term of art, but if it is used it would seem to mean a bank other than a bank incorporated in a Commonwealth country like Australia or New Zealand. Foreign in relation to the Crown would mean other than a non-Dominion company, and I wonder whether this point has been adverted to. Surely the fiscal agents could be more than are appointed other than in a Dominion country. It is significant, because it really deals with the powers given under Section 7. I am wondering if there is any particular reason why this limitation has been put in or if the point has not been adverted to. If the Minister does not have the answer now, perhaps, it could be dealt with when the Bill goes to the Other Place. I do not know whether the Minister wants such a limitation on his powers.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the Prime Minister has explained, owing to the present constitutional status of the country, the powers of the Government to borrow in capital markets should no longer be restricted to the United Kingdom. Moreover, as a condition of entry into the E.E.C., the United Kingdom is required to phase out the role of sterling as a reserve currency. It will, however, be necessary in future for Barbados to hold its foreign reserve in assets besides sterling. I am wondering whether that answers the question.

Mr. FORDE: Why do we have a fiscal agent outside of the United Kingdom? Perhaps he could raise the matter with the Minister of Finance in due course, and if he wants a wider definition to include any bank or incorporation, regardless of whether it is foreign or incorporated in a Dominion country, or to have a proper definition in the Section as to what he means by foreign bank. This can be dealt with when the matter goes to the Senate, and probably the amendment will be a formality. It does strike me, having read the Act, that the Minister has really limited himself severely in this respect whereas he needs much wider scope if he wants to get the best terms when he is raising loans. He may want to get a fiscal agent in New Zealand or somewhere else. He may want to use a fiscal agent from Trinidad or a fiscal agent from Barbados on, perhaps, more favourable terms than he is getting from a fiscal agent in a foreign bank.

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

9.40 p.m.

Clauses 3 to 9 inclusive were called and stood part.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (1972-73) ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this next Order, No. 6, is to move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year 1972-73.

This Bill is the first Supplementary Appropriation Bill in respect of the financial year 1972-73 and will provide for the grant from the Consolidated Fund of the sum of $1,478,845 and for the appropriation of such sum for the service and purposes specified in the Schedule.

As hon. members are fully aware, Section 109(5) of the Barbados Constitution makes provision for the Minister of Finance to introduce at any time before the end of the financial year a Supplementary Appropriation Bill in respect of Supplementary Expenditure voted on by the House of Assembly. Money Resolutions do not require the vote of the Senate, but in order that the Senate may have an early opportunity to debate the measures involved in charges under the Consolidated Fund, the Minister of Finance has approved the following procedure in regard to the submission of Money Resolutions from the House of Assembly. The Minister has laid down that except where there are special circumstances Money Resolutions will be sent to the House of Assembly three times during the financial year, in the months of July, October and January immediately after these measures are voted on by the House of Assembly. Supplementary Appropriation Bills containing the sums so voted will be introduced into the House of Assembly. So this is really just procedural.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: 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. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

The Schedule was called and stood part.

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive were called and stood part.

The Preamble was called and stood part.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the Leader of the House moves the motion for the Adjournment, I would like to ask leave of the House to give notice of a Resolution which unfortunately I was unable to give notice of earlier today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection to the hon. member for St. Michael West giving notice of such Resolution, leave will be granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is always happy to have Private Members given leave to give notices at any time.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, leave is granted.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:

"WHEREAS The Minister of Labour made a statement to the House at its meeting on 3rd October, 1972, on the state of industrial relations in the Island;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House views with deep concern the said statement."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, earlier in this sitting the hon. member for the City had intimated that he had some Resolutions to give notice of. I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition has them; if so, he may give notice of them on behalf of the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown did show me the Resolutions. There were two of them and he did put them in my hands and asked me to move them. One was dated 19th October, 1972 and reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that in view of the deplorable conditions existing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, this House calls upon the responsible Minister to offer his resignation from Government."

The other dated 20th October, 1972, reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that in view of the deplorable conditions existing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, this House calls upon the Government to take steps immediately to remedy the existing situation."

Your Honour understands the difficulty in which I am placed. The hon. member asked me to move these two Resolutions. I do not know what he would have done were he here and therefore I have, with the very kind leave of the House for which I am grateful, moved them. But it may very well be that one having been overtaken by the Government taking his good advice, he would not wish to pursue it.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th November, 1972, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.55 p.m.